

Retention, Tenure and/or Promotion

California State University, Bakersfield



July 2009 version



**“One’s mind, once stretched by a new idea
never regains its original dimensions.”**

~ Oliver Wendell Holmes

[Table of Contents]

Introduction.....	3
Review Cycles.....	3
Levels of Review.....	4
Promotion.....	4
Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion.....	4
Applicable Policies.....	4-5
RTP Candidates.....	6-10
Criteria for Performance Review	
Optional External Evaluation	
Areas to be Evaluated	
Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)— <i>commonly called RTP File</i>	
Suggestions for Constructing RTP File	
Unit RTP Committee/Library RTP Committee/Counseling Center RTP Committee.....	11-14
Duties of Committee Members	
Election of Unit RTP Committees	
Areas to be Evaluated	
Criteria for Performance Review	
Optional External Evaluation	
Department Chairs/Director of the Counseling Center.....	15-17
Mentoring	
Optional Department Chair Review of RTP Candidates	
Areas to be Evaluated	
Criteria for Performance Review	
Optional External Evaluation	

Dean/Dean of University Libraries/Vice President for Student Affairs.....	18-20
Areas to be Evaluated	
Criteria for Performance Review	
Optional External Evaluation	
University Review Committee (URC).....	21-24
Election of URC Committee Members	
Areas to be Evaluated	
Criteria for Performance Review	
Optional External Evaluation	
Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.....	25-27
Optional External Evaluation	
Areas to be Evaluated	
Criteria for Performance Review	
CSUB President.....	28
Appendix A – Contents and Organization of the RTP File (WPAF).....	29-33
Appendix B – Time Chart for RTP Process.....	34-35

[RTP Overview]

PERFORMANCE REVIEWS are required of faculty for purposes of retention, tenure and/or promotion (RTP). All faculty, except teaching staff who are awarded credit towards tenure, will undergo performance reviews in years 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 of their probationary period. (Faculty who are awarded credit towards tenure are evaluated every year.) During the 3rd year review, a request for a 4th year assessment may be made at any stage of the evaluation process. In addition, RTP candidates may themselves ask for a 4th year review.

The normal period of probation shall be a total of six years of full-time probationary service and credited service, if any. For the purpose of calculating the probationary period, a year of service commences with the first fall term of appointment. An individual faculty member may apply to the President for an extension of the probationary period for compelling reasons. An application for such an extension shall not affect determinations regarding the award of tenure.

Tenure shall be effective at the beginning of the academic year following the year in which tenure is awarded.

No individual shall participate in the review of a "close relative" (defined as the son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife, step-relative, or in-law) or "domestic partner" (defined as anyone sharing a common residence and life necessities with an employee).

**Be the
change
you want
to see in
the world.**

~ Gandhi

REVIEW CYCLES

RTP reviews are conducted each academic year during three cycles:

1. **Fall RTP Cycle** — review of 2nd year probationary faculty;
2. **Winter RTP Cycle** — review of 3rd, 5th, and 6th year RTP candidates, and 4th year faculty, if requested; and
3. **Spring RTP Cycle** — review of 1st year probationary faculty and temporary faculty.

LEVELS OF REVIEW

Once an RTP file is submitted to the department to begin a review cycle, the RTP file will advance through the following evaluations:

- Unit RTP Committee
- Department Chair (optional)
- Dean
- University Review Committee (URC)
- Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
- President

All deliberations and recommendations shall be ***confidential***. Only the affected faculty, review members at all levels of review, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the RTP files.

PROMOTION

Promotion of tenured faculty shall ordinarily occur at the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current rank or classification. Promotion of tenured faculty occurs within the following guidelines and restrictions.

- a. Tenured faculty wishing to undergo review for promotion shall notify the Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) in writing ***by November 1*** of their intention to undergo performance review for the purpose of promotion during the winter RTP cycle. Tenured faculty who do not notify the Office of the P&VPAA by that date will be ineligible to undergo review for promotion that year.
- b. The performance review for promotion purposes occurs in the Winter RTP cycle during the academic year in which the tenured faculty requests the review for promotion.

Prior to the President's final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw from the promotion process at any level of review by submitting a formal request to the P&VPAA. Unless the faculty formally withdraws from the review process, the review for consideration of promotion shall continue even if there is a recommendation against promotion at any level of review.

EARLY TENURE AND/OR EARLY PROMOTION:

Criteria for early tenure and/or early promotion are significantly higher than those for consideration during the normal cycle and are granted only in exceptional circumstances. It should be recognized that granting of early tenure and/or early promotion is rare.

To receive a favorable recommendation for early tenure or early promotion, a candidate goes through a more rigorous review than for normal tenure and must achieve a record of accomplishment which exceeds the essential criteria in both teaching (for counselors, exceptional performance in counseling) and scholarly/creative activities, and of acceptable performance in professionally related service at CSUB

APPLICABLE POLICY DOCUMENTS

Articles 13, 14, and 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, available at:
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/CFAtoc.shtml

CSUB Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy located in the CSUB Faculty Handbook Section 305 – Retention, Award of Tenure, and Promotion (Faculty Handbook is located on the CSUB website at <http://www.csub.edu/academicaffairs/Handbook/FacultyHandbook2008.pdf>)

Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion policies. Copies of these documents may be obtained from the candidate's department.

RTP forms and relevant information may be found on the Faculty Affairs website at:
www.CSUB.edu/FacultyAffairs/

Attachments:

- Appendix A: Contents and Organization of the RTP file (WPAF) from the CSUB Faculty handbook—Appendix G.
- Appendix B: Time Chart for RTP Process

[RTP Candidates]

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Department RTP criteria shall be used at each level of review for each faculty member. RTP candidates shall have the option of a performance review adhering to either the department RTP criteria in place at the time of their hiring or any subsequent revision of the department RTP criteria approved prior to the beginning of the current RTP cycle in which the faculty member is currently participating. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate faculty members during the evaluation process.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

Department RTP criteria are formally reviewed at least once every five years. After department criteria are approved by all tenured and tenured track faculty, changes are forwarded to the Dean and the P&VPAA.

OPTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION:

A request for an external review of materials may be initiated by any party in the performance review process and at any level of the review. Requests for external evaluation should be made as early as possible in the evaluation process, ideally prior to submission of the RTP File. The request must describe the circumstances requiring the external evaluation, the specific criteria involved, and the nature of the materials needing evaluation. The request must be approved by the President, or his designee, with the concurrency of the RTP candidate.

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

For Teaching Faculty

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Teaching**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The review for teaching success evaluates areas such as competence in discipline, effective communication, teaching techniques, assessment of student learning, organization of course, course objectives, and student evaluations;
- b. **Scholarly Activity**—may include, but is not limited to, research and publications, original preparation, scholarly and creative achievements, professional organizations, grants, professional registration, and/or validation of

scholarship by external peer review. All scholarly activity submitted is required to be of high quality;

c. **Services**— to the discipline, the University, and the community such as academic advisement, co-curricular activities, community service related to teaching specialty, diversity related activities, and/or committee assignments.

For Librarians

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**—activity that has received favorable peer review and is of high quality;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

For Counselors

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Professional Growth**—especially those accomplishments that have received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, research publication or presentation;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (WPAF)—commonly called the RTP File

The Department Chair serves as mentor to RTP candidates and is responsible for providing guidance, advice, and support to assist the candidate in preparing the RTP File. The Department Chair may work with the candidate to formulate a professional development plan that may include: goals and objectives to be pursued prior to the time of tenure decision of the candidate, ways to keep teaching performance current and dynamic, how to maintain currency in the field, and ways to contribute substantively to the field.

The candidate, with advice from the Department Chair, shall be responsible for selecting appropriate materials to document performance in accord with the department RTP criteria,

organizing the materials for convenient review by all levels, and maintaining and updating the RTP file for each subsequent review cycle.

The Unit RTP Committee and the candidate shall review the RTP file to ensure that the file is complete and accurate before the start of the review process, but it is ultimately the responsibility of the candidate to ensure the completeness of the WPAF.

Once submitted, the RTP file becomes part of the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF) and the property of the CSUB. Materials in the RTP file shall be confidential. Only the affected faculty, review members at all levels of review, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the RTP files. During the review process, each level of review shall be responsible for retaining the integrity of the RTP file until it is forwarded to the next level of the review. Faculty shall keep and store all relevant materials documenting the three primary areas—Teaching or Performance, Scholarly/Creative Activity or Professional Growth, and Professionally Related Services to the University and Community—between RTP cycles.

Adding documents to RTP file after date of completion of file:

Once the Unit RTP Committee and the RTP candidate have determined that his/her RTP file is complete, only items that become available after the date of completion of the file will be considered for submission. The new items should be submitted to the URC, and they will determine whether the material should be added. If the URC approves the addition of newly available materials, the file shall be returned to the Unit RTP Committee for reconsideration of its initial evaluation and recommendation and then moved through the review process again.

During the review process, no material shall be removed from the RTP file.

Quality over quantity should be emphasized in the WPAF; however, all accomplishments should be listed. Copies of all significant publications or scholarly activities for the period of review shall be included.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTING RTP FILE

Faculty Affairs will provide each new probationary faculty member with a binder and tabs and a file box that **may** be used for the candidate's WPAF. Remember, it is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure the completeness of his/her WPAF, whether a candidate decides to use the provided binder and file box or not. The CSUB Faculty Handbook Appendix G has the complete list of required items to be included in a candidate's RTP File. A copy of the list is included in Appendix A at the end of this handbook.

There are certain sections that are required to be in each RTP File. When a section contains materials from quarter-to-quarter and/or year-to-year, the materials shall be organized chronologically, preferably "reverse chronology" with the most recent materials toward the front of the respective section. The Faculty Affairs provided **Main RTP Binder** will include tabs for the required sections and sections that are optional. Below is a list of required and optional sections for an RTP File:

- a. **Log Sheet (required)** listing each document placed in the file, date of insertion, original source, person or authority responsible for inserting the document;

- b. **Access Sheet (required)** listing each person having access to the file, reason for access, and date of access;
- c. **Master Index (required)** for the Main RTP Binder and the additional boxes and/or binders. Each document in the RTP File must have a unique identifying code that is also displayed on the Master Index;
- d. **Department RTP Criteria (required)** – the approved department criteria that the candidate has chosen to be evaluated against;
- e. **Current Vita (required)** that encompasses the candidate’s entire academic and professional employment history and accomplishments in all three areas of review (Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service);
- f. **Summary of Teaching Performance (optional)** (1000 word narrative maximum). If including a summary, clearly indicate where in the Main RTP Binder or appendix boxes/binders supporting documentation can be found;
- g. **Previous and Current RTP Evaluations/Rebuttals/Responses (required)** including those from the current RTP review cycle;
- h. **Assignment Sheet (required)**:
 - 1. Classes Taught (for faculty) – list all courses taught and all assigned time since the last RTP review; or
 - 2. Major Responsibilities and Professional Activities (for librarians and counselors);
- i. **Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCİ) (optional)** -- blank copy of the Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCİ) Questionnaire;
- j. **Student Evaluation Summaries** (statistical summaries of SOCİ) **(required)** -- SOCİ must be administered in accordance with established departmental policy. These classes should be representative of the candidates teaching assignments. Anonymous student communications or evaluations outside of the SOCİ process shall not be included in the RTP File;
- k. **Grade Distributions (optional)** – statistical summaries;
- l. **Summary of Scholarly Activities (optional)** (1000 word narrative maximum). If including a summary, clearly indicate where in the Main RTP Binders or appendix boxes/binders supporting documentation can be found;
- m. **Summary of Professional, University, and Community Service Activities (optional)** (1000 word narrative maximum). If including a summary, clearly indicate where in the Main RTP Binder or appendix boxes/binders supporting documentation can be found.

2. **Appendix I Section or Binder:**

- a. **Teaching (for teaching faculty) (required)** – this appendix would include documentation supporting accomplishments. Teaching success is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion.

