

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

University Faculty Personnel Committee

April 25, 2023

TO: The General Faculty, Cal Poly Humboldt
FROM: The University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC)
SUBJECT: 2022-2023 Annual Report

The UFPC continues to be impressed with the quality of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activities, and service demonstrated by the outstanding faculty of Cal Poly Humboldt. Serving on the UFPC raises awareness about what a special place Cal Poly Humboldt is and the dedication of our colleagues. We are proud of the remarkable work being conducted across campus.

The UFPC acknowledges the considerable work individual faculty and review committees have accomplished to address many of the issues identified in the AY 2021-2022 UFPC report. For example, the UFPC observed more widespread and careful use of departmental retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) standards during WPAF preparation and file review than in years past.

However, other issues persist and are described in this year's annual report. Candidates up for review, committee members at every level, faculty involved in writing collegial letters, and administrators who will be involved in the RTP review process in 2023-2024 should refer to this report to avoid common problems outlined throughout.

Specific topics covered in this report can be quickly accessed below:

[UFPC Open Forum](#)

[UFPC Membership 2022-23](#)

[Files Reviewed](#)

[Action Items](#)

- [Academic Personnel Services](#)
- [University Senate/Faculty Affairs Committee](#)
- [RTP Criteria and Standards Committee](#)

[Personnel Process Issues Observed](#)

- [General File Preparation](#)
- [Early Tenure and Promotion](#)
- [Evaluations of Teaching/Librarianship](#)
- [Evaluations of Scholarship/Creative Activities](#)
- [IUPC and Department Chair Responsibilities](#)

[Departmental Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion](#)

[Independent Reviews](#)

[One- or Two-Year Reappointments](#)

UFPC Open Forum

The annual end-of-the-year open information meeting with the UFPC is scheduled for Wednesday, April 26 at 9 am in Goodwin Forum with remote access provided via Zoom:

<https://humboldtstate.zoom.us/j/88393756576> (Meeting ID: 883 9375 6576; Passcode: 281934)

UFPC Membership 2022-23

Serving on the 2022-2023 UFPC were continuing members Nikola Hobbel (English, Chair - fall only), Tyler Evans (Math), and Benjamin Marschke (History). Joshua Meisel (Sociology) rejoined the committee in the fall after a one-year leave and served as chair in the spring. Rosemary Sherriff (Geography, Environment, and Spatial Analysis) served on behalf of Nikola Hobbel in the spring, and new member Hyun-Kyung You (Child Development) joined the committee.

Files Reviewed

During the 2022-23 academic year, the overall number of files reviewed by the UFPC was unchanged from 2021-22:

Group III and IV Retention (reappointment) for Probationary Faculty	20
Group V Retention with Tenure/Promotion	12
Group VI Promotion of Tenured Faculty	7
Total	39

The UFPC provides the last faculty-level review of candidates seeking reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Additionally, the UFPC is the only faculty committee that has the perspective of seeing *all* files in the RTP process. This campus-wide review is important insofar as the UFPC helps ensure consistent implementation of RTP standards and helps to identify areas for improving the RTP process for candidates and review committees alike. Importantly, the UFPC is thereby able to both advocate for faculty candidates and improve the integrity of the RTP process.

AY 2022-2023 represented a return to face-to-face instruction, meetings, and other professional obligations. For students, faculty, and staff, the two years of global calamity wrought by the pandemic have altered all of our personal and professional lives. For the UFPC, all meetings continued to occur fully online, and there continued to be discussion of how to account for the myriad impacts associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in reviewing RTP files. In response, the committee edited and continued to add the following statement at the beginning of each of the recommendation letters:

The UFPC recognizes that AYs 2019-20 and 2020-21 generated unprecedented challenges for the entire campus community. In Fall 2019, campus closures stemming from Public Safety Power Shutoff events disrupted course schedules, research and creative activities, and engagement in service. In Spring 2020, the public health response to COVID-19 required all face-to-face instruction to move online following Spring Break and the cancellation of all non-essential university travel. The UFPC appreciates how these events had a cascading effect on the capacity of Cal Poly Humboldt faculty to achieve teaching/librarianship excellence from Spring 2020 through AY 2021-2022. Moreover, shelter-in-place orders led to the cancellation or postponement of research and creative activities as well as service opportunities through AY 2021-22. Therefore, the UFPC recognizes activities such as presentations canceled due to COVID-19 as carrying the same weight as completed presentations. It is with these ongoing circumstances in mind that the UFPC reviewed candidate files in AY 2022-2023.

