

PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS

APPROVAL FORM

Discipline: ESRM

 9/29/14
RTP Committee Chair Date

 9/26/14
Provost Date

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Science and Resource Management (ESRM) Program is committed to achieving excellence in teaching, student learning, scholarship, and service. The Program encourages peer collaboration and review, faculty experimentation and assessment, and continuous, rigorous evaluation of academic quality. Consistent with the mission of the University, the Program places a high value on the promotion of interdisciplinarity in teaching, research, and service, incorporating service learning/civic engagement throughout the curricula, and international and multicultural perspectives. The Program values engaging students in undergraduate research, collaboration, and innovation.

The educational quality of the ESRM Program depends on the quality of its faculty.¹ Program faculty support their quality program and the broader University through their efforts in teaching, research, and service. A dedicated ESRM faculty promotes the academic caliber and reputation of the program and the University.

This document seeks to set clear and attainable standards for its faculty to maintain a high quality program and guide faculty through the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process. It relates the general principles, guidelines, and criteria for three purposes:

- To establish the personnel performance standards to maintain a high quality faculty and program;
- To guide individual faculty members to pursue a successful career, that includes retention, tenure, and promotion through the academic ranks;
- To assist the ESRM Program Personnel Committee, the program chair, University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee(s), and other appropriate University administrators in reviewing the professional accomplishments of our Program Faculty

The “portfolio” is the functional equivalent of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).

THE PROGRAM PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

1. Composition: The ESRM Program Personnel Committee (ESRM PPC) shall be composed of three tenured members based on the following rules. Until such time as the ESRM Program has enough tenured faculty it may be necessary to constitute more than one Program Personnel Committee (PPC) who are mutually agreed upon by the faculty member being reviewed and the full time tenured members of the ESRM Program. This may require inviting members from outside the ESRM Program. Separate PPC’s—involving different faculty combinations—may be created by a majority vote of the Program in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, from University eligible faculty under the General Personnel Standards.

- a. Members of the ESRM PPC shall be tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor;
- b. Members of the ESRM PPC shall be elected annually by simple majority of the full-time, tenure-track members of the ESRM Faculty in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed at the initial faculty meeting in the fall semester;

¹ The term “faculty” used in this document refers to both tenured and tenure-track members of the ESRM program.

- c. If the ESRM Program has fewer than three tenured members, a list of tenured faculty from across the university willing to serve on the ESRM PPC shall be generated by the full-time tenure-track members, who will then vote by simple majority in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, for as many members as necessary to complete the three-person ESRM PPC;
 - d. When considering cases of promotion, the committee members' academic ranks must be higher than the faculty member under review;
 - e. The Program Chair may serve as a member of the ESRM PPC. In the event that the Chair does not serve as a PPC member, he or she has the responsibility to review all portfolios on schedule, to provide written comments on each of the three areas of professional activity, and write a general summary of the overall performance of a faculty member under review.
2. Responsibilities: The ESRM PPC has the responsibility to:
- a. Review all portfolios on schedule;
 - b. Provide written comments on each of the three areas of professional activity, and;
 - c. Write a general summary of the overall performance of a faculty member.

THE FACULTY MEMBER

The faculty member, requesting retention, tenure, or promotion, shall have prepared all necessary documents (the portfolio) in accordance with the published schedule, according to the format requirements and standards specified in the University RTP Policy. The faculty member has the right to submit a written response to the ESRM PPC's and/or the chair's review(s) during the review process.

TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Teaching is a central concern at a student-oriented University and is vital to growing and maintaining a successful ESRM Program. The department is committed to promoting teaching excellence in its faculty. As with all of the components of the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, process, what constitutes an effort to achieve teaching excellence is difficult to define for every context; measuring teaching excellence is, by its nature, imprecise. This is particularly true in the case of ESRM with our wide range of subjects and teaching modalities. Nevertheless, several elements demonstrate the desire of a faculty member to achieve teaching excellence across all courses and contexts:

- Concern for the learning and well-being of students in an atmosphere of mutual respect;
- Appropriate and innovative instructional methods and materials;
- Assessment of student learning outcomes and instructional effectiveness;
- Efforts to continually improve teaching effectiveness.

Quantitative measures drawn from student evaluations shall not become the sole indicator of teaching excellence. Such measures shall have equal weight with other sources of evidence described below.