Suggested sections to include are:

- a. Table of Contents of Appendix I;
- b. Raw data from SOCİ for each course taught during probationary period **(required)**;
- c. Sample syllabi and coursework;
- d. Peer assessments based upon a mutually agreed schedule of classroom visits during the review cycle;
- e. Formal assessments performed by the Faculty Teaching & Learning Center (FTLC) at the request of the faculty member during the review cycle.

b. **Performance (for librarians and counselors) (required)** – the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant and orderly.

3. **Appendix II Section or Binder: Scholarly Activity (required)** – this appendix would include documentation supporting accomplishments and showing how the faculty is growing and developing through scholarly/creative activities within the discipline (teaching faculty and librarians) or through professional growth activities within the field (counselors).

Suggested sections to include are:

- a. Table of Contents of Appendix II;
- b. Copy of each significant published, exhibited, or performed work in the period under review;
- c. For published, exhibited, or performed works, evidence of peer review or lack of peer review for each item;
- d. For work that has been accepted but not yet published, exhibited, or performed, a letter of acceptance, evidence of peer review, and evidence of quality of the publishing or performance venue;
- e. For unpublished works and on-going activities, you may include significant documentation that might assist reviewers in assessing quality;
- f. For co-authored activities, documentation of the unique and specific contribution of each author to the work;
- g. Other relevant documentation for any other activities.

4. **Appendix III Section or Binder: Service (required)** – type and extent of professionally related services the faculty provides to the campus and/or to the community and documentation supporting accomplishments in service.

Suggested sections to include are:

- a. Table of Contents for Appendix III.
- b. Membership/leadership of university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, presentations to community groups, and/or involvement in community projects.
- c. For each significant activity, you may describe (and where possible document) level of participation and responsibilities.
- d. Other relevant documentation.

“Dreams sometimes do come true. But not without something that looks a lot like hard work.”

~ Sylvia Ashton Warner

[Unit RTP Committees]

(Library RTP Committee *for Library candidates and*
Counseling Center RTP Committee *for Counseling*
candidates)

DUTIES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Unit RTP Committees are responsible for reviewing and evaluating in writing the RTP files of department faculty members being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. Evaluators should not simply enumerate the candidate's accomplishments, but evaluate them according to the department criteria. ***The focus must always be on the quality of the contributions rather than the quantity.*** Evaluators are also responsible for providing guidance to candidates for future reviews, especially in areas where the need for improvement may have been noted.

The Unit RTP Committee is required to formulate a written recommendation with regards to retention, tenure, or promotion, and reasons for the recommendations. The Unit RTP Committee shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation which shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee. An abstention shall count as a negative vote. All committee members shall sign the evaluation and recommendation. Any member of the Unit RTP Committee may submit a minority report. If any minority reports are submitted, a cover sheet signed by all committee members shall be included to indicate that they have reviewed the minority report(s). The views expressed by individual members of the Unit RTP Committee during the committee's deliberations shall be confidential.

The candidate will have a ten calendar day period for response or rebuttal and/or the right to request a meeting to discuss the recommendation before the recommendation is sent to the next level of review. Rebuttals, responses, and/or discussions shall be limited to the issues raised in the evaluations or recommendations and shall be based only on material in the RTP file. A copy of the written rebuttal statement or response shall be placed in the RTP file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

From the Unit RTP Committee, the RTP file, containing the evaluation and recommendation of the Unit RTP Committee, shall be forwarded to the Chair, if s/he opts to complete a separate review, or the Dean.

ELECTION OF UNIT RTP COMMITTEES

Service in the RTP process is one of the duties of tenured faculty. Full-time tenured faculty members serve on Unit RTP Committees and are elected by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty. The Dean may approve a department's request to elect a faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) to serve, but faculty in this program have the option to decline. Faculty may serve on more than one Unit RTP Committee during a given RTP cycle, but no faculty member shall serve on RTP committees at two different levels of review.

RTP committee members must have higher rank than those under consideration for promotion, except in cases of candidates that are already at the top rank (professor or equivalent). If promotion is not involved, tenured faculty of any rank may serve as members of the Unit RTP Committee.

Faculty serving as President of the CFA, Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC), or Director of Assessment are not eligible to serve on a Unit RTP Committee.

Candidates being reviewed during a given RTP cycle are ineligible for service on a Unit RTP Committee during that RTP cycle.

No individual shall participate on the Unit RTP Committee when the candidate is a "close relative" (defined as the son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife, step-relative, or in-law) or "domestic partner" (defined as anyone sharing a common residence and life necessities with an employee).

Members of the Unit RTP Committee shall serve a term of one RTP cycle, and they shall elect their own chair who participates in the evaluation and votes on the recommendation.

The Unit RTP Committee, Library RTP Committee, and Counseling Center RTP Committee shall consist of no fewer than three full-time tenured faculty members. In some circumstances, however, a department may not have enough eligible members to serve on the Unit RTP Committee. In this situation, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline. The outside member(s) shall have the same responsibilities as the other committee members.

At the candidate's discretion, the candidate may request a specific member from within or outside his/her department, who is jointly acceptable to other members of the committee, to serve on the Unit RTP Committee. All other criteria for membership on the committee must be met. The requested member would serve as a voting member for the requested faculty review only and would not participate in the review of other candidates.

The academic Deans are responsible for ensuring that the Unit RTP Committees are appropriately constituted. The department will submit to the Dean at least three weeks before the beginning of a review cycle, a list of members of the Unit RTP Committees.

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

For Teaching Faculty

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Teaching**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The review for teaching success evaluates areas such as competence in discipline, effective communication, teaching techniques, assessment of student learning, organization of course, course objectives, and student evaluations;
- b. **Scholarly Activity**—may include, but is not limited to, research and publications, original preparation, scholarly and creative achievements, professional organizations, grants, professional registration, and/or validation of scholarship by external peer review. All scholarly activity submitted is required to be of high quality;
- c. **Services**—to the discipline, the University, and the community such as academic advisement, co-curricular activities, community service related to teaching specialty, diversity related activities, and/or committee assignments.