Action Items

Given the numerous issues identified in the body of this report, the UFPC has developed a list of action items for the following administrative/governance bodies:

Academic Personnel Services

The following two action items were initially requested by the UFPC in 2020-2021; however, they have yet to be implemented:

- Provide aggregate data for the past ten years (to protect confidentiality in personnel matters) that reports the total number of faculty awarded early tenure and promotion by college, gender, and ethnicity. These data will be helpful to Faculty Affairs, the RTP Criteria and Standards Committees, and others in ensuring that equity goals are achieved.
- Provide aggregate statistics summarizing student response rates on Class Climate Surveys.

The UFPC also urges APS to:

- Work with IUPCs to ensure candidate files are complete prior to file close. The UFPC encountered many files missing appointment letters, recommendations from prior review cycles, student evaluations, among other issues.
- Work with candidates to obtain effective mentoring in file preparation.
- Review personnel processes to ensure that they can accommodate the anticipated increase in faculty in the next five years.

University Senate/Faculty Affairs Committee

Members of the UFPC met with members of the Faculty Affairs Committee in April, 2023 to renew discussion of the following points:

- To enact a resolution regarding early tenure and promotion that either 1) provides an overarching statement of expectations for early tenure; 2) provides a specific change to

Appendix J regarding early tenure and promotion; and/or 2) directs individual departments to develop their own standards for early tenure and promotion.

- Develop a process to increase response rates on student evaluations for all faculty; identify more valid and reliable student evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

RTP Criteria and Standards Committee

The UFPC urges departments to work with the RTP Criteria and Standards committee to update departmental standards that are older than five years. Appendix J is unclear about whether standards older than five years can be used as part of the RTP process:

A periodic review of department/unit standards shall occur once every five years. This review shall occur at both the department/unit level and at the Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards, and shall take place according to the approval process outlined in Section 1.c. and 1.d. If both the department/unit and the Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards are satisfied with existing department/unit standards, the periodic review may be waived. (Appendix J, Section IX.A.1.f)

Personnel Process Issues Observed by the UFPC

The UFPC identified several recurring issues impacting the RTP review process this academic year. It is noteworthy that many of the issues discussed below have been described in prior annual reports.

General File Preparation

The UFPC urges Group III candidates and all prior levels of review to address detailed notes on file preparation included in recommendation letters. College Personnel Committees (CPC) often provide valuable notes on file to candidates and in such instances the UFPC concurs with such recommendations. Whether such advice is coming from the UFPC or CPC, candidates and IUPCs should address these comments in preparing the WPAF for subsequent review cycles.

The UFPC refers candidates to the “Guidelines for Preparation of the Personnel Data Sheet,” available from the Academic Personnel Services’s website, which is separate from the directions embedded in the blank PDS form. These guidelines are particularly useful for faculty undergoing their first review.

The UFPC urges both candidates and the IUPC to carefully review the WPAF prior to file submission to ensure inclusion of all required documentation and relevant activities. As noted above, numerous files failed to include complete documentation of previous reviews. Others did not include all candidate activities for the review period. Further, all previous review letters from every review cycle need to be in the file. Probationary faculty should include all materials from all prior review cycles until the awarding of tenure and promotion.

Candidates should only include the most recently approved standards (i.e., [those posted on the Academic Personnel Services website](#)). Candidates may use prior standards if new standards were approved within the previous two years (Appendix J Section IX.A.1.e). The UFPC reviewed several files that included incorrect standards.

Do not add sections to the WPAF. In several cases, candidates created new sections for items such as external letters that made materials difficult to locate.

The UFPC again urges the Faculty Affairs Committee to develop guidance for the UFPC in considering such requests that balance the legitimate needs of faculty with the practical need to adhere to established Personnel Action Dates. There were instances in the past where candidates asked UFPC for permission to accept late materials for inclusion in the WPAF. One function of the UFPC, according to Appendix J (VIII.D.1.b), is to “Review request for insertion of materials in the WPAF after the IUPC has forwarded it to the next higher committee.” It can be problematic to grant such requests after a file has already undergone departmental and college level, given the Personnel Action Dates for file review.

