

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS

GENERAL PERSONNEL STANDARDS

Revised by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and submitted for approval in December 2023. (FAC 2023-24: Lydia Dixon (Chair), Jeff Benedetti-Coomber, Stephen Clark, Nancy Deans, Katherine Elder, and Aura Perez-Gonzalez.) These General Personnel Standards supersede the prior (2016) General Personnel Standards. Approved by the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee in April 2024. Approved by Provost Avila with minor change (approved by URTPC) May 2024, to be effective in Fall 2025 with rollout of SP-22-11.

This document shall be reviewed every five years or earlier at the request of the University President, the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs, or the University RTP Committee.

INTRODUCTION

This General Personnel Standards (GPS) document provides guidelines for the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process for tenure-line faculty members under review within a program area that, at the time of review, has no approved Program Personnel Standards (PPS)¹. Candidates applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion under these General Personnel Standards should also consult the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP-22-11 (referred to in this document as the “RTP Policy”) and obtain advice from Faculty Affairs, Success, and Equity (FASE), a faculty mentor, and/or their Program Chair when compiling their portfolio. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence and explanation for all achievements.

Statement on Equity and Inclusion

These General Personnel Standards affirm California State University Channel Islands’ commitment to equity and diversity as reflected by the Multicultural and International Mission Pillars of the University, as well as Academic Senate Resolution SR-16-01. Faculty members are responsible for helping to foster a collaborative and inclusive community that strives for equity and equal opportunity on our campus and beyond. Given this commitment, these General Personnel Standards encourage and value contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity through teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and professional, university, and community service, including community-based research.

Requirements for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion

According to the RTP Policy, eligibility for retention requires that faculty members receive at least one evaluation rating of “On track to meet Program Personnel Standards” or “On track to exceed

¹ While “faculty” generally refers to both non-tenure track faculty and tenure-line faculty, for the purposes of the GPS, it refers only to probationary and tenured faculty

Program Personnel Standards” from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for retention. However, receiving a single evaluation rating of “On track to meet Program Personnel Standards” or “On track to exceed Program Personnel Standards” does not in and of itself guarantee the granting of retention, if adequate progress has not been shown in other areas of evaluation. The standards applied by reviewers shall be in line with reasonable expectations for probationary faculty growth, development, achievement, and commitment to principles of diversity, equity and inclusion along their entire path toward tenure and/or promotion.

According to the RTP Policy, eligibility for tenure and/or promotion requires that faculty members under review obtain a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” or “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” in all areas of evaluation (Teaching or Professional Activities; Scholarly and/or Creative Activities; and Service) from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for tenure and/or promotion (see Section L of the RTP Policy). Furthermore, these requirements represent expectations for faculty to meet by the end of their probationary period or time at their current rank. With the exception of the area of Service², standards for faculty remain the same whether applying for promotion to associate or full professor.

Under extraordinary circumstances, such as when a faculty member has been brought in to begin a new program or is part of a project with a non-traditional mode of dissemination - the faculty member may develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding their specific RTP expectations. This MOU would be developed with their dean and in consultation with the provost’s office and/or FASE.

Professional Development Plan (PDP) and Portfolio

Please refer to sections H and K, respectively, in SP 22-11 for information and clarification of the Professional Development Plan and Portfolio.

Structure of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC)

For information on the structure of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC), see Section E of SP 22-11.

General Instructions

Faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service shall not be “double counted,” despite the recognition that many contributions may straddle multiple categories. When such overlap occurs, faculty shall describe which components of their contributions fall into each of the following categories. For example, student research or community based research may be counted in research, service, or teaching, depending on the

² See the Standard for Professional, University, and Community Service on page 10.

specific activities, or may include phases that fall into distinct categories. It is up to the faculty member to justify which contributions correspond to each category.

TEACHING

We at CI regard teaching as a cyclical process composed of three required elements:

- (1) The planning, creation, and implementation of appropriate and effective course methods, materials, and teaching practices;
- (2) The assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and teaching practices; and
- (3) Efforts to improve teaching and learning, personal reflection, and responsive change.

