

FACULTY AFFAIRS PRESENTS:

Information for Program Personnel Committees & AVPs

PPCs

- ▶ Have 3 or 5 tenured members of the faculty
- ▶ Are selected based on Program Personnel Standards
- ▶ In case of promotion consideration, members must have higher rank than candidates

Responsibilities of PPCs and AVPs

- ▶ Review and recommend approval of Professional Development Plans (PDPs) of faculty in their first year of service
- ▶ Conduct periodic reviews of first year faculty
- ▶ Review and evaluate Portfolios for retention, tenure, and promotion (Performance Evaluations)
- ▶ Provide a written recommendation

Faculty Affairs:

- ▶ Monitors the evaluation process through each level of review
- ▶ Provides copies of the recommendation to the faculty member
- ▶ Informs the faculty member of his or her right to respond or rebut within ten (10) days
- ▶ Forwards the portfolio to the next level of review as specified in the published RTP schedules

Personnel Files

- ▶ Please remember to sign the log in the Personnel Action File (the hanging file, as opposed to the Portfolio, which is usually a 3-ring binder) when you review the file

Evaluations per Article 15

- ▶ Deliberations are confidential
 - › The faculty member, appropriate administrators, the President, and the peer review committee members shall have access to written recommendations
- ▶ A faculty member shall not serve on more than one committee level of peer review
- ▶ For promotion consideration, peer review committee members must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Additionally, Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees
- ▶ Each peer review committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority by the committee
- ▶ If any stage of a Performance Review has not been completed within the specified period of time, [it] shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review

CSUCI's RTP policy: SP 10-10

Schedules A, B, & C

- ▶ A: Approval of the Professional Development Plan
- ▶ B: Faculty in 1st or 2nd year of service
 - ▶ B1: Periodic Review (abbreviated portfolio)
 - ▶ B2: Retention Review
- ▶ C: Retention (beyond 2nd year of service), Tenure, & Promotion

Schedule C

- ▶ C1: “routine” review: 3rd prob. year (hired w/ 1 year service credit*), 4th year prob. year (hired w/o service credit), 5th prob. year
- ▶ C2: “extensive” review: 3rd probationary year (hired without service credit); 4th probationary year faculty (hired with 1 or 2 years of service credit)
- ▶ C3: tenure and promotion: reviewed at all levels

Schedule C: Period of review

- ▶ C1: the period since the last submission of the portfolio for reappointment
- ▶ C2: the entire probationary period, including years for which service credit is granted

Schedule C3: Period of Review

- ▶ Tenure: for tenure, the period of review is the entire probationary period, including years for which service credit is granted
- ▶ Promotion: the time spent in rank, including accomplishments during time spent at that rank at other four-year or graduate-degree granting institutions
- ▶ Tenure and/or Promotion: a faculty member may include accomplishments prior to the period of review as part of the portfolio

Professional Development Plan

- ▶ The faculty member's agenda for achieving the professional growth necessary to qualify for retention, tenure and promotion. The PDP describes the activities and intended outcomes that the faculty member expects to achieve during the period of review for tenure and/or eventual promotion to full professor.
- ▶ Prepared, reviewed, and approved by the end of the faculty member's first year of appointment (due from faculty member in 1/23/2015)
- ▶ Conceived as a constructive learning process and not a formal agreement or contract, the PDP consists of three narratives for teaching (professional activities for non-teaching librarians and counselors), scholarly and creative activities, and service
 - Not to exceed 500 words each

PDPs Cont' d

- ▶ The PDP is Reviewed by the PPC, Program Chair (if not on PPC), and the appropriate AVP
- ▶ In the event the PPC, Program Chair, or the AVP does not approve the PDP, the faculty member shall revise it and resubmit it within two weeks. If, after re-submittal, the PPC, Program Chair, or the AVP make further suggestions for modifications, the faculty member may, within two weeks, submit a revised PDP
- ▶ No subsequent revision of the Professional Development Plan is necessary. A faculty member may move into areas different than anticipated in this first year plan, but those changes should be addressed in the narratives describing faculty members' actual work required as part of the Portfolio

Numeric Scores

For Retention:

- ▶ At least two “3—Meets Standards of Achievement” evaluations, one of which is in teaching (Professional Activities for non-teaching librarians and counselors).

For Tenure:

- ▶ At least **two** areas be rated at “4—Exceeds Standards of Achievement”—for teaching faculty, one of which must be Teaching (or Professional Activities for non-teaching librarians and counselors); **one** category must be rated at least at “3—Meets Standards of Achievement.
- ▶ Early tenure and promotion should be granted only under exceptional circumstances and requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in two areas be rated at “4—Exceeds Standards of Achievement”—for teaching faculty, one of these must be in the category of Teaching (professional activities for non-teaching librarians and counselors); one category must be rated at least “3—Meets Standards of Achievement



Requirements for Promotion:

- ▶ Likewise, promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor (or their equivalents) require that Performance in two areas be rated as “4—Exceeds Standards of Achievement”—for teaching faculty, one of these must be in the category of Teaching (professional activities for non-teaching librarians and counselors); and one category must be rated as at least “3—Meets Standards of Achievement.”



Writing Evaluations & Recommendations

Evaluation vs Recommendation

- ▶ Probationary faculty are *reviewed* every year. Periodic review (schedule B1, abbreviated portfolio) is an evaluation only; no recommendation for retention is made;
- ▶ Faculty under all schedules except B1 are being reviewed for Retention, Tenure and/or Promotion

Recommendations

- ▶ Retention, Tenure, and Promotion are granted by the President; evaluations at all other levels are recommendations;
- ▶ Tenure and Promotion recommendations can be separate; if a probationary faculty member applies for early tenure, the recommendation must recommend for or against Tenure AND must recommend for or against Retention;
- ▶ In 6th probationary year (on-time), recommendations ONLY address Tenure and/or Promotion, NOT Retention

Recommendations must:

- ▶ Only reference material in the candidate's file
- ▶ Give a 1-5 numeric score in each of the areas of evaluation: Teaching (or Professional Activities); Scholarly and Creative Activities; Service
- ▶ Evaluate the achievements documented in the file with reference to the requirements specified in the Program Personnel Standards
- ▶ Be addressed to the file and sent to the file (ie, Faculty Affairs); they must never be sent to the next level of review prior to the ten day response period;
- ▶ Be signed in alphabetical order – for the PPC
- ▶ Record the vote tabulation (total) – for the PPC

Recommendations Should:

- ▶ Be thorough and thoughtful evaluations of each category and demonstrate the reasoning for assigning whichever numeric score deemed appropriate;
- ▶ May emphasize that Programs without a PPS put the applicant at a disadvantage in the evaluation of items unique to the discipline



Questions?