Early Tenure and Promotion

Cal Poly Humboldt is one of very few CSU campuses that does not have a policy on early tenure and the absence of such a policy creates challenges for review committees. Early tenure and promotion cases are challenging for several reasons. First, Appendix J does not provide clear guidance on early tenure and promotion, and none of the departmental standards offer explicit criteria for early tenure and promotion. The UFPC is concerned that the absence of clear criteria for awarding early tenure and promotion results in arbitrary decision-making. For example, there are neither clear standards regarding what constitutes sufficient “length and breadth” of teaching experience for excellence during the probationary period, nor are there specific definitions of the levels of achievement necessary for early tenure beyond stating that candidates must “meet the standards and level of performance for tenure....”

Second, substantive differences between departments in expectations for Scholarship/Creative Activities continue, despite the efforts of the RTP Standards and Criteria Committee to align departmental standards. Achieving early tenure and promotion is therefore extremely difficult, if not impossible, for those faculty in departments with more rigorous RTP standards, while in other departments it has become somewhat commonplace. Since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor provides a salary increase, this situation has adverse material consequences for faculty in departments with more rigorous RTP standards.

Third, the issue of early tenure and promotion has become a controversial issue at Cal Poly Humboldt, because it highlights essential questions regarding disparities in personnel processes in higher

education. While no data has been collected, the inconsistencies across campus open up real potential for inequity and discrimination.

The proportion of probationary faculty submitting their WPAF for early review has varied considerably over the past six years:

Academic Year	Early Tenure and Promotion	Total Group V Candidates	Percent of Group V Candidates Seeking early Tenure/Promotion
2017-2018	9	10	90%
2018-2019	5	15	33%
2019-2020	8	12	67%
2020-2021	9	19	47%
2021-2022	5	16	31%
2022-2023	6	12	50%

With the exception of the Department of Chemistry,¹ departmental RTP standards do not provide criteria for early tenure and promotion. Consequently, the UFPC relied on our own interpretation of Appendix J and detailed this approach in its letter for each candidate for early tenure. This is not a formal policy, nor is it proposed as a solution. Rather, the committee provided the following language in each recommendation letter to ensure transparency regarding early tenure and promotion:

Appendix J IV.F.5 states:

The President may award tenure to a faculty unit employee before the normal (6) year probationary period (13.3, 13.19) if the following criteria are met:

a) Such consideration is initiated by the faculty unit employee’s department or equivalent unit or by the faculty member with the knowledge of his/her department or unit.

¹ Chemistry’s early standards were approved in 2019 and state, “Early tenure and early promotion are not the norm, but the exception. Applications for early tenure and promotion should only be submitted by a candidate who is considered to be exceptionally strong in all three areas of evaluation: teaching excellence, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Such exceptional strength *may* [italic added], for example, be exemplified by a candidate who is evaluated to be Excellent in all three areas at the time of the application for early tenure and/or early promotion.” The UFPC notes that it is not clear how an “exceptionally strong” candidate is defined, in the absence of being excellent across all three areas of evaluation.

b) The faculty unit employee demonstrates clear evidence that s/he has achieved, before the normal probationary period, a record of accomplishment that meets the standards and level of performance for tenure indicated in this appendix.

c) The length and breadth of the faculty unit employee's service are sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue.

Without specific departmental guidelines regarding early tenure, the UFPC applied Appendix J to evaluate each tenure case.

- 1. Consistent with Appendix J (IV.F.5.c), a candidate must show a sustained pattern of teaching/librarianship excellence.*
- 2. As stipulated in Appendix J (IV.F.5.b), a candidate "... achieved, before the normal probationary period, a record of accomplishment that meets the standards and level of performance for tenure," Scholarly/Creative Activity contributions must meet or exceed standards for a six-year period (e.g., if a department requires four contributions per year, the candidate would need 24 contributions, regardless of the current probationary year).*
- 3. As stipulated in Appendix J (IV.F.5.b), a candidate "... achieved, before the normal probationary period, a record of accomplishment that meets the standards and level of performance for tenure," Service contributions must meet or exceed standards for a six-year period (e.g., if a department requires 90 hours per year, the candidate would need 540 hours, regardless of the current probationary year).*

In cases regarding early promotion to Professor/Librarian, the committee provided the following language in each recommendation letter to ensure transparency regarding early promotion:

Appendix J IV.I.3 states:

A tenured faculty unit employee may be promoted to Professor, Librarian equivalent, or SSP-AR Level III, prior to having satisfied the service requirements of provision 14.3 of the CBA. 14.4 In such cases, the following criteria must be met:

a) Such consideration is initiated by the faculty unit employee's department or equivalent unit or by the faculty member with the knowledge of his/her department or unit.

b) The faculty unit employee demonstrates clear evidence that s/he has achieved, before the time in service requirements for promotion, a record of accomplishment that meets the standards and level of performance for rank indicated in this appendix.

c) The length and breadth of the faculty unit employee's service are sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue.

Without specific departmental guidelines regarding early promotion, the UFPC applied Appendix J to evaluate this early promotion case.

- 1. Consistent with Appendix J (IV.I.3), a candidate must show a sustained pattern of accomplishment.*

2. *Scholarly/Creative Activity contributions must meet or exceed standards for a six-year period (e.g., if a department requires four contributions per year, the candidate would need 24 contributions, regardless of the current probationary year).*
3. *Service contributions must meet or exceed standards for a six-year period (e.g., if a department requires 90 hours per year, the candidate would need 540 hours, regardless of the current probationary year).*

Evaluations of Teaching/Librarianship

Teaching and librarianship effectiveness is evaluated through direct observation by faculty colleagues. The UFPC reminds faculty that Appendix J [Section IX.B.1.a.4] states,

Teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of student evaluations by peers. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from colleagues within the candidate's academic discipline(s). The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observation can take place in a variety of ways, such as classroom visitations, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes.

In regards to evaluations of librarianship, Appendix J [Section IX.B.1.b.3] states,

Evaluations of effectiveness in librarianship shall be based primarily on written statements from faculty members within the candidate's area of service. The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observation can take place in a variety of ways such as classroom visitations, team teaching, mutual service on department and library committees, etc. The library shall organize and promote a system of peer evaluation which will aid in developing the written statements of the candidate's colleagues.

Having numerous colleagues observe the same class session is less effective than having numerous class sessions observed by different faculty members over time. Collegial evaluations of teaching/librarian performance should include review of syllabi, materials, Canvas pages, etc.

The UFPC directs evaluators to the APS website, which offers new teaching observation guides especially for evaluating both synchronous and asynchronous online courses. These guides were developed by the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Council's Subcommittee on Inclusive Teaching, and reflect the 2019 Appendix J update regarding the nature and quality of inclusive instruction. They can be found at <https://hraps.humboldt.edu/faculty-evaluations>

The UFPC reminds IUPCs of their responsibility to secure collegial observations of teaching (Appendix J, Section IX.B.1.a.5) and "ensure that there is adequate substantive peer evaluation of candidates" (Appendix J, Section VII. A.1.a). The UFPC continues to find an insufficient number of collegial

observation letters given the number of faculty at the rank of professor in some departments. Given that such observations are the primary source of evidence for evaluating teaching effectiveness, it is imperative that all departmental colleagues be invited to provide teaching observations, though only faculty at the rank of professor are required to do so. Appendix J (Section VIII.B.3.a) states:

The IUPC shall invite written statements from all available members of the unit at the rank of professor to ensure that there is adequate substantive collegial evaluation of candidates. Other faculty members of the unit will be notified of the deadline for receipt of these written statements, but are not required to provide such a statement.

Teaching and librarianship are also evaluated based on review of student evaluations. The UFPC notes several challenges with the use of student evaluations to evaluate teaching. First, the subject position and identity of the candidate affect how students understand the instructor's approach, knowledge, and pedagogical skill. Research clearly shows that women and people of color in STEM fields consistently face resistance, hostility, and diminishment of their expertise from both colleagues and students.² The UFPC notes that while the University Senate passed a resolution this academic year to address bias in student evaluations of teaching,³ other issues with using student evaluation data remain and are highlighted below.

The shift from in-class paper evaluations to online evaluations completed outside of class has had a negative impact on response rates and the tone of student comments regarding individual faculty. Response rates on student evaluations vary considerably from class to class and candidate to candidate. Low response rates, defined here as below 50 percent, likely advantage faculty who benefit from receiving evaluations from students who already view them and their teaching more favorably. Conversely, faculty who are already disadvantaged by student evaluations imbued with gender and racial biases see negative numeric scores driving down mean item scores. Departments should monitor student course evaluation response rates and work with candidates to develop strategies to address low response rates. This is particularly an issue for evaluation to promotion to Professor as there is no intermediate (i.e., retention) review following promotion to Associate Professor.