Each element informs the other two, and this cycle reflects the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher dedicated to continuous improvement. Standards for tenure and promotion in the area of teaching are based on these three elements.

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on academic year stateside teaching, and, when appropriate, teaching in other programs (e.g., Extended University [EU], Summer and Winter Sessions)³, depending on the structure of the program in question. Evaluation of teaching shall include all courses—including assigned Extended University courses—that are taught as part of the Academic Year assignments. Evaluation of teaching shall prioritize Academic Year assignments. Courses taught as additional employment through Extended University or Summer or Winter Sessions shall be considered by reviewers if the candidate argues that said classes contributed to the faculty member's development and contributions in the area of Teaching. In either case, faculty shall clearly note which classes were taught stateside and which classes constituted their Academic Year assignments.

The following section defines expectations for and provides examples of how to meet the following three Standards for Teaching, which are based on the required elements listed above in the introduction to the Teaching section. Evidence of success in the category of Teaching can include but is not limited to the examples listed under each of the three Standards defined below.

Standard A: Faculty will demonstrate effective planning, creation, and implementation of course methods, materials, and teaching practices.

Description: The candidate's narrative and appendices on Teaching shall demonstrate how they use specific methods and materials that are appropriate and effective to meet course, program, and

³Stateside teaching refers to courses that are funded in part by the State allocation, while Extended University courses may be self-supported and are not always considered part of a faculty member's academic year assignment.

University learning outcomes. Additionally, candidates shall demonstrate how they have effectively balanced rigor, access, and equity in their teaching.

Evidence for Standard A in teaching can include (but is not limited to) the following:

- I. Methods and materials that enable students to achieve the desired learning outcomes.
- II. Examples of student work that show how learning outcomes for the course/program/university are being met.
- III. Instructional methods and materials that actively engage students in course content.
- IV. Selected materials that reflect promising pedagogical practices.
- V. Syllabi that conform to the requirements of CI Syllabi Policy.
- VI. Effective collaboration in interdisciplinary and/or team teaching practices.
- VII. Effective inclusion of service-learning initiatives in courses.
- VIII. Successful utilization of appropriate teaching technologies to improve student learning (e.g. Canvas, Open Educational Resources [OER], etc.).
- IX. Successful utilization of other high-impact practices to improve student learning and retention. Please see Section I.7.e⁴ of the SP 22-11 RTP Policy for examples. Each program/department must consider the elements that best suit its discipline, and determine how faculty teaching successfully satisfies this criterion.
- X. Materials and methods that reflect the instructor's commitment to accessibility and inclusivity.

Standard B: Faculty shall engage in assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and teaching practices.

Description: To meet this standard, candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in a process of evaluation and assessment of student learning outcomes and of their own teaching practices.

Evidence for Standard B in teaching must include the first two items listed below as required per the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP 22-11 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement; additional evidence can include but is not limited to the other examples listed in part III.

⁴ Section 1.7.e (SP 22-11 RTP Policy): "Each program shall indicate in its PPS how faculty use of and participation in high-impact teaching and learning practices that promote student success, especially for historically underrepresented groups, (e.g., culturally-relevant pedagogy, study abroad, embedded research, experiential/service learning, learning communities, anti-racist pedagogical practices/curriculum development, etc.) shall be considered when evaluating faculty contributions in the area of Teaching and/or Professional Activities for purposes of retention, tenure, and/or promotion."