For Librarians

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**—activity that has received favorable peer review and is of high quality;
- c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

For Counselors

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. **Professional Growth**—especially those accomplishments that have received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, research publication or presentation;
- c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Department RTP criteria shall be used at each level of review for each faculty member. RTP candidates shall have the option of a performance review adhering to either the department RTP criteria in place at the time of their hiring or any subsequent revision of the department RTP criteria approved prior to the beginning of the current RTP cycle in which the faculty member is currently participating. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate faculty members during the evaluation process.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

Department RTP criteria are formally reviewed at least once every five years. After department criteria are approved by all tenured and tenured track faculty, changes are forwarded to the Dean and the P&VPAA.

OPTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION:

A request for an external review of materials may be initiated by any party in the performance review process and at any level of the review. Requests for external evaluation should be made as early as possible in the evaluation process, ideally prior to submission of the RTP File. The request must describe the circumstances requiring the external evaluation, the specific criteria involved, and the nature of the materials needing evaluation. The request must be approved by the President, or his designee, with the concurrency of the RTP candidate.

**“What we have done for ourselves alone
dies with us. What we have done for
others and the world remains and is
immortal.”**

~ Albert Pine

[Department Chairs]

(For librarians there is no Department Chair; for counselors, the Department Chair is the Director of the Counseling Center)

MENTORING

The Department Chair serves as a mentor to RTP candidates and is responsible for providing guidance, advice, and support to assist the faculty member in preparing his/her RTP file. Different areas on which the Department Chair may work with the faculty member are formulating a professional development plan, which may include goals and objectives to be pursued by the time of tenure decision, ways to keep teaching current and dynamic, how to maintain currency in the field, and ways to contribute substantively to the field.

The faculty member, with advice from the Department Chair, shall be responsible for selecting appropriate materials to document performance in accord with the department RTP criteria, organizing the materials for convenient review by all levels, and maintaining and updating the RTP file for each subsequent review cycle. It is the responsibility of the candidates to ensure the completeness of their RTP file.

OPTIONAL DEPARTMENT CHAIR REVIEW OF RTP CANDIDATES

Department Chairs have the option to review, evaluate, and formulate a written recommendation regarding retention, tenure, or promotion of department candidates. If the Chair makes a separate recommendation regarding a faculty member, then he/she may not participate as a member of that candidate's Unit RTP Committee.

If the Department Chair reviews a file for retention, tenure and/or promotion, he/she should not simply enumerate the candidate's accomplishments but evaluate them according to the department criteria. ***The focus must always be on the quality of the contributions rather than the quantity. Evaluators are also responsible for providing guidance to candidates for future reviews, especially in areas where the need for improvement may have been noted.***

During the review process, no material shall be removed from the RTP file. All material from the RTP file shall be **confidential**. Only the affected faculty, review members at all levels of review, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the RTP files.

If an evaluation has been completed by the Department Chair, the candidate will have a ten calendar day period for response or rebuttal and/or the right to request a meeting to discuss the recommendation before the recommendation is sent to the Dean. Rebuttals, responses, and/or discussions shall be limited to the issues raised in the evaluation or recommendations and shall be based only on material in the RTP file. A copy of the written rebuttal statement or response shall be placed in the RTP file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

A Department Chair may not review a "close relative" (defined as the son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife, step-relative, or in-law) or "domestic partner" (defined as anyone sharing a common residence and life necessities with an employee).

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

For Teaching Faculty

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Teaching**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The review for teaching success evaluates areas such as competence in discipline, effective communication, teaching techniques, assessment of student learning, organization of course, course objectives, and student evaluations;
- b. **Scholarly Activity**—may include, but is not limited to, research and publications, original preparation, scholarly and creative achievements, professional organizations, grants, professional registration, and/or validation of scholarship by external peer review. All scholarly activity submitted is required to be of high quality;
- c. **Services**— to the discipline, the University, and the community such as academic advisement, co-curricular activities, community service related to teaching specialty, diversity related activities, and/or committee assignments.

For Librarians

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**—activity that has received favorable peer review and is of high quality;
- c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

For Counselors

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Professional Growth**—especially those accomplishments that have received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, research publication or presentation;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The department RTP criteria shall be used for review. RTP candidates themselves shall have the option of a performance review adhering to either the department RTP criteria in place at the time of their hiring or any subsequent revision of the department RTP criteria approved before the beginning of the current RTP cycle. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty member during the evaluation process.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

The Chair shall make certain that the department RTP criteria be formally reviewed at least once every five years and that the effective date be included on the criteria document. For the cases of candidates seeking early tenure and/or early promotion, well defined departmental expectations for the level of "exceptional" shall be included in the department RTP criteria. Changes to the criteria may be proposed by any faculty member. After approval by a majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, changes in the department RTP criteria shall be forwarded to the school Dean and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Given the critical importance of the RTP process, the P&VPAA, school Deans, and departments are encouraged to make every attempt to resolve amicably any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the P&VPAA shall request the University Review Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

OPTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION

A request for an external review of materials may be initiated by any party in the performance review process and at any level of the review. Requests for external evaluation should be made as early as possible in the evaluation process, ideally prior to submission of the RTP file. The request must describe the circumstances requiring the external evaluation, the specific criteria involved, and the nature of the materials needing evaluation. The request must be approved by the President, or his designee, with the concurrency of the RTP candidate.

[Dean]

(For librarians, the school Dean is the Dean of University Libraries; for counselors, the school Dean is the Vice President for Student Affairs)

After the Unit RTP review, and the Chair's if s/he so chooses, the Dean shall prepare a separate written evaluation and recommendation. The Dean should not simply enumerate the candidate's accomplishments, but evaluate them according to the appropriate department criteria. ***The focus must always be on the quality of the contributions rather than the quantity.*** Evaluators are also responsible for providing guidance to candidates for future reviews, especially in areas where the need for improvement may have been noted.