In their portfolio narrative, faculty should reflect on their commitment to maintaining a

professional relationship with students inside and outside the classroom (e.g. mentorship, advising, professional development, etc.). When developing their teaching portfolios faculty are encouraged to use the following guidelines to build a case for their commitment to teaching excellence.

- 1) Methods, Materials and Innovative Pedagogy: Evidence of methods, materials and innovative pedagogy must include the following:
 - a. Course materials, including but not limited to syllabi, assignments, projects, and other supplementary materials provided by the faculty member;
 - b. The use of teaching methods that are appropriate to the course content and objectives;
 - c. The use of materials that are scholarly and appropriate for the topic and reflect current issues/scholarship in the field;
 - d. Syllabi and other course materials that make clear learning outcomes, course requirements, class schedule, assignments and grading policies.

The following elements are supplemental but reveal student-centered best practices in teaching:

- e. Interdisciplinary courses, team teaching, and/or other innovative teaching methods;
 - f. Incorporating instructional technology that reflects best practice for student engagement and learning;
 - g. Integration of service learning that articulates well with course curriculum. ESRM views service learning as a particular hallmark of our program and strongly encourages faculty to utilize this best practice whenever it is appropriate for the subject matter and content.
- 2) Outcomes and Instructional Effectiveness: Evidence of outcomes and instructional effectiveness must include the following:
 - a. Demonstrated consistency in teaching excellence throughout the probationary period that incorporates:
 - i. Peer Review of Teaching: At least one written evaluation by a tenured member of the ESRM Program each probationary year. Faculty may augment this annual evaluation with peer evaluations from other tenured university faculty;
 - ii. Student evaluations of teaching (quantitative summaries);
 - iii. Written comments from student evaluations;
 - iv. Periodic (e.g. annual) summation of all of the above sources of feedback about the effectiveness of overall teaching efforts and a clear articulation of how the faculty specifically adapted and responded to previous inputs and experimentation. Faculty should be able to clearly articulate how previous feedback was utilized.

The following elements are supplemental but reveal faculty commitment to instructional effectiveness:

- b. Teaching and/or advising awards, research mentoring awards, success of students in post-graduate endeavors, or other recognition/communication from students and fellow instructors.
- 3) Efforts to Improve Teaching Effectiveness: Evidence of efforts to improve teaching

effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. Participation in curriculum development and assessment of student learning as demonstrated by the creation of new courses and/or the significant revision of existing courses, curricula, or Programs;
- b. Development and utilization of assessment tools; syllabi developed; materials presented to Curriculum Committee;
- c. Courses developed that further the programmatic interests of the ESRM Program and/or University mission;
- d. Courses that contain a service-learning, multicultural, and/or international focus;
- e. Courses that span traditional disciplinary or institutional boundaries;
- f. Demonstrated efforts to improve teaching such as:
 - i. The teaching narrative;
 - ii. Attendance at professional development events and workshops;
 - iii. Consultation with colleagues;
 - iv. Integration of accepted teaching best practices;
 - v. Development of grants designed to improve teaching effectiveness;
 - vi. Audiovisual recording of one's presentations/teaching sessions with an explicit goal of becoming a more effective speaker/communicator.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

The definition of scholarly activity is necessarily imprecise. Inasmuch as the term is used here alongside "teaching" and "service," however, it intends something that goes beyond the general research that is essential to all good teaching and to the many forms of quality service. The following criteria aim to clarify what constitutes scholarly research for the purposes of promotion and tenure. Such criteria and sources are not all-inclusive and may not have equal application to all sub-disciplines falling under the ESRM umbrella.

- 1) Criteria: At its core scholarly activity creates new knowledge based on original investigation that adds knowledge of significance to one's field; synthesizes, criticizes, or theorizes in original ways; clarifies extant knowledge; communicates unique connections between existing knowledge and practical applications; and stimulates the intellectual development of one's colleagues in the field.
- 2) Research publications: As a general guideline a faculty member should strive for three quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications (one publication every other year of the review period). The PPC should consider the number "three" to be a benchmark: having fewer than three publications does not necessarily serve as evidence of a lack of scholarly evidence. In evaluating a faculty member for tenure and promotion the publications offered by the candidate as evidence of scholarly activity will be evaluated within the context of the constellation of evaluative concerns listed below.
- 3) Sources of evidence: In evaluating evidence of scholarly activity faculty should strive to balance their scholarly work within the categories below, which represents a *rough* hierarchy. The department personnel committee will, among other things, consider the degree to which the faculty member has disseminated his or her research to the broad scholarly community through the following means:
 - a. *Peer reviewed and published by university or commercial presses*: Academic journal articles (whether in print or online), books, and monographs;
 - b. *Peer reviewed and published by university or commercial presses*: Text books, anthologies, synthetic essays and literature reviews, book chapters, and case studies;