Finally, there are several evaluation items of dubious utility that warrant revision. For example, what does the following item measure? "I felt encouraged to explore materials outside of class to improve on what I was learning." By contrast, other CSU campuses, including Sacramento State, for example, merely offer one Likert-scale question about the overall experience of the student.

² Bavishi, A., Madera, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2010). "The effect of professor ethnicity and gender on student evaluations: Judged before met." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 3 (4), 245–256. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020763>
Smith, B., & Hawkins, B. (2011). "Examining Student Evaluations of Black College Faculty: Does Race Matter?" *The Journal of Negro Education* 80 (2), 149-162. Retrieved February 19, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41341117>
Williams, D. (2007). "Examining the Relation between Race and Student Evaluations of Faculty Members: A Literature Review." *Profession*, 168-173. Retrieved February 19, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25595863>
³ Faculty Affairs Committee. 2022. "Resolution to Address Bias in the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness Process". Cal Poly Humboldt. December 13. https://senate.humboldt.edu/sites/default/files/12-22.23-sets_second_reading.pdf

Candidates should respond to and reflect upon student course evaluations of their teaching/librarian performance in their teaching philosophy and/or course descriptions in the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS). It is good practice (and helpful to evaluators) for the candidate to comment upon or explain low or otherwise unusual student evaluations or patterns in evaluations.

Candidates should explain plans to improve in response to evaluations as well as reflect on how changes affected course effectiveness. Merely refuting student criticisms does not support an impression of growth as an instructor.

Neither candidates nor reviewers should average across evaluation items, because averaging anonymous student ratings obscures variability in item ratings. Though an “Overall Instructor Rating” is provided in the student evaluation reports, candidates and review committees should focus on individual mean item scores as they provide the most information about potential areas of strength as well as provoke reflection and growth as an instructor.

Evaluative letters are those submitted to the IUPC as part of the review process that specifically provide narrative assessments of the quality of a faculty member’s teaching/librarianship. Student thank-you notes, emails, and other forms of direct communication are non-evaluative. These materials should not be included as evaluative letters in Section 7 the WPAF. Such materials should be placed in Section 8.

Evaluations of Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service

Candidates should explicitly self-assess contributions based on departmental standards. That is, candidates should highlight how they meet standards for Minimum Essential, Good, or Excellent across Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service. A summary table that lists achievements in the contribution areas of Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service aligned with departmental standards is an effective way to illustrate how a candidate meets RTP criteria. In the area of Service, if departmental standards require listing hours completed, candidates are encouraged to consistently report hours (by week or month or semester, but consistently), so review committees can identify whether candidates meet annual service expectations. The UFPC asks IUPCs to encourage and help candidates to include such tables in the WPAF.

Appendix J [IX.B.2] notes,

Faculty are expected to engage in an ongoing program of scholarly/creative activities and be guided by their department/unit criteria and standards. Scholarly/creative activities may be defined using the five interrelated dimensions of scholarship proposed by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Discovery, Integration, Application, Teaching, and Engagement*. Scholarly/creative activity shall be characterized by clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

Collegial/peer review appropriate to the discipline is required and shall be defined in the department/unit RTP criteria and standards [emphasis added]

The issue of what constitutes “effective presentation” and “peer review appropriate to the discipline” is central to evaluation of scholarship/creative activities. This remains the most challenging issue raised by the expanded definition of scholarship offered by Boyer. Many departmental standards do not clearly define peer review. If candidates and review committees wish to count activities that occur outside of “traditional” peer review as scholarship/creative activities, then departments need to create clear guidelines for rigorous evaluation of those activities. In the absence of such “traditional” peer review, the UFPC encourages candidates to classify activities as service.

Peer review must be conducted by colleagues in the same specialty area as candidates and “where appropriate, from peers outside the university” (VII.A.1.b). External reviews of scholarship/creative activities are particularly useful for tenure and promotion evaluations and represent standard practice in higher education. IUPCs, in consultation with candidates, should work to secure such letters well in advance of when the file is due.