The Dean is responsible for making a recommendation in each review, including a written statement giving the reasons for the recommendation and providing copies of the recommendation to the faculty member and to all prior levels of review. All RTP file materials shall be confidential. Only the affected faculty, review members at all levels of review, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the RTP files. Once completed, the RTP file will be forwarded to the University Review Committee (URC).

The candidate will have a ten calendar day period for response or rebuttal and/or the right to request a meeting to discuss the recommendation before the recommendation is sent to the URC. Rebuttals, responses, and/or discussions shall be limited to the issues raised in the evaluation or recommendations and shall be based only on material in the RTP file. A copy of the written rebuttal statement or response shall be placed in the RTP file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

The Dean shall not participate in the review of a "close relative" (defined as the son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife, step-relative, or in-law) or "domestic partner" (defined as anyone sharing a common residence and life necessities with an employee). The Dean shall designate these duties if s/he is ineligible to evaluate a candidate.

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

For Teaching Faculty

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Teaching**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The review for teaching success evaluates areas such as competence in discipline,

effective communication, teaching techniques, assessment of student learning, organization of course, course objectives, and student evaluations;

b. **Scholarly Activity**—may include, but is not limited to, research and publications, original preparation, scholarly and creative achievements, professional organizations, grants, professional registration, and/or validation of scholarship by external peer review. All scholarly activity submitted is required to be of high quality;

c. **Services**— to the discipline, the University, and the community such as academic advisement, co-curricular activities, community service related to teaching specialty, diversity related activities, and/or committee assignments.

For Librarians

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**—activity that has received favorable peer review and is of high quality;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

For Counselors

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Professional Growth**—especially those accomplishments that have received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, research publication or presentation;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The department RTP criteria shall be used for all reviews. RTP candidates themselves shall have the option of a performance review adhering to either the department RTP criteria in place at the time they began the tenure track or any subsequent revision of the department RTP criteria approved before the beginning of the current RTP cycle. Once the evaluation process has begun,

there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty member during the evaluation process.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

Department RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five years. For the cases of candidates seeking early tenure and/or early promotion, well defined departmental expectations for the level of "exceptional" shall be included in the department RTP criteria. Changes to the criteria may be proposed by any faculty member. ***After approval by a majority vote of all tenured and probationary faculty, changes in the department RTP criteria shall be forwarded to the school Dean and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.***

Given the critical importance of the RTP process, the P&VPAA, school Deans, and units are encouraged to make every attempt to resolve amicably any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the P&VPAA shall request the University Review Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

OPTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION:

A request for an external review of materials may be initiated by any party in the performance review process and at any level of the review. Requests for external evaluation should be made as early as possible in the evaluation process, ideally prior to submission of the RTP File. The request must describe the circumstances requiring the external evaluation, the specific criteria involved, and the nature of the materials needing evaluation. The request must be approved by the President, or his designee, with the concurrency of the RTP candidate.

**Looking back
across my
timeline
through school,
and indeed in
the early days
of teaching, I
see one good
thing about
being filled
with
insecurities.
Knowing that I
had everything
to gain, I
seemed to seek
out mentors."**

**~ Shirley
McPhillips**

[University Review Committee (URC)]

The University Review Committee (URC) is a six member committee comprised of tenured professors, librarians, or counselors. The committee selects its own chair, and that chair participates in the evaluations and votes on the recommendations. No member of the URC may serve on a Unit RTP Committee.

The URC is responsible to review and evaluate in writing the RTP file of each RTP candidate commenting upon the faculty's qualifications under each category of the criteria and formulating a recommendation which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation. In addition, a review of the appropriateness of recommendations made and procedures used at previous levels of the review process should be assessed. If the URC finds that all relevant information was not considered, due process was not followed, or there was an arbitrary action, then the committee may return the RTP file for reconsideration. All URC members shall sign the URC evaluation and recommendation. In addition, any member of the committee may submit a minority report. If any minority reports are submitted, a cover sheet signed by all the URC members shall be included to indicate that they have reviewed the minority report(s).

Evaluators should not simply enumerate the candidate's accomplishments, but evaluate them according to the department criteria. ***The focus must always be on the quality of the contributions rather than the quantity.*** Evaluators are also responsible for providing guidance to candidates for future reviews, especially in areas where the need for improvement may have been noted. The views expressed by individual members of the URC committee during the committee's deliberations shall be confidential.

No individual shall participate in the review of a "close relative" (defined as the son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife, step-relative, or in-law) or "domestic partner" (defined as anyone sharing a common residence and life necessities with an employee). If a URC member has a conflict, s/he should attach a memo to the URC evaluation indicating the reason s/he is ineligible to participate in the review of the candidate.

The URC provides copies of the recommendations to the candidates and all prior levels of review. The candidate will have a ten calendar day period for response or rebuttal and/or the right to request a meeting to discuss the recommendation before the recommendation is sent to the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA). Rebuttals, responses, and/or discussions shall be limited to the issues raised in the evaluation or recommendations and shall be based only on material in the RTP file. A copy of the written rebuttal statement or response shall be placed in the RTP file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

Once the response period is complete, the URC shall forward the RTP files, including its evaluations and recommendations, to the P&VPAA for review. Once the P&VPAA has completed his/her review, the URC and the P&VPAA shall discuss their respective recommendations before the recommendations are submitted to the President.

ELECTION OF URC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Service in the RTP process is one of the duties of tenured faculty. Only full-time tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the University Review Committee. No faculty member shall serve on RTP committees at two different levels of review.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty elect the members of the URC. URC members shall be elected to over-lapping two-year terms. Election of the six URC members shall precede Unit RTP Committee elections. If elected to the URC, faculty members are obligated to serve, except those faculty members serving as Department Chair, or faculty that have served on the URC within the last six years, or faculty that have served (two) 2-year terms on the URC – in these cases, the faculty have the option to accept or decline nomination for election to the URC.

URC members must have higher rank than those under consideration for promotion, except in cases of candidates already at the top rank (professor or equivalent).

The URC is comprised of:

- 2 members elected by and from the School of Humanities & Social Sciences;
- 1 member elected by and from the School of Business and Public Administration;
- 1 member elected by and from the School of Education;
- 1 member elected by and from the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics;
- 1 member shall be elected at-large.

Each school elects their representative(s) to the URC. Librarians and counselors (academically-related III) are eligible to serve as the at-large member, and they participate in the election of this URC member. The Academic Senate oversees the election of the at-large member of the URC. When the at-large member is not a librarian or counselor, the URC shall be augmented by a tenured librarian elected by the librarians or a tenured counselor elected by the counselors to sit with the committee in a non-voting, advisory capacity when a librarian or counselor, respectively, is being reviewed.

Faculty serving as President of the CFA, Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC), or Director of Assessment are not eligible to serve on the URC.

Faculty being reviewed are ineligible for service on the URC.

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

For Teaching Faculty

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Teaching**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The review for teaching success evaluates areas such as competence in discipline, effective communication, teaching techniques, assessment of student learning, organization of course, course objectives, and student evaluations;

b. **Scholarly Activity**—may include, but is not limited to, research and publications, original preparation, scholarly and creative achievements, professional organizations, grants, professional registration, and/or validation of scholarship by external peer review. All scholarly activity submitted is required to be of high quality;

c. **Services**— to the discipline, the University, and the community such as academic advisement, co-curricular activities, community service related to teaching specialty, diversity related activities, and/or committee assignments.

For Librarians

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**—activity that has received favorable peer review and is of high quality;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

For Counselors

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;

b. **Professional Growth**—especially those accomplishments that have received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, research publication or presentation;

c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The department RTP criteria shall be used for review. RTP candidates themselves shall have the option of a performance review adhering to either the department RTP criteria in place at the time of their hiring or any subsequent revision of the department RTP criteria approved before the beginning of the current RTP cycle. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty member during the evaluation process.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

Department RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five years. Changes to the criteria may be proposed by any faculty member. After approval by a majority vote of all tenured and probationary faculty, changes in the department RTP criteria shall be forwarded to the school Dean and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Given the critical importance of the RTP process, the P&VPAA, school Deans, and units are encouraged to make every attempt to resolve amicably any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the P&VPAA shall request the University Review Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.



**“We make a living by what we get; we
make a life by what we give.”**

~ Winston Churchill

OPTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION:

A request for an external review of materials may be initiated by any party in the performance review process and at any level of the review. Requests for external evaluation should be made as early as possible in the evaluation process, ideally prior to submission of the RTP File. The request must describe the circumstances requiring the external evaluation, the specific criteria involved, and the nature of the materials needing evaluation. The request must be approved by the President, or his designee, with the concurrency of the RTP candidate.

[Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA)]

The Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs is responsible to review each RTP file and recommend action, and the basis for the action, to the President. Copies of the recommendation are to be provided to the faculty members and all prior levels of review.

The candidate will have a ten calendar day period for response or rebuttal and/or the right to request a meeting to discuss the recommendation before the recommendation is sent to the President. Rebuttals, responses, and/or discussions shall be limited to the issues raised in the evaluation or recommendations and shall be based only on material in the RTP file. A copy of the written rebuttal statement or response shall be placed in the RTP file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

Once the P&VPAA has completed his/her review, the P&VPAA and the URC shall discuss their respective recommendations before the recommendations are submitted to the President. All deliberations and recommendations shall be **confidential**. Only the affected faculty, review members at all levels of review, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the RTP files.

The Provost shall not participate in the review of a "close relative" (defined as the son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife, step-relative, or in-law) or "domestic partner" (defined as anyone sharing a common residence and life necessities with an employee). The Provost shall designate these duties if s/he is ineligible to evaluate a candidate.

OPTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION:

A request for an external review of materials may be initiated by any party in the performance review process and at any level of the review. Requests for external evaluation should be made as early as possible in the evaluation process, ideally prior to submission of the RTP File. The request must describe the circumstances requiring the external evaluation, the specific criteria involved, and the nature of the materials needing evaluation. The request must be approved by the President, or his designee, with the concurrency of the RTP candidate.

AREAS TO BE EVALUATED

For Teaching Faculty

The principal areas in which teaching faculty performance shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Teaching**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The review for teaching success evaluates areas such as competence in discipline, effective communication, teaching techniques, assessment of student learning, organization of course, course objectives, and student evaluations;
- b. **Scholarly Activity**—may include, but is not limited to, research and publications, original preparation, scholarly and creative achievements, professional organizations, grants, professional registration, and/or validation of scholarship by external peer review. All scholarly activity submitted is required to be of high quality;
- c. **Services**— to the discipline, the University, and the community such as academic advisement, co-curricular activities, community service related to teaching specialty, diversity related activities, and/or committee assignments.

For Librarians

The principal areas in which librarians shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**—activity that has received favorable peer review and is of high quality;
- c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the librarian's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

For Counselors

The principal areas in which counselors shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are:

- a. **Performance**—the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion;
- b. **Professional Growth**—especially those accomplishments that have received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, research publication or presentation;
- c. **Professionally Related Services**—to the University and to the community.

In evaluating the counselor's performance in categories a, b, and c, particular consideration may be given to contributions to university-wide initiatives and the accomplishment of University mission and goals.

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The department RTP criteria shall be used for review. RTP candidates themselves shall have the option of a performance review adhering to either the department RTP criteria in place at the time of their hiring or any subsequent revision of the department RTP criteria approved before the beginning of the current RTP cycle. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty member during the evaluation process.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

Department RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five years. Changes to the criteria may be proposed by any faculty member. After approval by a majority vote of all tenured and probationary faculty, changes in the department RTP criteria shall be forwarded to the school Dean and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Given the critical importance of the RTP process, the P&VPAA, school Deans, and units are encouraged to make every attempt to resolve amicably any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the P&VPAA shall request the University Review Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

**“Children are likely to live up to
what you believe of them.”**

~ Lady Bird Johnson

[CSUB President]

The President shall review the evaluations and recommendations and other materials forwarded by the P&VPAA as necessary to arrive at a decision regarding retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. The President may return the materials to the appropriate reviewing level for clarification. The final decision of the President will be reported in writing to the faculty concerned and to the chairs of all the appropriate reviewing committees by June 1. In the instance of denial, the reasons for the decision shall be included in the report.

“A lot of people have gone further than they thought they could because someone else thought they could.”

~ Unknown

[Appendix A]

(CSUB Faculty 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.

a. Log Sheet

1. All documents placed in the RTP file shall be listed chronologically on the Log Sheet, with date of insertion, original source of each document, and person or authority responsible for inserting the material.
2. All documents removed from the RTP file shall be listed chronologically on the Log Sheet, with date of removal and person or authority responsible for removing the material.
3. The Log Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the Dean or director of the faculty.

b. Access Sheet

1. The names of all persons accessing the RTP file shall be recorded on the Access Sheet, with date(s) of access and reason for access.
2. Each person accessing the RTP file shall be responsible for recording the necessary information on the Access Sheet.
3. The Access Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the Dean or director of the faculty.

c. Master Index

1. All documents in the RTP file arranged chronologically within each section of the file shall be so listed on the Master Index, i.e., the Master Index shall be organized by section.
2. Each document shall have a unique identifying code, which is also displayed on the Master Index.
3. The Master Index shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

d. Assignments Sheet

1. Faculty shall list all courses taught, quarter-by-quarter, since the last RTP review on the Assignments Sheet. In addition, faculty shall list all assigned time (including number of units for each reassigned activity), quarter-by-quarter, since the last RTP review.
2. Librarians and counselors shall list all assigned responsibilities since the last RTP review.
3. The Assignments Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

e. Current Vita

1. A current vita should contain the following information:
 - 1) formal education, including dates of attendance and degrees awarded;

- 2) employment history, including position titles and dates;
- 3) prior teaching and/or professional experiences;
- 4) instructionally related activities, including, but not limited to, major advising responsibilities, supervising major tutorial programs, curriculum or program development;
- 5) scholarly or creative accomplishments or professional growth accomplishments, including, but not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, and presentations of peer reviewed papers at professional meetings;
- 6) funded grants and contracts, including consulting activities;
- 7) professionally related services to university and/or community, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership on university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, and other activities contributing to the enlightenment and enrichment of the community;
- 8) major honors and awards, including special leaves or sabbaticals for professional development; and
- 9) other areas of assigned responsibilities.

2. The vita shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

f. Current Unit RTP Criteria

1. After consultation with the Department /Program Chair or Director, the faculty shall place in the file a copy of the unit RTP criteria being used for the current RTP cycle.
2. The unit RTP criteria may be those in effect at the time the faculty was hired or any subsequent revision, including those in effect at the beginning of the current RTP review cycle. The faculty has the responsibility and authority to make the choice.
3. The unit RTP criteria in the RTP file shall be used by all levels of review for that RTP review cycle.

g. Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations

1. At each level of review, evaluations and recommendations pertaining to retention, the ward of tenure, and promotion shall be placed in the RTP file, as well as entered into the Log Sheet.
2. The faculty shall receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation from each level of review before the RTP file is forwarded to the next level of review.
3. The faculty shall have seven (7) days from the receipt of the evaluation and recommendation to file a written rebuttal or response.
4. All rebuttals or responses shall be placed in the RTP file and entered into the Log Sheet.

h. Personal Statement (Optional)

Faculty are encouraged to prepare a Personal Statement summarizing their perspective of their performance in each of the three areas for the current RTP cycle, highlighting their accomplishments, and addressing any criticisms, concerns, or suggestions for improvement made during previous RTP reviews or by students on the SOCI for the current review.

i. Documentation of Teaching or Performance

1. Teaching
 - a) Careful documentation of teaching performance is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly for faculty, teaching success is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion.
 - b) Student evaluations of teaching (SOCI) for all courses taught during the probationary period must be included.

- c) Other evidence illustrating teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 1) representative syllabi, course materials and handouts, quizzes and exams;
 - 2) peer evaluations of teaching, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
 - 3) signed letters from current students or alumni;
 - 4) professional development activities for the improvement of teaching performance, including those conducted by the Faculty TLC;
 - 5) curriculum development—new courses and/or new pedagogy; and/or
 - 6) significant advising of students in a major/program.
 - d) The use of information or other technologies and involvement in TLC and assessment activities, by themselves, will carry little, if any, weight in the judgment of teaching effectiveness. Reviewers should justify their evaluations regarding such activities and student learning.
 - e) Additional teaching through Extended University, including SOCI, may be included in this section.
 - f) Except for the SOCI, no anonymous materials, including letters, notes, e-mails, etc., shall be included in the RTP file.
2. Performance (librarians and counselors)
- a) For librarians and counselors, performance is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. Therefore, careful documentation of performance on all assignments during the probationary period is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly.
 - b) Evidence illustrating high levels of performance may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 1) assignments requiring significant leadership skills, analytical and organizational skills, and/or problem solving skills
 - 2) peer evaluations of performance, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
 - 3) signed letters from faculty, staff, current students, or alumni; and
 - 4) program development.
 - c) The information should be in sufficient detail to substantiate the role of the faculty and his/her contributions.
3. Specific Suggestions for Organizing Teaching Materials
- a) Materials for each course (SOCI, syllabus, handouts, quizzes and exams, peer reviews, etc.) should be included in a single "course file." All course files should be organized in identical fashion.
 - b) All course files for a given quarter should be grouped together and labeled/coded in some fashion so that reviewers can easily discern quarter-by-quarter teaching.
 - c) All course files for a given academic year should be grouped together and labeled/coded in some fashion so that reviewers can easily discern year-by-year teaching.
 - d) Other evidence supporting teaching effectiveness (signed letters from students, professional development activities, curriculum development, advising, etc.) should be placed in a separate file distinct from course files.
 - e) Because of the volume of materials that will accumulate during the probationary period, it is absolutely essential that all materials regarding teaching be organized in the RTP file in chronological order, preferably "reverse chronology," with the most recent materials (current review cycle) being in front.

j. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth

1. This section must show how the faculty is growing and developing through scholarly/creative activities within the discipline (teaching faculty or librarians) or through professional growth activities within the field (counselors).
2. Faculty should include evidence for scholarly/creative activities in accord with their unit RTP criteria, which may include, but is not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, papers presented at professional conferences, etc.
3. Faculty are responsible for obtaining outside reviews of unpublished scholarly manuscripts in a timely manner so that they can be included in the RTP file before the RTP review cycle begins.
4. Scholarly/creative materials that have been neither published nor reviewed by peers in the discipline will carry little, if any, weight in the review process.
5. When listing papers presented at a scholarly conference, the faculty must provide information as to whether the paper was selected through a refereed process.
6. 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.
7. In general, grant/contract proposals that have been funded carry more weight than those that have not been funded. Grant/contract proposals that have been submitted for review but have not yet been evaluated carry little weight in the review process.
8. Consulting work (paid or unpaid) in of itself carries little, if any, weight in the review process. Consultant reports, if they have received outside peer review, may carry some weight.
9. Reviews of book manuscripts, journal articles, papers being considered for presentation at professional meetings, etc., may carry some weight if there is documentation of the faculty's contributions.
10. Under ordinary circumstances, work on accreditation applications and reports should be considered under the category of service to the department and university rather than as scholarly activity. However, in those instances where the products of the accreditation process can be worked into a larger research strategy or design that can lead to or result in the production of an article or monograph published in a peer-reviewed journal, such activities can be considered scholarship.
11. Activities currently "in process" or being "planned for the future" may be listed, but such activities carry some weight only in the early stages of the faculty's probationary period. If these activities are listed in this section, then the faculty is obligated to inform all reviewers regarding the outcome of these "in process" or "planned" activities in subsequent review cycles.
12. Specific suggestions for organizing materials in this section
 - a) Materials must be organized in chronological order, preferably "reverse chronology," with the most recent materials (current RTP review cycle) in front; and
 - b) Versions or revisions of published papers or articles must be carefully cross-referenced in the RTP file (including Log Sheet and Master Index). Earlier versions should be purged from the file to keep physical size manageable.

k. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and to the Community

1. This section must show the type and extent of professionally related services the faculty provides to the campus and/or to the community.
2. Faculty should include evidence for professionally related services to the university and to the community in accord with their unit RTP criteria, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership of university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, presentations to community groups, involvement in community projects, etc. Supporting

documentation from others knowledgeable about the faculty's level of performance should be included in this section.

3. The professionally related services listed in this section should be related to the faculty's teaching area, field of scholarship/creative activities, or professional assignments.
4. Teaching for additional pay through Extended University (and other similar academic arrangements) shall not be listed in this section.
5. Consulting activities for which the faculty was paid shall not be listed in this section.
6. Activities for which special assigned time arrangements have been made shall be counted in this section only to the extent that the faculty's performance was exemplary or his/her efforts significantly exceeded the amount of assigned time. In either case, supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the assigned time arrangements should be included in this section.

I. Miscellaneous Section (optional)

1. An additional section may be appended to the RTP file to include such materials as:
 - a) large, bulky items, e.g., audio or video tapes, CDs, award plaques, photographs, paintings, and creative "artifacts;"
 - b) unpublished or unreviewed manuscripts;
 - c) unreviewed grant/contract proposals;
 - d) letters/articles published by the local media.

“To the world, you may just be somebody. But to somebody, you may just might be the world.”

~ Unknown

[Appendix B]

RTP Process Time Line

Tenured track and tenured faculty **elect URC members**



Departments submit to the Dean a list of **Unit RTP Committee members** at least 3 weeks before the beginning of the review cycle.



By November 1, tenured faculty notify Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs in writing desire to undergo **review for promotion**.



If desired, a **request for an external review of materials** is made, preferably prior to submittal of RTP file for review.



RTP File preparation

- Chair works with faculty member to insure selected material is appropriate to document performance.



Unit RTP Committee reviews file

- Faculty member submits RTP file to Unit Committee.
- If material is missing from RTP file, Unit Committee requests faculty member add the missing material.
- Unit Committee evaluates file and writes evaluation providing guidance for candidate for future reviews.
- Unit Committee formulates written recommendation with regards to RTP and reasons for recommendations and sends to candidate.
- Candidate has 10 calendar day period to respond or rebut and/or request a meeting to discuss recommendation before recommendation is sent to the next level of review.
- RTP file is forwarded to Chair, if Chair opts to evaluate candidate, or Dean.



Chair reviews file (*optional*)

- If Chair opts to evaluate faculty member, s/he receives file from Unit Committee and will follow the same procedure outlined for Unit RTP Committee.
- If Chair completes a review, the faculty member will receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation and will follow the same procedure outlined earlier to respond/rebut.
- RTP File is forwarded to Dean.



Dean reviews file

- Dean receives file from Chair or Unit Committee and will follow the same procedure outlined earlier for evaluation and recommendation.
- Faculty member will receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation and will follow the same procedure outlined earlier to respond/rebut.
- RTP File is forwarded to University Review Committee (URC).



URC reviews file

- URC receives file from Dean and will follow the same procedure outlined earlier for evaluation and recommendation.
- Faculty member will receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation and will follow the same procedure outlined earlier to respond/rebut.
- RTP File is forwarded to Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.



Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (P&VPP) reviews file

- P&VPAA receives file from URC and is responsible to review file and recommend action, and the basis for the action, to the President.
- Provost meets with URC to discuss recommendation.
- Faculty member will receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation and will follow the same procedure outlined earlier to respond/rebut.
- RTP file is forwarded to President.



President reviews file

- President receives file from P&VPAA.
- President reviews evaluations/recommendations as well as the faculty member's responses/rebuttals and will make final recommendation and notify faculty member **by June 1.**



RTP file is returned to department