- I. **Peer observations of teaching:** A minimum of one peer observation of teaching by a tenured colleague of a higher rank for each probationary year is required by the RTP policy. For tenured faculty, a minimum of one peer observation is required during the period of review. Peer observations should assess the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching methodology, course materials, and course material presentation, and offer constructive suggestions for improvement as appropriate. In general, peer observations of teaching are expected to be positive and/or to demonstrate consistent improvement relative to prior observations as an overall pattern during the faculty member's time at rank. However, these observations are snapshots in time and are not necessarily conducted by trained observers in a consistent manner. As a result, their value in assessing the effectiveness of the faculty member's pedagogical methodology is limited. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on these peer observations in their narratives. It is the faculty's responsibility to arrange for peer observations, in consultation with their chair. Per the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements to these observations.
- II. **Student responses to instruction (e.g. Student Ratings of Teaching, aka SRTs):** SRTs are administered in all courses considered as part of the review and shall be considered by all levels of review. SRTs are expected to reveal a generally positive view of the faculty member's teaching. SRTs are not necessarily an accurate direct measure of how effectively students learn in the classroom. As such, their value must be taken in context as part of a holistic evaluation and thus shall normally be considered in light of other indicators of teaching proficiency, including peer observations. Student responses to instruction can, however, provide insights into a number of important dimensions of the faculty member's efforts. In addition, some variation in SRTs is to be expected, for example, for courses with experimental teaching methods and for new course preparations. Such situations should be recognized by the review committee, and addressed by the candidate in the teaching narrative. In addition, bias may be present in SRTs⁵, and per the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements in response to perceived bias. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on SRTs in their Teaching narrative.
- III. **Assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes:** In addition to peer observation and student responses to instruction, candidates are encouraged to engage in other activities that assess and evaluate student learning outcomes in order to inform and improve their teaching practices. These activities can include the following:
 - A. Development of classroom assessment techniques and tools that elicit student feedback on teaching practices (e.g. implementation of formal/informal mid-semester reviews, surveys of student learning, student reflections on their learning, etc.)
 - B. Learning assessment tools that are aligned to learning outcomes

⁵ Kreitzer, R.J., Sweet-Cushman, J. "Evaluating Student Evaluations of Teaching: A Review of Measurement and Equity Bias in SETs and Recommendations for Ethical Reform." *Journal of Academic Ethics* 20, 73–84 (2022).

Standard C: Faculty shall engage in efforts to improve teaching and learning, reflection, and responsive change

Description: To meet this standard, the candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher, which is a process of continuous improvement.

Evidence for the three areas of standard C in teaching is listed below. For each category, faculty shall describe how such efforts have led to growth and development in their teaching practice or in student learning.

- I. **Continual effort to improve teaching and learning** described in the teaching narrative. Examples of evidence of continual effort to improve teaching and learning can include but are not limited to the following:
 - A. Involvement with faculty development opportunities
 - B. Consultation and/or work with colleagues in formal and/or informal ways to implement methods to increase teaching effectiveness
- II. **Reflection on teaching** that demonstrates faculty efforts to continually improve their courses. Examples of evidence can include but are not limited to the following:
 - A. Summary of and personal reflection on student responses to teaching and peer observations
 - B. Description of changes made in response to formal/informal midterm course evaluation
 - C. Revision of curriculum to ensure the infusion of new or innovative teaching practices, such as effective use of instructional technology, into course content and delivery
- III. **Responsiveness in teaching** that improves student learning opportunities and experiences. Examples of evidence can include but are not limited to the following:
 - A. Redesign of course structure and/or revision of assignments in response to assessments and feedback
 - B. Modification of instructional methods and technologies in response to feedback
 - C. Use of technologies to enrich student learning
 - D. Redesign of course structure to meet needs of English language learners and/or students with special needs
 - E. Incorporation of instructional methods and materials introduced during professional development events

Requirements for Retention in Teaching

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement that shows that they have made appropriate progress towards meeting the standards as described above, consistent with their time at rank, shall earn a rating of “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievements in Teaching that surpass reasonable expectations for their time at rank shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion in Teaching

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement across the three elements described above shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for significantly exceeding the standards across the three elements shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Standard: Faculty members in a non-teaching role (e.g. Library and Counselor faculty) within the university are expected to make significant or transformative contributions in the area of Professional Activities.

Description: Expectations for meeting or exceeding the standard in this area, and the evidence used to support this section of the portfolio, will depend on the faculty member’s specific position. Faculty members are encouraged to work closely with their Program Chair and FASE to ensure that they are adequately addressing their specific achievements in the area of Professional Activities. They should also clearly contextualize their achievements in this area in their narrative.