- c. *Peer-reviewed and published, open-access datasets*: Large, multi-year datasets of original data (*i.e.* not a meta-data database or derivative analyses of others' data) collected in whole or part by the faculty member while at CI. Such datasets should be collected with robust methodologies. Such datasets describe some aspect of the biophysical or social worlds and could be of use to investigators exploring longitudinal changes across space and/or time now or at some future time.
 - d. Conference papers, conference proceedings, presentations at scholarly conferences, invited presentations on other campuses;
 - e. Technical reports and other professional products provided to external agencies that are directly related to one's field, that often involve invited presentations outside the University for technical and professional audiences;
 - f. Grants, fellowships, and/or scholarships that are related to scholarly research and activities. While grants are not required, the program recognizes grants as a clear means to an end; and it is expected that faculty will fund their research through external grants when needed. A consistent pursuit of external funding (successful or unsuccessful) shows a clear desire to foster a robust scholarly program
 - g. Research presentations, papers, and posters conducted in conjunction with students at off-campus venues and on-campus professional meetings;
 - h. Novel or open-access tools to facilitate data collection or analyses are not considered research *per se*, but may be included as evidence of scholarly engagement,
 - i. Self-published research is not considered research unless its scholarly impact is well documented (e.g. evidence of its citation in the peer-reviewed scholarly literature, inclusion in library collections, reviews in scholarly journals).
- 4) Research published by the University or any of its affiliates, presentations given at the University outside of a professional, academic meeting, material published in newspapers and magazines are *not* considered research; these activities *may* be considered as service.
- 5) When presenting evidence of scholarly research it is the responsibility of the candidate to communicate to the department committee and others in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Process the nature of their publications and how they fit into the above sources of evidence in their self-evaluation narrative. Candidates should also take care to present evidence of the impact of their research (for example, journal impact factor, number of libraries that subscribe to a journal in which they have published, number of citations of an article, book, or other scholarly work, resulting rebuttals/academic dialogs, and testimony from scholars outside of the University as allowed by the policies of the University).

SERVICE

Faculty service activities include services performed for the Program, Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, campus divisions, student organizations, the University, the CSU system, professional organizations at local/regional/national/international levels, or the community broadly writ.

Faculty should demonstrate a consistent effort to be of service to their students, Program, the University, their profession, and /or their community through a *combination* of service activities. Participation in the following are considered service activity:

- 1) Service, in professional organizations at local/regional/national/international levels including elective or appointive positions, service on editorial boards, and so forth;
- 2) Service as a peer reviewer for scholarly journals, book proposals, book manuscripts, teaching materials, grant applications and so forth;
- 3) Academic program/department activities, work projects, governance or offices, committee or subcommittee activities;
- 4) Campus division activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
- 5) Academic Senate activities, work projects, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
- 6) University or CSU system-wide activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
- 7) Participation or advisory roles in student organizations;
- 8) Participation on Technical Advisory Panels for public or private entities;
- 9) Community (broadly defined) initiatives/organizations, work projects, task forces, offices, committees or subcommittee activities, that are consistent with the faculty's area of professional expertise.

SEVERABILITY

Environmental Science and Resource Management (ESRM) Program Personnel Standards are guided by RTP and other University policies. Where any discrepancy occurs between this and other University policies, University policies will be observed. If such a particular discrepancy were to occur, all other policies contained herein will remain in force.

AMENDMENT

The ESRM Personnel Standards shall be reviewed and updated at intervals not greater than five years in response to any related changes of the division/University RTP procedures. Such changes will take place in a scheduled meeting of ESRM Faculty. Changes in this document will occur by a simple majority vote of program faculty present at a scheduled meeting. The Chair shall then submit the up-dated ESRM PPC to the University RTP committee and/or other committees for approval. The revised ESRM PPS will take effect after the approvals by the University RTP committee and by the Provost/Vice-President of Academic Affairs.