For collaborative work, there should be a clear description of the candidate’s role and responsibilities. Similarly, the UFPC urges the candidate to clearly describe activities and responsibilities in service roles.

For a work to be considered a forthcoming publication, the UFPC urges candidates to include correspondence from editors, publishers, jurors, etc., that specifically confirms the acceptance of the candidate’s work and provides a targeted publication/exhibition/performance date. Though numerous departmental RTP standards specifically acknowledge forthcoming publications/exhibits/performances as carrying the same weight as published/completed works, it is important that forthcoming *not* be confused with works in progress. Works in progress, while important elements of a candidate’s scholarly/creative activity, do not carry the same weight as completed activities.

The UFPC encourages faculty to report all service activities. The UFPC observes the variation in faculty reporting practices of community service activities. Of particular note are volunteer activities with local schools, preschools, and other youth groups. Regardless of the reason for the community service (e.g., volunteering at one’s own child’s school), these activities do constitute important community service. Appendix J (IX. B. 3.g) states “Community service contributions which relate directly to one’s discipline or position will be given greater weight.” Documenting how community service contributions relate to the discipline lends additional significance to the activity, however, service unrelated to the discipline is also valued.

Many faculty letter writers focus only on teaching/librarianship in their evaluative letters. Colleagues who work in related fields should address the candidate’s scholarship/creative activities to attest to the

strength and significance of contributions, where appropriate. Colleagues should also address the candidate's service. Departmental colleagues are well positioned to address service as most serve on departmental committees together.

Faculty letter writers should focus on evaluation. Many letters report on candidate activities but read as a list drawn from the PDS rather than an evaluation of the quality and significance of scholarship/creative activities or service.

In some cases, review committees discounted service activities that received assigned time. The UFPC finds that such service should count toward departmental standards, particularly because the time invested in such activities generally exceeds assigned time. In making the case for including such service, candidates should clearly detail all activities and discuss time commitments for such activities in relation to assigned time. For tasks leveraging the award of assigned time, candidates should clearly detail contributions over and above the assigned time compensation.

IUPC & Department Chair Responsibilities in Preparing the WPAF

The IUPC must assist candidates in preparing WPAFs that contain supporting materials addressing RTP criteria and standards. The UFPC notes that there appears to be considerable variation in how IUPCs approach their responsibilities. This responsibility includes verifying and confirming information listed in the PDS and ensuring inclusion of all required documentation. The UFPC urges IUPCs to work with candidates well in advance of when the file is due to make sure that candidates—particularly those undergoing their first review—put forward the strongest file possible.

Appendix J notes the following IUPC responsibilities:

Assist candidates in preparing WPAFs that contain supporting materials which address RTP performance criteria and standards. (VIII.B.1.b)

Advise candidates on materials which are necessary or beneficial for WPAF inclusion. (VIII.B.1.c)

IUPCs shall ensure that there is adequate substantive peer evaluation of candidates. (VII. A.1.a)

Invite written statements from the candidates' current Cal Poly Humboldt students and current student employees (VIII.B.3.b)

As noted above, the IUPC is responsible for ensuring that department faculty and university librarians evaluate the candidate's teaching/librarianship based on direct classroom observation. Moreover, the IUPC can support their faculty colleagues by helping ensure that their files include all materials pertinent to the review cycle. The UFPC notes that there were many candidates seeking a second reappointment or tenure and promotion who failed to include materials from prior review cycles. The

IUPC should also review materials to ensure that “all submitted statements are accurate, relevant, and timely” (Appendix J, Section VII.B.3.b).

Faculty members serving on personnel committees (at any level) can and should also write collegial letters that include evaluations of teaching/librarian effectiveness based on classroom observations. Serving on a review committee does not excuse one from the responsibility to observe and evaluate colleagues. If there are relatively few faculty in a department, then the IUPC or the candidate should solicit teaching observations by faculty members from other departments.

Likewise, the UFPC reminds department chairs that unless they serve on the IUPC, they are encouraged to provide a separate “chair’s” written evaluative statement relating to the three contribution areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activities, and service.

Finally, the UFPC urges members of an IUPC to carefully read Section VIII.B of Appendix J pertaining to function, organization, and procedures of the IUPC.

Departmental Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

The UFPC is pleased that all departments have approved standards. In addition to the ongoing absence of standards previously noted regarding early tenure and promotion, other issues remain.

The UFPC urges the RTP Criteria and Standards committee to continue working with departments to clarify key elements of their standards. As many departments used existing standards from other departments as a template for developing their own standards, the same problems appear in multiple standards. For example, several departments distinguish between two types of conference presentations. Category I contributions require presentations where “peer review and dissemination are an integral part of the process (for example, when papers are circulated in advance).” Category II contributions are “Participating in academic conferences or forums by presenting original work, workshops, or acting as a discussant on a panel or roundtable.” This distinction is confusing to candidates and review committees. Alternatively, it is not clear how keynote addresses are reflected in such standards. The UFPC saw repeated instances of classification as Category I without evidence of peer review being *integral* to the process. The UFPC urges departments using such a standard to revise the standard or work with candidates to ensure that they provide evidence that demonstrates how they met the Category I standard.

The UFPC urges departments referencing “peer-reviewed disseminations” in their standards to revise standards to clarify expectations for such activities. Whereas conference presentations are often peer-reviewed and disseminated (through presentation), the UFPC questions whether this is the intended application of the standard because such a definition creates a very low bar for performance,

particularly as some standards require only two such contributions for a ranking of Excellent for tenure and promotion.

The UFPC urges departments to revise standards that allow for qualification of quantitative standards. For example, standards might state that a peer-reviewed publication counts as a Category I contribution and require a certain number of Category I contributions for different rankings. The standard might then also note that activities where the candidate was lead author weigh more strongly in evaluations. In practice, the “weigh more strongly” piece is not being implemented. No standards using this qualification provide guidance on how to weigh contributions.

Lastly, **the UFPC recommends that departments, when revising their RTP standards, eliminate the counting of hours for service and points for scholarship and service.** Counting hours can be messy and vague for candidates. For example, when enacting service commitments by email, the recording of minutes spent is onerous and inefficient. Rather, the UFPC recommends that service standards reflect general breadth, depth, and/or leadership activities.

Relatedly, the UFPC suggests the development of scholarship/creative activities standards that specify activities in categories (e.g., the number of peer-reviewed publications, funded grants, or conference presentations), and a consequent table that illustrates levels of achievement (Minimum Essential, Good, and Excellent) for each rank. For departmental standards that specify an average annual number of points/activities for ranking scholarship/creative activities or service, there exists variation in how candidates and review committees compute this statistic. Most departmental standards do not specify the number of years that are used to compute the average and this results in variable applications of the standard. In terms of using points to quantify scholarly/creative activities, this approach is perhaps simple at the initiating unit level, but becomes cumbersome for reviewers beyond the department or unit.

The UFPC reminds all IUPC and CPC members as well as deans that their evaluations of candidates must follow the departmental RTP standards. Committees should clearly detail decisions regarding excellence in teaching/librarianship and whether the candidate meets departmental standards for Minimum Essential, Good, or Excellent. Importantly, all levels of review should clearly explain how the candidate meets a standard. For example, if a standard requires five Category I contributions and 12 Category II, detail how the contributions reported in the PDS meet those standards.

The UFPC urges all levels of review to avoid excessive quotations. The committee regularly sees very long letters from IUPCs where the majority of the text are direct quotes from evaluative and student letters. One or two short quotes that represent themes are helpful. Long strings of quotes are not.

Independent Reviews

The UFPC reminds all levels of review that parallel concurrent reviews must be independent. There should be no consultation between department chairs and IUPCs nor between deans and College Personnel Committees. Not only is this independence essential for the integrity of the RTP review process, but it also affords each level of review the capacity to provide its own unique recommendation independent of other recommendations.

One- or Two-Year Reappointments

Whereas the UFPC is bound by Appendix J to endorse the recommendations of prior reviews for retention when they are in agreement (Appendix J Section VIII.D.1.a.1), the dean and CPC recommendations can diverge. In the case of retention recommendations, two-year reappointments are not required (Appendix J Section VII.B.5.a).

This annual report and all previous UFPC annual reports are available on the UFPC website (<https://senate.humboldt.edu/ufpc>).

Sincerely,

Joshua Meisel, Chair

Tyler Evans

Nikola Hobbel (fall only)

Benjamin Marschke

Rosemary Sherriff (spring only)

Hyun-Kyung You