Evidence for Professional Activities may include (but is not limited to) the following:

- I. Provision of direct service to appropriate University clientele (such as library patrons, counseling clients, etc.)
- II. Incorporation of best professional practices to meet the goals and needs of the university community
- III. Engagement in activities to maintain discipline and interdisciplinary currency
- IV. Implementation/enhancement of workflows, management of budgets, and personnel supervision
- V. Development of effective web pages, multimedia, or technology based resources created to meet student and faculty needs

- VI. Effective provision of general reference services and consultations in subject areas to faculty, staff, and students
- VII. Establishment of a pattern of continuous improvement
- VIII. Mentoring of students, including academic advising if relevant
- IX. Supervision of independent study or thesis projects
- X. Mentorship of faculty and staff colleagues

SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Standard: Faculty are expected to establish a record of scholarly/creative endeavors that generates, integrates, and disseminates knowledge.

Description: To meet this standard, candidates shall produce refereed publications and/or juried creative activities as appropriate to their discipline. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to contextualize how the type and amount of evidence of performance, the relative weight of authorship roles and authorship order, and the appropriate editorial standards (peer-reviewed, editor-reviewed, etc.) align with their disciplinary conventions to meet the standards of this GPS. Scholarship and/or creative activities that engage with student research is valued equally with activities that draw on traditional methodologies.

Evidence of achievement in the category of scholarly and/or creative activities can include but is not limited to the following:

- I. **TIER ONE:** All specific Tier One items appear under the assumption that the faculty member was a significant contributor (see Description).
 - A. Publications in refereed journals or juried exhibitions
 - B. Publications of peer-reviewed book chapters, monographs, textbooks, collections, or anthologies; creative works that appear in juried exhibitions and galleries, including films, videos, or other electronic media
 - C. Publications of peer-reviewed authored books (note: such books shall typically count for two tier one items)
 - D. Published data sets spanning significant longitudinal monitoring, historic scope, etc., that represent a major scholarly contribution to the discipline
 - E. Publication of an edited book of which the faculty member was the primary editor
 - F. Receipt of an awarded external grant to support scholarship (must be an amount or specific award considered significant in faculty member's discipline or field - limited to one for purposes of promotion and tenure)
 - G. Solo exhibitions or a significant part of a group exhibition in a museum, commercial gallery, university gallery/museum, or recognized alternative venue
 - H. Performance(s) at a recognized professional venue with recognized organizations, not sponsored by CSUCI, that relate to the faculty member's area of specialization

- I. Earning patents
- J. Other works that are clearly demonstrated to have widespread and meaningful impact on the faculty member's professional community or other kinds of dissemination appropriate to the nature of the research

II. TIER TWO:

- A. Publications in proceedings of professional meetings and conferences
- B. Exhibition catalogs
- C. Submitted applications for large external grants, commissions, fellowships, prizes, other awards if demonstrating significant effort/scholarly progression
- D. Creating, editing or reviewing articles/cases/chapters/course materials for academic journals and publications
- E. Dissemination of research aimed to improve teaching and learning
- F. Presentations at professional meetings, seminars, symposia, and conferences
- G. Publications in popular media with national, regional, or local readerships
- H. Media appearances that contribute to the advancement of teaching and/or scholarship
- I. Reports of applied research (e.g., policy paper, newspaper article)
- J. Development of software
- K. Public art projects/commissions: national, state, county, city
- L. Artwork review/image reproduction in art texts/book publications, national/international art periodicals, gallery/museum exhibition catalogs, regional art publications, or local newspapers and periodicals
- M. Invited symposia and presentations (internal or external)
- N. Practitioner manuals or publications for local or regional audiences

Note: Some Tier 2 items may merit being counted as Tier 1 items if justified by the faculty member due to the importance of the work done, the impact, or the recognition level.

Requirements for Retention in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement that indicates timely progress towards three significant demonstrations of scholarly/creative activity shall earn “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence that they will achieve more than three significant demonstrations of research and scholarly/creative activity at their current rank shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria. While we expect faculty members to ultimately achieve three Tier One activities for Promotion and Tenure, Tier Two activities demonstrate growth and development towards this goal.

Requirements for Promotion and Tenure in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a minimum of three demonstrations of scholarly/creative activity from Tier One during the time in rank shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for more than three demonstrations of scholarly/creative activity shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards”.

PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Standard: Faculty shall take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the University, the profession, and the community through good citizenship and application of professional expertise.

Description: To meet this standard, candidates are expected to maintain appropriate and consistent service activity throughout the period of review for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Service contributions are expected of all program faculty regardless of rank. However, reviewers at all levels shall take into account the need for assistant professors to prioritize their teaching and scholarly/creative activities during their probationary years. Therefore, assistant professors may choose to primarily focus their service contributions in support of their home program/department activities. This means that assistant professors shall not be held to the same standard of service contributions as more senior faculty (i. e., associate and full professors with tenure). In other words, greater depth of service and roles of greater responsibility shall be expected as faculty are promoted through the ranks.

Evidence: While there is not a set number or type of service commitments that a faculty member must undertake to meet standards, they shall clearly show that they have assumed a service load appropriate to the three (3) WTUs⁶ that all tenure-track faculty are assigned for this purpose; for some faculty, this will mean sustained engagement in a Senate committee that meets regularly and has a high workload, while for others it will mean participation in multiple, less time-consuming committees or community and professional engagements. It is up to each faculty member to describe the responsibilities and significance of the service that they perform.

Any service that is compensated with additional release time shall be clearly stated by the faculty member and shall not normally be considered as part of their primary service requirement, though it may be considered as part of the overall service contributions as outlined in the narrative. For example, if a faculty member receives release time for a service role, they should explain what other service they engage in that fulfills their initial 3 WTUs for service; in the case where a faculty member is given extra release time for a service role, but that service role is exceptionally large,

⁶ The weighting system used by the California State University to determine the appropriate teaching credit for instructional assignments. According to the CBA, a full load of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service is considered to be 15 Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) per semester.

they should explain how their service extends beyond the extra release time given to fulfill their initial 3 WTUs as well.

Evidence of performance in the categories of professional, university and community service can include, but is not limited to, the following activities:

- I. Academic program/department activities, work projects, governance or offices, committee or subcommittee activities;
- II. Academic Senate activities, work projects, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
- III. Campus division activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
- IV. Participation or advisory roles for student organizations;
- V. University or CSU system-wide activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
- VI. Engagement with community organizations or governing bodies;
- VII. Service in professional organizations at local, regional, national, or international levels, including elective or appointed positions;
- VIII. Service on editorial boards or editorial responsibilities for books and/or journals with national or international significance

A faculty member's service roles can be undertaken via leadership and/or participatory roles, and the level of achievement in the area of Service can be determined in a variety of ways, including the following:

- A. the degree of initiation and/or consistency of the commitment to a task or tasks;
- B. the impact of the service on the University and/or other constituencies;
- C. positive feedback received from colleagues and others;
- D. tangible products, results, or concrete accomplishments from the service provided.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to articulate the quality and quantity of service in their narrative. The faculty member is encouraged to address any issues of cultural taxation and identity taxation⁷ that have impacted their professional growth and accomplishments in the area of Service.

⁷In The term "cultural taxation" was coined in 1994 by scholar Amado Padillo "to describe the expectation placed on faculty of colour to address diversity-related departmental and institutional affairs," then expanded by Joseph and Hirschfield "to include extra burdens that stem from faculty of colour's commitment to campus diversity issues and the lack of legitimacy they experience from colleagues challenging their existence in the academy" (Joseph & Hirschfield, 2023). They later adopted the term "identity taxation" to include and emphasize the extra labour performed by members of a variety of different marginalized groups because of their intersectional identities" (Joseph & Hirschfield, 2023). For further discussion of these terms see, for example:

Requirements for Retention in Service

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a consistent track record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with the three (3) WTUs assigned for this purpose shall earn “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Service.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence that they have assumed a service load of a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that they have gone beyond both their assigned three (3) WTUs for service and any additional assigned time for service commitments shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Service. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria.

Requirements for Promotion and Tenure in Service

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a consistent record of service comparable to their three (3) WTUs of release time shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Service. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for sustained participation in service on a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that goes beyond their three (3) assigned WTUs for service shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards”. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria.