# Cal Poly Humboldt.

**Office for Faculty Affairs and Academic Personnel Services**

# RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

**August 2023**

**Prepared By:**

*Dr. Kimberly White*
*AVP for Faculty Affairs*
*Kim.White@humboldt.edu*

# RTP Handbook Sections

**H**

**Section 1: Faculty Personnel Action Dates (PAD) 2023/24**

**Section 2: Faculty Handbook – Appendix J**

**Section 3: Professional Development Plan (PDP)**

**Section 4: Personnel Data Sheet (PDS)**

**Section 5: Preparing Your Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)**

**Section 6: University Faculty Personnel Committee 2022/23 Annual Report**

**Section 7: Evaluations**

**Section 8: Collective Bargaining Agreement**

**Section 9: Relevant Policies**

**Cal Poly Humboldt.**

**Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs**

March 3, 2023

## 2023/2024 Faculty Personnel Action Dates

**To All Faculty, Staff, and Administrators:**

In accordance with Sections 13.5, 14.5 and 15.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and upon the recommendation of the University Faculty Personnel Committee, I hereby approve the attached 2023/2024 dates for submission of periodic evaluations and performance reviews to the Department Personnel Committee, the College Personnel Committee, and the University Faculty Personnel Committee, as appropriate.

The complete schedule of faculty personnel actions for AY 2023/2024 is attached to this memorandum. It will also be posted on the Office of Academic Affairs (http://www.humboldt.edu/aavp/administrative-memoranda) web site and the Academic Personnel Services (APS) web site (https://hraps.humboldt.edu/aps-calendars). The evaluation review process is scheduled on the basis of unalterable notification deadlines established by the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement. The deadlines are intended to allow sufficient time for careful review at each level and they cannot be extended.

The **Summary of Faculty Personnel Actions and Due Dates** available on the APS website (https://hraps.humboldt.edu/faculty-evaluations) provides further information about the RTP process and timelines.

Please refer to **Appendix J** of the *Humboldt Faculty Handbook* to review the criteria, policies and procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of probationary/tenured faculty; **Appendix K** for the criteria and processes by which temporary faculty may apply for elevation in range; or **Appendix M** for the "Personnel Policies and Procedures for Coaches." The "Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" (post-tenure review) policy may be accessed on the Academic Personnel Services web site (https://hraps.humboldt.edu/evaluation-tenure-line-faculty).

**New this year:** Post-Tenure Review deadlines and Lecturer Periodic Evaluation deadlines are now included in this document. See page 3 for dates and further information.

The periodic evaluation schedule for coaching faculty is as established in Appendix M of the Faculty Handbook.

Questions regarding the personnel action dates or the evaluation process may be directed to Academic Personnel Services, x5086 or by email at aps@humboldt.edu.

Sincerely,

Jenn Capps, Ph.D.
Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs

## <u>2023/24 PERSONNEL ACTION DATE (PAD) CALENDAR</u>

### *Group I.  RETENTION (REAPPOINTMENT) FOR NEW PROBATIONARY FACULTY APPOINTED FALL 2021*
### *MODIFIED PERFORMANCE REVIEW*

►►*New faculty appointed in Spring 2023 with service credit for Fall 2022 are subject to a <u>full performance review</u> and, therefore, shall submit a WPAF on September 1, 2023 following the **Group III** schedule.  If service credit was not awarded, then new faculty appointed in Spring 2023 are subject to a modified performance review which is due on January 11, 2024 following the **Group I** schedule. ◄◄*

**Personnel Action:  New Probationary Faculty Retention**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee receives file | W | January 10 |
| File closes | W | January 17 |
| Department Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate<br>Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | T | January 23 |
| College Dean or Equivalent Administrator receives file | F | February 2 |
| Dean or Equivalent Administrator decision due to candidate | TR | February 15 |

### *Group II.  PROBATIONARY FACULTY IN THE FIRST YEAR OF A TWO-YEAR REAPPOINTMENT*
### *PERIODIC EVALUATION*

►►*Refer to your previous retention/reappointment letter to determine whether you should undergo a periodic evaluation (short review) or a performance review (WPAF).  Only faculty in the first year of a two-year reappointment complete a Periodic Evaluation following the **Group II** schedule. ◄◄*

**Personnel Action:  Periodic Evaluation of Continuing Faculty in the first year of a two-year reappointment**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee receives file | TR | January 25 |
| File closes | TR | February 1 |
| Department Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate<br>Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | M | February 12 |
| College Dean or Equivalent Administrator receives file | TR | February 22 |
| Dean or Equivalent Administrator evaluation due to candidate | TR | March 21 |

### *Group III.  RETENTION (REAPPOINTMENT) FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY*
### *PERFORMANCE REVIEW – <u>Fall 2023 Semester Schedule</u>*

►► *Refer to your previous retention/reappointment letter to determine whether you should undergo a periodic evaluation (short review) or a performance review (WPAF). For those undergoing a performance review, your letter will also state whether you are <u>**required**</u> to follow the Fall (**Group III**) or Spring (**Group IV**) retention schedule. ◄◄*

**Personnel Action: Retention -- Continuing probationary faculty on fall semester schedule (WPAF)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee (IUPC) receives file | TR | August 17 |
| File closes | TR | August 24 |
| Dept. Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to College Personnel Committee with copy to candidate<br>Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | TR | September 7 |
| College Personnel Committee/Dean receives file | M | September 18 |
| College Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to UFPC with copy to candidate<br>Dean recommendation addressed to Vice President with copy to candidate | F | October 13 |
| University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) receives file | M | October 23 |
| UFPC recommendation addressed to Vice President with copy to candidate | F | December 22[†] |
| Vice President receives file | W | January 3 |
| Vice President decision due to candidate | TR | February 15 |

[†] The 10-day rebuttal period is extended to January 3rd because of campus closure.  If a meeting is requested and the recommending body is unable to meet due to the semester break, candidates may request further extension of the rebuttal period by contacting the UFPC Chair.

*Candidates may submit a rebuttal statement or response and/or request a meeting to be held to discuss recommendations within 10 (ten) days\* following receipt of any recommendation.  The Personnel Action Date Schedule allows for this 10-day response period.  However, when a candidate elects to not respond to a recommendation, files will be immediately forwarded to the next level of review.*

*\* The term "day" refers to calendar days.  The 10-day response period is computed by excluding the first day and including the last day, unless the last day is a holiday or other day the campus is not regularly open for business (CBA 2.11).*

### Group IV.  RETENTION (REAPPOINTMENT) FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY
### PERFORMANCE REVIEW – Spring 2024 Semester Schedule

►► *Refer to your previous retention/reappointment letter to determine whether you should undergo a periodic evaluation (short review) or a performance review (WPAF). For those undergoing a performance review, your letter will also state whether you are* ***required*** *to follow the Fall (****Group III****) or Spring (****Group IV****) retention schedule.* ◄◄

**Personnel Action:  Retention -- Continuing probationary faculty on spring semester schedule (WPAF)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee receives file | F | January 12 |
| File closes | F | January 19 |
| Department Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to College Personnel Committee with copy to candidate<br><br>Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | T | February 6 |
| College Personnel Committee/Dean receives file | F | February 16 |
| College Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to UFPC with copy to candidate<br><br>Dean recommendation addressed to Vice President with copy to candidate | M | March 18 |
| University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) receives file | TR | March 28 |
| UFPC recommendation addressed to Vice President with copy to candidate | F | April 19 |
| Vice President receives file | W | May 1 |
| Vice President decision due to candidate | M | June 3 |

### Group V.  RETENTION WITH TENURE/PROMOTION – INCLUDES EARLY TENURE
### PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**Personnel Action:  Retention with Tenure/Promotion – includes Early Tenure (WPAF)‡**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee (IUPC) receives file | T | September 19 |
| File closes | T | September 26 |
| Department Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to College Personnel Committee with copy to candidate<br><br>Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | T | October 10 |
| College Personnel Committee/Dean receives file | F | October 20 |
| College Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to UFPC with copy to candidate<br><br>Dean recommendation addressed to Vice President with copy to candidate | T | November 28 |
| University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) receives file | F | December 8 |
| UFPC recommendation addressed to President with copy to candidate | F | February 16 |
| Vice President receives file | M | February 26 |
| Vice President recommendation addressed to President with copy to candidate | TR | April 4 |
| President receives file | M | April 15 |
| President tenure decision to candidate<br>President promotion decision to candidate | M | June 3 |

‡ Faculty seeking an early tenure decision will be considered concurrently for retention; therefore only one file should be submitted following the **Group V Retention with Tenure/Promotion – Includes Early Tenure** schedule.

*Candidates may submit a rebuttal statement or response and/or request a meeting to be held to discuss recommendations within 10 (ten) days\* following receipt of any recommendation.  The Personnel Action Date Schedule allows for this 10-day response period.  However, when a candidate elects to not respond to a recommendation, files will be immediately forwarded to the next level of review.*

*\* The term "day" refers to calendar days.  The 10-day response period is computed by excluding the first day and including the last day, unless the last day is a holiday or other day the campus is not regularly open for business (CBA 2.11).*

### Group VI.  PROMOTION OF TENURED FACULTY
### PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**Personnel Action:  Promotion of Tenured Faculty (WPAF)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee (IUPC) receives file | F | October 27 |
| File closes | F | November 3 |
| Department Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to College Personnel Committee with copy to candidate <br><br> Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | TR | December 14 |
| College Personnel Committee/Dean receives file | W | January 3[†] |
| College Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to UFPC with copy to candidate <br> Dean recommendation addressed to Vice President with copy to candidate | W | February 7 |
| University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) receives file | M | February 19 |
| UFPC recommendation addressed to President with copy to candidate | TR | March 28 |
| Vice President receives file | M | April 8 |
| Vice President recommendation addressed to President with copy to candidate | W | May 1 |
| President receives file | TR | May 9 |
| President promotion decision to candidate | M | June 17 |

[†] The 10-day rebuttal period is extended to January 3rd because of campus closure.  If a meeting is requested and the recommending body is unable to meet due to the semester break, candidates may request further extension of the rebuttal period by contacting the UFPC Chair.


### Group VII.  TEMPORARY FACULTY RANGE ELEVATION

**Personnel Action:  Temporary Faculty Range Elevation (Range Elevation Portfolio)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee (IUPC) receives file | TR | February 1 |
| File closes | TR | February 8 |
| Department Personnel Committee recommendation addressed to College Dean with copy to candidate <br> Department Chair recommendation addressed to Dean with copy to candidate (optional) | TR | February 29 |
| Dean receives file | F | March 8 |
| Dean decision due to candidate | F | April 19 |


### POST TENURE REVIEW

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Post Tenure Review File due from faculty member to Department PTR Committee | TR | February 15 |
| Post Tenure Review Department Report due to Dean | M | March 18 |
| Post Tenure Review Dean Written Report due[†] | M | April 15 |

[†] PTR Policy states meeting with the Dean to occur at this stage


### PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME OR 3-YEAR LECTURER APPOINTEES*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department Personnel Committee (IUPC) Periodic Evaluation due to Dean <br> Department Chair recommendation due to Dean (optional) | F | April 19 |
| Dean Periodic Evaluation due for 3-year and full-time lecturer appointees <br> **and** <br> Academic Year/Semester Lecturer evaluations due from Department (IUPC or Chair) | M | June 3 |

*Lecturer periodic evaluation materials will be filed in the Personnel Action File at least five (5) days after they are sent to the faculty member (CBA 11.4). Faculty may respond to materials in their Personnel Action File at any time (CBA 11.2).*


*Candidates may submit a rebuttal statement or response and/or request a meeting to be held to discuss recommendations within 10 (ten) days* following receipt of any recommendation.  The Personnel Action Date Schedule allows for this 10-day response period.  However, when a candidate elects to not respond to a recommendation, files will be immediately forwarded to the next level of review.*

*\* The term "day" refers to calendar days.  The 10-day response period is computed by excluding the first day and including the last day, unless the last day is a holiday or other day the campus is not regularly open for business (CBA 2.11).*

## FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

### Table of Contents

*FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION*[1]

## I.   PREAMBLE

A.   Two documents serve as the basis for Trustee policy concerning retention, tenure and promotion of Faculty Unit Employees: the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the Trustees of the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA), and Title 5 of the California Administrative Code. Campus procedures must comply with the content and language of these documents. The language of the CBA shall take precedence in matters of interpretation.

B.   Trustee policy on campus personnel matters ranges from the CBA and Title 5 details to the broad policy statements which require the campuses to develop local regulations and procedures to implement policy. The local implementation measures must be consistent with the CBA, Title 5 and Trustee policy.

C.   In accord with Title 5, Section 42701 decisions on retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) at Humboldt State University are based upon consultation. Appendix J's purpose is to provide faculty unit employees' involvement, where appropriate, at all levels of the RTP process and to provide for orderly and timely evaluation procedures.

D.   During any RTP cycle, criteria, policies, and procedures in Appendix J shall remain unchanged.  15.3

E.   All faculty members and administrators concerned shall act in good faith, with professional responsibility, collegiality, and comply with this personnel policy.

## II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

A.   In the policies and procedures prescribed by this document, "is" is informative, "shall" is mandatory, "may" is permissive, "should" is conditional, and "will" is intentional.

B.   The following terms, important to understanding Appendix J, are herein defined.

1.   Administrator – an employee serving in a position designated as management or supervisory in accordance with HEERA. 2.1

2.   Candidate – a faculty unit employee being evaluated for retention, tenure, or promotion.

3.   CFA – The California Faculty Association or the exclusive representative or the union. 2.7

4.   Day – a calendar day. 2.11

5.   Department – the faculty unit employees within an academic department, library, or other equivalent administrative unit. 2.12

6.   Diversity - Diversity includes all the ways in which people differ, and it encompasses all the different characteristics that make one individual or group different from one another. Diversity can be broadly defined to include all aspects of human difference, including but not limited to, age, ability/disability, race, ethnicity, gender, gender expression and identity, language heritage, learning style, national origin, sexual orientation, religion, socio-economic status, status as a veteran, and world-view.

---

[1]      Reference numbers in Appendix J refer to articles from the CBA of September 18, 2012 - June 30, 2014 (refer to CBA for exact language).

7. Equity - Recognizing the historical and systemic disparities in opportunities and outcomes and providing the resources necessary to address those disparities (The Education Trust-West, 2017). Equity is about showing results that lead to change.

8. Equity-Mindedness - The Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California (USC) refers to "Equity-Minded" as a perspective or mode of thinking exhibited by practitioners who call attention to patterns of inequity in student outcomes. These practitioners are willing to take personal and institutional responsibility for the success of their students and critically reassess their practices. It also requires that practitioners be race-conscious and aware of the social and historical context of exclusionary practices in American Higher Education.

9. Faculty Unit Employee – a bargaining unit member who is subject to retention, tenure, or promotion.

10. Inclusion - Inclusion is the act of creating environments in which any individual or group can feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued.

11. Personnel Action File (PAF) – the one official personnel file containing employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. Campus medical and police records are not a part of the PAF. 2.17, 11.17

12. Minoritized - used instead of "minority" to signify the social construction of underrepresentation and subordination in U.S. social institutions, including colleges and universities. Persons are not born into a minority status nor are they minoritized in every social milieu (e.g., their families, racially homogeneous friendship groups, or places of religious worship). Instead, they are rendered minorities in particular situations and institutional environments that sustain an overrepresentation of whiteness (Harper. S. R. (2013)).

13. Periodic Evaluation – the evaluative process of a faculty unit employee which is normally required for probationary faculty who are not subject to a Performance Review. 15.20b, 15.30-15.33

14. Performance Review – the evaluative process required for retention, tenure, or promotion for faculty unit employees who are not subject to a periodic evaluation.  15.37-15.39

15. Personnel Action File (PAF) – the one official personnel file containing employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. Campus medical and police records are not a part of the PAF. 2.17, 11.17.

16. Positionality - the social, economic and political context that shapes your identity in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, birth place, immigration status and ability status. Positionality also describes how your identity influences, and potentially biases, your understanding of and outlook on the world.

17. President – the chief executive officer of HSU or his/her designee

18. Probationary Period – the period of service, prior to the granting or denial of tenure, credited to a faculty unit employee who has received a probationary appointment. 13.2

19. Professional Development Plan (PDP) – a document that describes a program of professional development in each of the areas of performance for RTP.

20. Promotion – the advancement of a probationary or tenured faculty unit employee who holds academic or librarian rank to a higher academic or librarian rank, or advancement of a Counselor Faculty Unit Employee to a higher classification. 14.1

21. Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) – the HSU summary form used by the candidate to present basic data on qualifications in the retention, tenure and promotion process.

22. Racial Equity - Equity work at Humboldt State University (HSU) recognizes the historical and systemic disparities in opportunities and outcomes and provides resources necessary to rectify those disparities. Racial equity at HSU will be achieved when one's racial identity no longer predicts, in a statistical sense, how one fares. Racial equity is one part of racial justice and works to eliminate policies, attitudes, and cultural messages that reinforce differential outcomes by race.

23. Retention – authorization to continue in probationary status for another year.

24. "RTP" – retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

25. Tenure – the right to continued permanent employment at the campus as a faculty unit employee except when such employment is voluntarily terminated or is terminated by the Employer pursuant to this agreement or law. 13.14-13.20

26. "UFPC" – University Faculty Personnel Committee.

27. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) – that portion of the Personnel Action File used during the performance review of a faculty unit employee. 2.17 and Article 11

## III. CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT

A. The President shall incorporate into a newly appointed faculty unit employee's appointment letter information pertinent to that person's employment at HSU.  12.2

1. In addition, the appointee shall be advised of:

   a) the required academic degree,

   b) any other requirements necessary for retention, tenure or promotion, and

   c) the existence of a procedure to waive, under rare circumstances, the terminal degree requirement.

2. The President shall provide newly appointed faculty unit employees with a copy of the Faculty Handbook and direct the appointee's attention to Appendix J. CFA shall provide the new appointee with a copy of the CBA.

B. Procedures for establishing equivalency or compensating strengths as a substitute for the prescribed terminal degree.

1. *Demonstration of Equivalency* – Candidates will normally be expected to possess the doctorate or other terminal degree from an accredited institution, as appropriate to each discipline or program of instruction. When acceptance by the university, of a claim of equivalence to possession of the doctorate or other terminal degree is sought, the following supporting evidence shall be required:

   a) Evidence that candidates have achieved regional or national status of outstanding prominence in their disciplines or areas of instruction. Such evidence consists, in part, of publications, exhibits, performances, professional lectures, the holding of major office in professional organizations, and the like, which support the claim of regional or national prominence.

b)  The committee supporting the claim of equivalence shall provide evidence that candidates' professional expertise is sought regionally or nationally, that their publications have appeared in leading journals or other significant books or papers, and that those publications, exhibits, or performances have been reviewed other than locally.

c)  Equivalency, having been demonstrated in RTP, need not be re-demonstrated in future situations.

2.  *Demonstrations of Compensating Strengths* – In exceptional cases candidates may establish compensating strengths to the degree of significance that the UFPC will find it possible to recommend waiving of the requirement for the appropriate doctorate or terminal degree so that a favorable personnel decision can be made. It shall be the responsibility of candidates to prepare the case for compensating strengths guided by the personnel committee of the initiating unit. While the degree of candidates' academic or other competence as previously demonstrated in performance at this university, special experience relevant to candidates' university assignment and the amount of higher education they have completed may serve as factors in the case presented, they shall not be sufficient to complete the case. Evidence shall also be required that demonstrates candidates' exceptional value to the university, and its instructional program in particular, of a type sufficient to establish a unique basis for determining that acceptance of the claim of compensating strengths is in the best interest of the university.

3.  *Recommendations for Equivalence or Compensating Strengths* – The case for equivalence or compensating strengths shall be affirmatively recommended to the President upon the approval of two levels of personnel committee review, provided that one of these is the UFPC.

## IV. RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION (RTP)

A.  All candidates for RTP shall be subject to Periodic Evaluations or Performance Reviews according to Figure 1. 14.6, 15.31

B.  Academic departments and units, in collaboration with other university personnel and committees involved in the RTP process, have the responsibility to ensure that probationary faculty receive mentoring. Departments may employ any approach to mentoring that they find effective.

C.  The President shall make the final decision in all RTP matters following consultation with the UFPC. 13.11, 13.16, 14.8

1.  The President's decisions shall be based on the PAF. 11.9, 15.12c.

2.  The President's decisions shall be in writing and shall include the reasons for the decision. 15.47

3.  The President's decisions are to be based on candidates' professional qualifications, work performance, or personal attributes as documented in the PAF. Any other basis shall be reduced to writing and inserted into the Personnel Action File in accord with the CBA, with copies to the candidate. 11.9, 15.12c

D.  The President shall notify candidates of the final decision by the following deadlines.

1.  Probationary candidates for retention with less than two (2) years' service, **February 15**. 13.12

2.  Probationary candidates for retention with more than two (2) years' service, and candidates for tenure, **June 1**. 13.13, 13.18

3.  Candidates for promotion, **June 15**. 14.9

E.   A terminal year appointment may be awarded to a candidate who is denied retention or tenure and has at least three (3) years' service. 13.18

F.   The normal probationary period is six (6) years of full-time service (including credited service). 13.3

    1.   Questions involving the definition of service shall be resolved in accord with the CBA. 13.6

    2.   The President may extend the probationary period for one (1) year if a candidate is on Workers' Compensation, disability leave, sick leave, or unpaid leave. 13.7, 13.8

    3.   The President, upon recommendation by the appropriate unit, may grant up to two (2) years of probationary credit for previous service. 13.4

    4.   A maximum of one (1) year of professional leave may be counted as time in rank.  22.25

       a)   The amount of time to be so counted shall be based upon the IUPC's recommendation.

       b)   The appropriate administrator shall forward the recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Vice President for Student Affairs.

    5.   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.

       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.

    6.   The President may award tenure at the time of appointment only after an evaluation and recommendation by the appropriate department. 13.17

    7.   Tenure shall be effective at the beginning of the academic year following the date of the award. 13.20

G.   All newly appointed probationary faculty seeking second year retention shall undergo a Modified Performance Review, including those awarded service credit upon appointment to the university.

    1.   The Modified Performance Review shall include submission of a reviewed Professional Development Plan, evaluations of teaching performance, Initiating Unit personnel Committee (IUPC) review, and review by the College/Library Dean /Director of Counseling and Psychological Services.

    2.   The IUPCs shall consider teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness and address possible problem areas in making a recommendation to the College Dean, the Dean of the University Library or the Director of Health and Counseling Services.

    3.   After the Modified Performance Review for second year retention, subsequent terms of retention prior to tenure and promotion normally shall be two years.

H.   A Periodic Evaluation shall be required of all candidates who are not subject to a Performance Review (See Figure 1).  15.20

The IUPCs shall consider teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness and address possible problem areas in making a recommendation to the College Dean, the Dean of the University Library or the Director of Health and Counseling Services.

I.   Provisions relating specifically to promotion.

1.   A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. 14.2

2.   A probationary faculty unit employee shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time s/he is considered for tenure. 14.2 In cases where a probationary faculty unit employee is being considered for promotion and tenure prior to him/her having fulfilled the time in service requirements for such consideration, the same criteria shall apply for promotion as those identified relative to tenure under IV.F.5. a-c) above.

3.   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.

4.   A faculty unit employee has the option of not being considered for promotion and may withdraw without prejudice at any stage of the process. 14.3, 14.7

## V. PERSONNEL ACTION FILE

### A. File Custodian

College Deans, the Dean of the University Library and the Vice President for Student Affairs (for counselor faculty unit) shall maintain official Personnel Action Files (PAF) for faculty unit employees in their respective units. 11.1

1.   File content is to be accurate, relevant and timely. 11.1

2.   RTP actions shall be based upon materials contained in the PAF. 11.1, 11.9, 15.12c

3.   Other records on campus to which faculty unit employees have legal access shall be indicated in the PAF. 11.16

### B. File Access

1.   Access to faculty unit employee PAFs shall be limited only to persons with official business. The file custodian shall maintain a log, as part of the PAF, which records all access to the PAF. 11.15 Any material identified by source may be placed in the PAF. Identification shall indicate the author, the committee, the campus office, or the name of the officially authorized body generating the material. 11.3

2.  Faculty unit employees shall have the right to access all materials in their PAF. Pre-employment materials are excepted unless used in personnel actions other than appointment. 11.10

3.  Faculty unit employees, accompanied by another person of their choosing if desired, may inspect their PAF. Appointments shall be scheduled with the file custodian under reasonable conditions of inspection. 11.11

4.  File custodians shall provide copies within fourteen (14) days of all PAF materials requested in writing by faculty unit employees. 11.12

### C. File Additions

1.  A faculty unit employee shall have the right to submit material to his/her PAF. 11.2

2.  All material placed in the PAF shall be identified by source, except for classroom student evaluations collected in accordance with standard procedures. 11.3, 15.16

3.  A faculty unit employee shall be provided with a copy of all material submitted to the file custodian for placement in his/her PAF at least five (5) days prior to such placement. 11.4

### D. File Corrections

1.  A faculty unit employee shall have the right to place a written rebuttal to any materials in his/her PAF. 11.2

2.  If a faculty unit employee believes that material in the PAF, or material submitted for the PAF, is not accurate, relevant, or timely, he/she may request that the file custodian cause the material to be corrected or deleted in accordance with the CBA. 11.13

3.  If a request for correction or deletion is denied by the file custodian, the faculty unit employee may submit the request to the President within seven (7) days and the President shall respond within twenty-one (21) days, including reasons for denial in accordance with the CBA. 11.14

### E. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

1.  The WPAF is prepared for a Performance Review (See Figure 1). 15.8

    a)  It contains all required forms and documents, candidate generated material, evaluative materials and recommendations and candidate's rebuttals, if any. 15.8

    b)  WPAF materials submitted by a faculty unit employee shall be deemed incorporated by reference into the PAF, but need not be physically placed in the file. 11.7, 15.9

2.  Materials shall be in an online portfolio with 9 sections. Material in each section shall be in reverse chronological order, most recent material first.

    a)  Section 1 - Index of materials submitted for evaluation. 11.7, 15.9

    b)  Section 2 - Pertinent documents concerning original appointment, subsequent retention, tenure and promotion; evaluations of leaves intended to count as time in academic rank; and clarification of the terminal degree status if not readily apparent. Tenured faculty need not include data from before their last promotion.

c)  Section 3 - Initiating unit and college personnel policies and procedures, and Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards.

d)  Section 4 - Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) and Professional Development Plan (PDP).

e)  Section 5 - Evaluation materials provided by evaluating committees and administrators rather than the candidate. 15.12a

f)  Section 6 - Evaluative letters that address areas of performance from faculty and professional colleagues (on and off campus), administrators, staff, and other relevant individuals (non-students).

g)  Section 7 – Evidence of teaching effectiveness/librarianship/counseling effectiveness (in addition to collegial letters).

   (1)  Student letters, identified by name. 15.17b

   (2)  Student evaluation data collected as part of the classroom student evaluation process. 15.17a.

   (3)  Any other relevant evidence.

h)  Section 8 – Non-evaluative evidence of scholarly/creative activities.

i)  Section 9 – Non-evaluative evidence of service.

3.  The file custodian as defined in Section V.A. above shall prohibit access to the WPAF, for forty-two (42) days following the date of the President's notification (in the case of tenure or promotion) or the Provost's notification (in the case of retention). 10.4 Any action in processing a dispute formally may be postponed for a period of up to twenty-five (25) days in order that the faculty member may pursue efforts to resolve the dispute informally.  10.5

   a)  Following this period, and in the absence of a grievance, the Index from WPAF Section 1 shall be permanently placed in the Personnel Action File and appropriately updated to reflect any material added to the file during the course of the evaluation cycle (e.g., recommendations and rebuttals). Materials for evaluation submitted by a faculty unit employee and incorporated by reference in the Index, shall be considered part of the Personnel Action File. Such indexed materials (generally materials from WPAF Sections 8 and 9) shall be archived electronically and a digital copy provided to the faculty unit employee upon request.  15.9

   b)  If a grievance is filed, the integrity of the file shall be maintained by all parties until the grievance is resolved.  11.15

## VI. PERIODIC EVALUATION

A.  In an academic year or work year in which a candidate is not subject to a Performance Review for retention, probationary faculty unit employees shall be subject to a Periodic Evaluation (See Figure 1).  15.31

B.  Periodic Evaluations shall be conducted by the IUPC of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator. There shall be consideration of the Professional Development Plan, student evaluations of teaching performance (when teaching duties have been assigned and student evaluations are available), peer reviews, and administrative reviews. 15.21, 15.32

C.  Professional Development Plan – Each probationary candidate shall develop, in consultation with the department chair, a Professional Development Plan that describes a program of professional development in the three areas of performance for RTP: teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness, scholarly/ creative activities, and service. The plan shall be flexible and open to change as needed, it shall reflect the strengths of the candidate and her/his professional development needs, and it shall be aligned with the department, college, and university needs. Candidates are encouraged to discuss their professional development goals with the department chair prior to Performance Review or Periodic Evaluation. This discussion should include identifying strengths of the candidate, areas that may benefit from mentoring and professional development, and resources needed to achieve the stated goals. Any resources required or that might be anticipated as necessary to support the Professional Development Plan must remain consistent with what can reasonably be offered by the department, college or university.

D.  Department chairs may make separate recommendations as part of the Periodic Evaluation process. If such a separate recommendation is to be made, the chair shall not participate as a member of the department or equivalent unit peer committee.  15.21

E.  A written record of the Periodic Evaluation shall be placed in the candidate's Personnel Action File. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the written record of the Periodic Evaluation.  15.33

## VII. PERFORMANCE REVIEW

### A. Evaluation by Peers, Students, and Administrators

The Performance Review shall consist of an evaluation of a candidate's performance areas by peers, students, and administrators. 15.38

#### 1.   Peer evaluation

a)  IUPCs shall ensure that there is adequate substantive peer evaluation of candidates.

b)  The effectiveness, relevance, and value of a candidate's accomplishments and activities in each performance area shall be determined primarily on the basis of written statements from colleagues within the university and, where appropriate, from peers outside the university.

c)  Due to the potential for the perception of a conflict of interest, candidates shall not request signed student letters from current HSU students or from students working under them. It is the responsibility of the IUPC to make requests for signed student letters on behalf of the candidate. A candidate shall not be penalized for the lack of such letters; in such case, anonymous student course evaluations shall be considered as sufficient student commentary on teaching.

## 2.   Student evaluation

a)   All classes (unless exempted) taught by faculty shall be evaluated each semester by students completing a quantitative or a combination of quantitative and qualitative written questionnaire (15.15, 15.17).

   (1)   Candidates shall not be present when evaluations are administered.

   (2)   Evaluations shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. 15.17a

   (3)   Space may be provided on the quantitative form for student comments.  15.17a

   (4)   Summaries of student evaluations shall be prepared by regularly employed staff, not student employees. These shall contain appropriate tabulations and compilations of student comments.

   (5)   Evaluation summaries shall be placed in the Personnel Action File and shall not be available to candidates until after class grades have been submitted.

   (6)   Candidates are encouraged to comment in writing on student evaluations including such information as required course status, grade point distribution, rigor, or course objectives.

b)   In addition to classroom evaluations, students may be provided an opportunity to consult with the IUPC. 15.16 All statements submitted outside of the regular classroom evaluation process shall be identified by name before placement in the PAF.  15.17b

c)   Low enrollment courses may be exempted from the requirement for student evaluations as specified below (see University Senate Resolution #29-12/13-FAC):

   (1)   Course sections enrolling three or fewer students

   (2)   Thesis courses, comprehensive examination courses, baccalaureate and master's project courses, senior and master's field, applied, and directed research course and independent study courses.

## 3.   Administrative Evaluation

a)   The College Dean, the Dean of the University Library or the Director of Health and Counseling Services shall evaluate and forward written recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Vice President of Student Affairs who, in turn, shall forward a written recommendation to the President. 15.6, 15.45

b)   Department chairs may make separate recommendations in which case they may not serve on personnel committees which evaluate the candidates.  15.39b

## B. Evaluation Procedures

## 1.   Timelines

a)   The President shall announce timelines for the Performance Review process after receiving recommendations from the UFPC. 13.5, 14.5, 15.4

b)   The WPAF is closed to new materials at the first level of evaluation as of the date established under VII.B.1.a. 15.12b

    (1)   Upon request by a candidate or personnel committee, the UFPC may grant an exception for addition of new materials that become accessible after the closing date.  15.12b

    (2)   If the exception is granted, the added material shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee for review, evaluation, and comment.  15.12b

c)   All evaluations shall be completed within the timelines specified in VII.B.1.a. The WPAF shall automatically be transferred to the next level of review if it has not been completed and the candidate so notified. 15.4, 15.46

### 2.   Compilation of the Working Personnel Action File

a)   Responsibility for providing WPAF materials is shared among candidates, IUPCs, and administrators. 15.12a

b)   Candidates shall ensure that their WPAF contains supporting materials which address RTP performance criteria and standards.  15.12a

    (1)   Materials shall be submitted to the IUPC by the deadline announced by the President. 13.5, 14.5, 15.4, 15.12.b

    (2)   The HSU Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) shall be utilized for presenting basic data on qualifications for RTP.

        (a)   Copies of PDS forms shall be available from department chairs and completed for submittal to the IUPC.

        (b)   Accomplishments and activities shall be cited only once under the most appropriate section. Those that are relevant to more than one section should be referenced in the main section with a note "Relevant also to Section 'blank'."

        (c)   In addition to listing accomplishments and activities, candidates may comment on anything they feel is relevant. This may include comments on written statements submitted by others.

    (3)   Candidates shall request statements from appropriate individuals who are capable of evaluating them in one or more performance areas. This may be done in conjunction with the IUPC.

    (4)   Candidates shall submit for evaluation examples of materials which support performance areas.

        (a)   An index to such materials, which is section 1 of the WPAF, shall be prepared with a duplicate in the Personnel Action File. 15.9

        (b)   Personnel committees or administrators may request an external review of supporting materials.  15.12d

            (i)   The request shall document the need for an outside review.  15.12d

(ii)   The request must be approved by the President, with the concurrence of the candidate.  15.12d

(c)   Indexed materials shall be archived electronically at the conclusion of the Performance Review and a digital copy provided to the candidate upon request.  15.9

(5)   Candidates shall assemble their WPAF according to the format outlined in V.E.2.

## 3.   Documentation

a)   Each evaluative submission in the Performance Review shall include the name of the document author, except for student classroom evaluations. 11.3, 15.17a-b. The identity of a document author shall be verified by a signature (scanned images are allowed), secure digital signature or system-based identity verification.

b)   All submitted statements shall be accurate, relevant, and timely.  11.1

c)   The end product at each step of a Performance Review shall be a written recommendation which is placed in the WPAF.  15.45

(1)   Candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation containing decision rationale.  15.5

(2)   Within ten (10) days of receipt, candidates may submit a rebuttal statement and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation.  15.5

(3)   A copy of the rebuttal statement shall be placed in the WPAF with copies sent to previous review levels.  15.5

## 4.   Faculty Recourse

a)   Interpretation/procedural error by peers.

(1)   If a faculty unit employee believes that a misinterpretation of the CBA or Appendix J, or a procedural error, has been committed by peers or peer committees, he/she may request that the next higher committee investigate.

(a)   In the case of the UFPC, the request shall be submitted to the General Faculty President.

(b)   All such requests shall be in writing with copies to all personnel committees.

(2)   If the investigating committee, or the General Faculty President, determines that there has been a misinterpretation or procedural violation, a faculty unit employee may take the matter to the University Senate.

(3)   The University Senate may request a directive of compliance from the University President where failure to comply may result in disciplinary action.

(4)   The above procedures do not replace the faculty unit employee's right to file a grievance.

b)   Grievance. Faculty unit employees may file a grievance in accord with Article 10 of the CBA.

> ### 5.   Retention Period

> a)   Any evaluation committee or appropriate administrator may request that the President or her/his designee grant a one-year retention period for a candidate he/she deems would benefit from an additional Performance Review.

> b)   The President or her/his designee may grant a one-year retention period for a candidate he/she deems would benefit from an additional performance review.

## VIII.   PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

### A. General Provisions

1.   Function

   a)   Evaluate candidates for RTP and make recommendations to the President as part of the performance review process. 15.32, 15.38

2.   Organization

   a)   Members shall be elected by probationary and tenured faculty unit employees. 15.40

   b)   Only tenured faculty with full time appointments may serve. At the request of a department, the President may agree to permit faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Programs to run for election for membership on any level peer review committee. 15.40

   (1)   Faculty may serve on only one level of peer review.  15.41

   (2)   Service on a peer review committee does not preclude members from supplying evaluative statements to IUPCs.

   (3)   Members must have a higher rank than candidates being considered for promotion.  15.42

   (4)   Candidates for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees.  15.42

   (5)   Department chairs may make separate recommendations. If a separate recommendation is made, the chair shall not participate as a member of the department or equivalent unit peer committee. 15.21, 15.39b

3.   Procedures

   a)   Recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of committee membership.  15.44

   b)   Department and higher level peer review committee(s) may rank-order faculty unit employees recommended for promotion. The end result of a promotion ranking shall serve as a recommendation to the President.  15.43

   c)   Recommendations shall include supporting rationale.  15.5

   d)   All deliberations shall be confidential.  15.10

e) Candidates shall be given a copy of the committee recommendation at least ten (10) days before it is forwarded to the next level of review.  15.5

   (1) Within ten (10) days of receipt, candidates may submit a rebuttal statement and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation. 15.5

   (2) A copy of the rebuttal statement shall be placed in the WPAF with copies sent to previous review levels.  15.5

f) Committee recommendations, along with any candidate response, shall be forwarded to the next level of review as part of the WPAF.

g) Copies of recommendations made by higher level committees and administrators shall be sent to previous review levels.

## B. Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC)

1. Function

   a) Evaluate candidates for RTP, not serve as advocates.

   b) Assist candidates in preparing WPAFs that contain supporting materials which address RTP performance criteria and standards.  15.12a

   c) Advise candidates on materials which are necessary or beneficial for WPAF inclusion.

   d) Make recommendations to the next higher peer review committee.

2. Organization

   a) The IUPC shall be composed of at least three members elected each spring by the initiating unit. If there are insufficient eligible members, the initiating unit shall elect members from related academic disciplines.  15.40

   b) Each initiating unit may determine its own policies and procedures consistent with university policies and the CBA.

3. Procedures

   a) 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.

      (1) Statements from colleagues shall be based upon direct observations and analysis of a candidate's effectiveness and contributions in each performance area.

   b) The IUPC shall invite written statements from the candidates' current HSU students and current student employees to ensure that there is adequate notification and opportunity for substantive student evaluation.

   c) The IUPC may provide a meeting where faculty and students can personally consult with the committee. All comments received shall be submitted or summarized in writing and identified by name before placement in the WPAF. 15.16, 15.17b

d) Recommendations of the IUPC shall be based primarily upon written evaluations of candidates made by colleagues in the unit. Evaluations by colleagues within the unit shall be substantiated by other evidence such as written statements from colleagues outside the unit, peers outside the university, former students, and student classroom evaluations.

e) The IUPC shall include in the WPAF a written description of procedures employed to solicit collegial letters and student letters and procedures employed in making its recommendation.

f) For candidates holding a joint appointment, evaluation shall be obtained from all affected IUPCs. 15.13

   (1) After considering recommendations from affected Deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall inform candidates and committees which IUPC will serve as the primary committee.

   (2) The primary IUPC shall assist candidates in WPAF compilation.

   (3) Other IUPCs shall forward their recommendations to the primary IUPC.

## C. College Committee

1. Function

   a) Review recommendations and WPAFs received from IUPCs and make its own recommendations to the UFPC. (Note: Library personnel committee and counselor personnel committee recommendations shall be forwarded directly to the UFPC.)

   b) Insure that IUPCs carry out the duties assigned to them.

2. Organization

   a) Colleges shall elect members each spring to fill vacancies on their personnel committee(s).

   b) Each college may determine its own policies and procedures consistent with university policies and the CBA.

3. Procedures

   a) Recommendations of college committees shall be based upon materials contained in WPAFs.

   b) College committees shall include in each WPAF a written description of procedures employed in making recommendations.

## D. University Faculty Personnel Committee

1. Function

   a) Review recommendations and WPAFs received from lower level peer review committees and make final recommendations regarding RTP to the President.

   (1) Endorse retention recommendations of lower level committees if lower level committees are in agreement, unless a candidate specifically requests a review by the UFPC.

(a)     Append comments on perceived candidate deficiencies which may lead to unfavorable tenure recommendations in the future.

(b)     Review candidates for second year retention when IUPC and Dean recommendations differ.

(2)   Perform a full review of candidates for tenure and promotion regardless of lower level committee recommendations.

b)   Review request for insertion of materials in the WPAF after the IUPC has forwarded it to the next higher committee.  15.12b

c)   Review procedures employed by lower level committees to insure they are consistent with university policies and the CBA.

d)   Report at least annually to faculty unit employees and hold an open informational meeting each May for personnel committees and candidates for RTP.

2.   Organization

a)   The UFPC shall be composed of five seats: One seat shall be held by a faculty member of the College of Natural Resources and Sciences, one by a faculty member of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, one by a faculty member of the College of Professional Studies, and two by faculty members from the general faculty at-large. Members of the UFPC must be tenured and hold the rank of professor, librarian, or SSP-AR III. The term of office shall be for two years. The amount of assigned time will be determined annually through the faculty governance recommending process of the Executive Committee of the University Senate.

b)   The University Senate Appointments and Elections Committee shall hold elections in the spring before teaching schedules for the following fall term are determined. Electors may vote for one candidate for each vacancy according to the rules governing the General Faculty Elections. All electors may vote for any vacancy.  15.40

c)   Any vacancies which occur during the academic year shall be immediately filled for the remainder of the academic year by a special election called by the General Faculty President.

3.   Procedures

a)   Immediately following its election in the spring, the UFPC may recommend dates to the President for the performance review process for the next academic year. 15.4, 14.5, 13.5

b)   The UFPC shall forward to the President its recommendations, along with supporting rationale, on every candidate which it has reviewed.

c)   The President shall consult with the UFPC before making a final decision on any candidate. The President shall use reasoned judgment in support of any decision he/she makes regarding a recommendation from the UFPC. In the event that the President's recommendation differs from that of the UFPC, the President shall give reasons that are specific for the individual case and sufficient to persuade any reasonable, disinterested person that the UFPC's recommendation should be overturned.

## IX. AREAS OF PERFORMANCE FOR RTP

## A. General Criterion

The general criterion for any decision regarding RTP shall be academic competence of candidates as judged by their performance in the areas outlined below, with attention to the value of the candidates currently and in the reasonably foreseeable future to the instructional program of the university. In all such decision the affirmative action policies then in effect and governing personnel matters in the university shall be adhered to.

1. Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards

   a) Each department/unit shall recommend the criteria and standards by which it will evaluate performance for retention, tenure, and promotion. The standards shall be designed to evaluate faculty performance for which they were hired and/or to which they are assigned.

      (1) The department/unit standards add specificity to the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).
      (2) The departments shall establish clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements.

   b) Department/unit criteria and standards shall be consistent with the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).

   c) Department/unit criteria and standards are subject to recommendation by a majority of tenured and probationary department/unit faculty members voting. Departments/units may revise existing standards by a majority vote of tenured and probationary department/unit faculty members voting and then following the approval process outlined in Section 1.d.

   d) Departments/units shall submit criteria and standards for approval by the Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards. The committee shall be comprised of the college deans (or designees), the Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel Services (ex officio) and six tenured-line faculty, with at least one from each college, and at least three tenured. Preference given to faculty who has have experience at the IUPC, CPC, or UFPC level. Appointments to the committee shall be made by the Senate Appointments and Elections Committee in consultation with the UFPC. The committee shall be chaired by a tenured faculty member of the committee, selected by the committee.

      (1) Departments shall produce RTP standards that locate qualitative/quantitative measures within the range of standards across departments/units. The Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards shall identify outliers' standards and shall work with the department/unit to bring standards within the university range.

      (2) The Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards shall be charged with ensuring unit/departmental standards are in alignment with university standards and criteria as specified in Appendix J, and shall ensure that standards are not overly complex or prone to misinterpretation.

   e) Once approved by the Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards, the criteria and standards shall be used at all levels of review.

      Faculty who will be evaluated for a promotion and/or tenure decision shall have the option to either use the current year's department/unit standards and criteria or the immediate previous department/unit standards and criteria if the standards have been changed in the previous two years.

   f) 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.

g) Any level of RTP performance review may suggest revisions to the department/unit when, in their opinion, department/unit standards may be unclear, overly rigid, or complex. Such suggestions shall be advisory in nature and shall be forwarded to the department/unit, the Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards, and the University Faculty Personnel Committee office for archiving and consideration in the next review cycle.

i) The University's policy on RTP (Appendix J) shall serve as the guideline for development and interpretation of department/unit criteria and standards. For departments without approved standards, the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J) shall be the basis to evaluate faculty performance.

2. Candidates shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness, scholarly/creative activities, and service. The most important of these specific criteria for determining academic competence shall be teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness. A record of teaching/ librarian/ counseling excellence, combined with an "Acceptable" level of performance in the two non-teaching/librarian/counseling areas, as defined in the department/unit criteria and standards, shall be taken as a strong justification for RTP.

a) All faculty members are expected to make contributions in both the area of scholarly/creative activities and in the area of service in accordance with the department/unit standards that have been established and approved.

b) The area of scholarly/creative activities and the area of service each shall be valued and/or weighted equally in the RTP process, and shall be reflected in the department/unit criteria and standards. Thus, the prolific scholar shall not, because of his/her strength in scholarship, be given preference over the faculty member whose strength consists of making significant contributions in the area of professional, university and/or community service, provided that both are equally effective teachers, librarians, or counselors.

c) An "Acceptable" level of performance, defined in department/unit criteria and standards, shall recognize that a candidate's strengths may be concentrated in either scholarly/creative activities or service, and not suffer as a consequence. However, a candidate shall balance such concentrated ("Excellent") achievement in one of the two non-teaching areas with at least a "Minimum Essential" level in the other, in accordance with department/unit RTP criteria and standards. For example, an "Excellent" level of performance in service activities (in accordance with department/unit RTP criteria and standards) shall be balanced with at least a "Minimum Essential" level of performance in scholarly/creative activities (in accordance with department/unit RTP criteria and standards), or vice versa. Alternatively, a candidate may be "good" in both non-teaching areas.  As an example, "Acceptable" levels of performance for a positive promotion and/or tenure decision are reflected in the following combinations using "Minimum Essential," "Good," and "Excellent" as the evaluative terms:

| Scholarly/Creative Activities | Service | Outcome |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Good | Good | Acceptable |
| Excellent | Minimum Essential | Acceptable |
| Minimum Essential | Excellent | Acceptable |

| Good | Minimum Essential | Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|
| Minimum Essential | Good | Unacceptable |

(1) Each department/unit, in its criteria and standards, shall clearly define the level of performance required for each of the evaluative terms: Minimum Essential, Good, and Excellent.

(2) In all cases, Minimum Essential shall include evidence of reasonable effort and contribution by the candidate consistent with the diverse roles and responsibilities of faculty.

(3) Candidates for promotion and/or tenure who do not meet Minimum Essential performance in either or both non-teaching categories shall not receive a positive promotion and/or tenure recommendation.

3. Where not obvious, the value of contributions in the scholarly/creative activities and service areas of performance should be indicated and explained by the candidate and evaluated by the faculty and/or members of the initiating unit personnel committee. For example, in cases where candidates receive weighted teaching units for their non-teaching duties (i.e., coaching, theatrical design, conducting, etc.) the initiating unit personnel committee shall explain how the assignment of weighted teaching units contributes to the scholarly/creative activities and service areas of performance.

## B. Assessment of the Areas of Performance for RTP

All faculty are expected to create inclusive learning environments and ensure that students are provided with an equitable opportunities for success. Faculty may also make contributions toward equity and inclusion in scholarly/creative activities and service aspects of their duties. These contributions to equity and inclusion can take a variety of forms including but not limited to those listed below, and should be identified in the appropriate section of the WPAF:

### 1. Effectiveness

a) Teaching effectiveness is essential for retention, tenure, and promotion. Effective teaching demands the clear communication of disciplinary/subject matter knowledge and the transformation and extension of that knowledge to a diverse student population.

(1) It is expected that faculty will continually strive to create welcoming and inclusive learning environments, where students from diverse backgrounds and cultures are treated equitably, and all students have equal opportunity to succeed. Examples of such activities may include:
1) Exposing students to a diverse ensemble of scholars
2) Integrating diverse examples/voices into curriculum
3) Developing/Implementing inclusive pedagogies
4) Providing space for students to share their identities and common experiences
5) Building inclusive community/cohorts
6) Incorporating indigenous peoples and knowledge into curriculum where appropriate
7) Incorporating opportunities that encourage students from diverse backgrounds to work collaboratively inside and outside the classroom
8) Providing a variety of ways in which students can demonstrate mastery of course material

(2) It is expected that faculty will continually improve their understanding of student learning, increase their knowledge of pedagogy, and strengthen teaching skills throughout the probationary period, and will demonstrate clear, precise communication as well as effective application of that knowledge in teaching.

(3) Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated through understanding and current knowledge, including the use of measures of student learning, in such activities as:

1) Clearly defined student learning outcomes
2) Appropriate learning activities
3) Samples of student exams and essays
4) Designed course materials.

(4) Faculty are expected to participate in professional development activities that enhance teaching effectiveness for the purpose of:

1) Acquiring theoretical and empirical research-based knowledge about effective learning and teaching;
2) Reflecting upon and practicing such knowledge in the educational setting; and
3) Demonstrating how the use of various pedagogies have informed and enhanced teaching effectiveness;
4) Reflecting on and understanding how positionality impacts the learning environment and the teaching/learning experience;
5) Understanding *and* working toward equity-minded teaching practices

(5) 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.

(6) Other academic contributions to teaching effectiveness to be evaluated by colleagues include but are not limited to: course syllabi, learning outcomes, exams, and other learning activities.

(7) Constructive and professional relationships with students are important for a strong academic program, therefore, it is expected that faculty demonstrate sound academic advising, effective counseling of students on course-related matters, the ability to work with a diverse student population, ensure equitable learning opportunities and activities, and availability of the faculty member on a regular basis to assist the academic needs of students.

(8) Assessment by the candidate's colleagues shall be substantiated by other evidence such as written comments by colleagues not in the candidate's area of service, student evaluations, degree of achievement of and supporting statements from former students.

(9) Written student evaluation of teaching in all courses (unless exempted) is required of all faculty by trustee policy and the CBA, but candidates for RTP may be evaluated in all courses taught during the year preceding their application for RTP. Additional written or oral evaluations may be taken, and identified by name, and submitted as part of the candidate's file. Student evaluations will be used as one element in assessing the quality of instruction, but not as the sole indicator of such quality.

b) Effectiveness in Librarianship – is essential for retention, tenure, and promotion. Effective librarianship demands the clear communication of disciplinary/subject matter knowledge and the transformation and extension of that knowledge to a diverse student population.

(1)  Library faculty who teach will strive to teach culturally grounded information literacy.

(2)  It is expected that faculty will continually improve their understanding of student learning, increase their knowledge of pedagogy, and strengthen librarianship skills throughout the probationary period, and will demonstrate clear, precise communication as well as effective application of that knowledge in their work with students.

(3)  The primary emphasis of this area is on the quality of librarianship. 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.

(4)  Specific performance criteria for effectiveness in librarianship shall be developed as part of the Library Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures and included in a candidate's WPAF.

(5)  Assessment by the candidate's colleagues shall be substantiated by other evidence such as written comments by colleagues not in the candidate's area of service and student evaluations.

c)  Counseling Effectiveness – is essential for retention, tenure, and promotion. Effective counseling demands the clear communication of disciplinary/subject matter knowledge and the transformation and extension of that knowledge to a diverse student population.

(1)  It is expected that faculty will continually improve their understanding of counseling practices and strengthen counseling skills throughout the probationary period, and will demonstrate clear, precise communication as well as effective application of that knowledge in their work with students of diverse backgrounds and experiences.

(2)  It is expected that counseling faculty will continually strive to create welcoming and inclusive environments, where students from diverse backgrounds and cultures are treated equitably, and all students have access to the support they need.

(3)  The primary emphasis of this area is on the quality of counseling. Evaluations of counseling effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from faculty members within the candidate's areas 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 videotapes of counseling, co-therapy, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes. The department shall organize and promote a system of peer evaluation which will aid in developing the written statements of the candidate's colleagues.

(4)  Specific performance criteria for effectiveness in counseling shall be developed as part of the Counseling Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures and included in a candidate's WPAF.

(5)  Assessment by the candidate's colleagues shall be substantiated by other evidence such as written comments by colleagues not in the candidate's area of service, student evaluations, degree of improvement or achievement, and supporting statements form former students.

(6)  Written student evaluations of both individual and group counseling are required. Such evaluations may include both quantitative and qualitative components and should be garnered from a significant proportion of students participating in counseling with the candidate.

Student evaluations and letters will be used as one element in assessing the quality of counseling, but not as the sole indicator of such quality.

## 2. Scholarly/Creative Activities

Faculty are expected to engage in an ongoing program of scholarly/creative activities and be guided by their department/unit criteria and standards. Faculty *may* make contributions toward equity and inclusion in their scholarly/creative activities. Examples of such activity *could* take the form of Scholarly/Creative Activities that:

1) Utilize community-based methods
2) Recognize diverse ways of knowing
3) Use critical theories and methodologies
4) Emphasize research *with* rather than *on* minoritized communities
5) Give presentations to marginalized communities
6) Provide opportunities for minoritized students, e.g. research, internship or student assistant opportunities.

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. (See Figure 2) Collegial/peer review appropriate to the discipline is required and shall be defined in the department/unit RTP criteria and standards

**There is no expectation that faculty would have contributions in each of the five dimensions of scholarship.** Faculty members should engage in scholarly/creative activities appropriate to their discipline and described in their PDP.

a) The scholarship of discovery refers to the pursuit of inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge. It is documented through critically evaluated and professionally recognized activities such as but not limited to:

1) Journal articles
2) Monographs
3) Proceedings
4) Poems
5) Stories
6) Artistic creations
7) Awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work
8) Public performances
9) Published books
10) Professional presentations.

b) The scholarship of integration consists of making connections across disciplines and/or advancing knowledge through synthesis as demonstrated by activities such as but not limited to:

1) Writing textbooks
2) Developing educational media
3) Writing for non-specialists
4) Sponsoring colloquia and forums
5) Shaping a core curriculum
6) Preparing computer software

7) Integration of professional experiences in classrooms
8) Critical review articles
9) Editing books.

c) The scholarship of application asks how knowledge can be applied to the social issues of the times in a dynamic process that generates and tests new theory and knowledge. It is documented by using knowledge to address demanding, substantive human problems. It is demonstrated in activities such as but not limited to:

1) Conducting applied research and evaluation
2) Consultation with and/or providing technical assistance for community/organizations
3) Developing new products, practices, clinical procedures, new artistic works,
4) Performing clinical service
5) Promoting experiential learning and professional development.

d) The scholarship of teaching includes not only transmitting knowledge, but also transforming and extending it through activities such as but not limited to:

1) Designing new courses
2) Writing textbooks
3) Published research in teaching and learning
4) Creation of course software
5) Creation of technology-mediated instruction
6) Shaping a core curriculum
7) Developing innovative and/or inclusive pedagogy.

e) The scholarship of community engagement connects any of the above dimensions of scholarship to the understanding and solving of pressing societal, environmental, civic, and ethical problems. Community-engaged scholarship involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community. It can be trans-disciplinary and often integrates some combination of multiple forms of scholarship. For example, service learning can integrate the scholarship of teaching, application, and engagement while community-based participatory research can integrate the scholarship of discovery integration, application and engagement.

f) A list of activities evaluated by the candidate's colleagues is preferable to a list alone. Departments are encouraged to develop additional discipline oriented criteria within the framework of this definition. Scholarly and creative activities in progress shall weigh less heavily than work completed.

## 3. Service

All faculty shall offer reasonable contributions to the university, the profession and/or the community as defined by department/unit RTP criteria and standards. In the area of participation in professional organizations, documented evidence of participation and leadership roles shall be considered more significant than mere membership. It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate service through activities such as but not limited to:

a) Service to the university, profession and community
b) Participation on department/school, college and university committees, including shared governance activities
c) Working collaboratively and productively with colleagues
d) Mentoring colleagues
e) Non-Academic and/or academic mentoring of minoritized students

f)   Participation in traditional academic functions such as convocation and commencement; student outreach activities, etc.

g)   Participation in group projects directed toward accomplishing department/school, college and university goals such as outcomes assessment development and implementation, strategic planning, accreditation activities, etc.

h)   Contributions to the community-at-large such as organizational leadership and presentations, as well as other relevant participation in groups serving the public interest. Community service contributions which relate directly to one's discipline or position will be given greater weight. Those activities that bring recognition to the university and aid faculty in their professional growth are of particular importance.

i)   Giving presentations at the Campus & Community Dialogue on Race (CDOR)

j)   Serving as the equity advocate on search committees

k)   Serving on committees and programs to close opportunity and equity gaps

l)   Leadership in professional organizations whose goal is to increase the representation of minoritized students or faculty in their discipline/profession

m)   Serve on working groups in order to improve community engagement (e.g. Equity Arcata, etc.)

4.   Candidates' contributions to their departments or programs other than teaching/ librarianship/ counseling, their participation in department programs, advising, college and university committees, and their extra departmental work in the university at large will be considered as to extent and quality. Activities which can be identified in a candidate's area of service within the university shall weigh more heavily than activities which cannot be so defined.

5.   Any activity, including participation in faculty development, which the candidate feels should be considered by personnel committees but which does not conveniently fit one of the above categories (Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activities, or Service), should be listed separately in the candidate's file and so identified.  15.12a

## X. STANDARDS FOR ACADEMIC RANK

### A. Teaching Faculty

Determination of whether a faculty member meets the following expectations for rank should be reflected in departmental criteria and standards.

1.   The rank of professor is reserved for those associate professors who have earned the highest order of respect and recognition from their colleagues in the university. Professors must be capable of presenting undergraduate courses in their disciplines, and where applicable, graduate level courses, and of directing research or stimulating creative activity with the highest degree of competence. Professors must have a strong record of participation and achievement in the combined non-teaching activities (scholarly/creative activities and service), and show promise of continuing growth in these activities. Professors do superior work in their disciplines and possess the appropriate degree or have established equivalence to it or demonstrate rare and exceptional compensating strengths.

2.   The rank of associate professor is reserved for those assistant professors who have clearly demonstrated that they are well along the way towards achieving those qualities essential for senior rank. Associate professors must be capable of presenting undergraduate courses in their disciplines with a high degree of competence, and where applicable, graduate level courses. They must have a reasonable record of participation and achievement in the combined non-teaching activities (scholarly/creative activities and service), and show promise of continuing growth in these activities. Associate professors perform at a high level in their disciplines and possess the appropriate terminal degree or have established equivalence to it or demonstrate rare and significant compensating strengths.

3.  An assistant professor possesses either (1) the terminal degree, other approved terminal preparation or the equivalent; or (2) the master's degree or the equivalent and has the expectation of attaining the appropriate terminal degree or other required preparation, experience, and competence within the time specified in the candidate's letter of appointment. An assistant professor demonstrates the potential to develop into an excellent teacher, and demonstrates the potential to make substantial achievements in the combined non-teaching activities (scholarly/creative activities and service).

4.  *Tenure.* In most instances only those persons will be recommended for tenure who have the potential to meet the standards required for eventual promotion to the rank of professor. It should be understood, however, that the granting of tenure does not assure promotion.

5.  *Terminal degree.* In disciplines or programs of instruction in which the doctorate is not normally attainable or desirable, preparation which is to be regarded as terminal shall be defined by the initiating unit, with the concurrence of the UFPC and the President.

## B. Librarians

Determination of whether a librarian meets the following expectations for rank should be reflected in departmental criteria and standards.

1.  Librarian is equivalent to the academic rank of professor. This rank is reserved for those associate librarians who have earned the highest order of respect and recognition from their colleagues in the university. Librarians at this rank must be capable of integrating the theory and practice of library science into the broader educational objectives of the university with the highest degree of competence. Librarians must demonstrate superior performance, leadership and expertise and be recognized as authorities by their colleagues, both within and without the library. Librarians must have a strong record of participation and achievement in the combined non-librarianship activities, and show promise of continuing growth in these activities.

2.  Associate librarian is equivalent to the academic rank of associate professor. This rank is reserved for those senior assistant librarians who have clearly demonstrated that they are well along the way towards achieving those qualities essential for senior rank. Associate librarians must be capable for performing a range of library activities with a high degree of competence using initiative, judgment, and independence. Associate librarians possess a high degree of special expertise which is sought after by colleagues, exhibit highly developed working relationships within and without the library, and provide creative approaches and/or innovative solutions to the problems encountered in the functioning of the library. They must have a reasonable record of participation and achievement in the combined non-librarianship activities (scholarly/creative activities and service) and show promise of continuing growth in these activities.

3.  Senior assistant librarian is equivalent to the academic rank of assistant professor. The senior assistant librarian is characterized by knowledge, ability, and experience for independent performance of the full range of library activities in an assigned area. The senior assistant librarian demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the application of basic fundamentals of librarianship to the particular needs of the library and has the potential to make substantial achievements in the areas of librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activities and service.

4.  *Tenure.* In most instances only those persons will be recommended for tenure who have the potential to meet the standards required for eventual promotion to the rank of librarian. It should be understood, however, that the granting of tenure does not assure promotion.

5.  *Terminal degree.* The Terminal degree for librarians is a master's degree in library science from an ALA accredited library school or a library school accredited by a foreign library association whose standards

can be demonstrated to be of equal quality. Equivalent quality shall be determined by the initiating unit with the concurrence of the UFPC and the president.

## C. Counselors

Determination of whether a counselor meets the following expectations for rank should be reflected in departmental criteria and standards.

1.  SSP-AR III is parallel to the rank of professor. This rank is reserved for those who have earned the highest order of respect and recognition from their colleagues in the university. Counseling faculty at this level have demonstrated effectiveness in their professional roles in breadth, depth, and length of service within the department, university, and profession. Counseling faculty at this rank must be capable of integrating the theory and implementation of psychological practice at the highest level of competence. SSP-AR III counselors must demonstrate superior performance, leadership, and expertise and be recognized as authorities by their colleagues, both within and outside of the Health and Counseling Services program. SSP-AR III counselors must have a strong record of participation and achievement in the combined non-counseling activities, and show promise of continuing growth in these activities.

2.  SSP-AR II is parallel to the rank of Associate Professor. This rank is reserved for those who have clearly demonstrated that they are well along the way towards achieving those qualities essential for senior rank. Counselors at this rank must be capable of performing a range of counseling activities with a high degree of competence using initiative, judgment, and independence. They possess a higher degree of specialized expertise that is sought after by colleagues; they exhibit more broadly developed working relationships within and outside their work setting. They must have a reasonable record of participation and achievement in the combined non-counseling activities, and show promise of continuing growth in these activities.

3.  SSP-AR I is equivalent to the academic rank of assistant professor. The SSP-AR I counselor is characterized by knowledge, ability, and experience for independent performance of the full range of counseling activities in an assigned area. The SSP-AR I counselor demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the university and has the potential to make substantial achievements in the areas of counseling effectiveness, scholarly/creative activities, and service.

4.  *Tenure.* In most instances only those persons will be recommended for tenure that have the potential to meet the standards required for eventual promotion to the rank of SSP-AR III. It should be understood, however, that the granting of tenure does not assure promotion.

5.  *Terminal degree.* The terminal degree for counseling faculty is a degree which allows for the independent practice of psychotherapy in California according to state board regulated licensure requirements. Such degrees include a Doctorate in Psychology or a closely related discipline (leading to licensure as a psychologist), a Master's degree in Clinical Social Work (leading to the LCSW), or a Master's degree in Counseling (leading to the LMFT license). In cases where an alternative degree is desirable within the Counseling unit, such preparation which is to be regarded as terminal shall be defined by the initiating unit with the concurrence of the UFPC and the president.

## XI. AMENDMENTS

A.  Amendments to bring Appendix J into conformity with the current CBA need not be voted on by the General Faculty of Humboldt State University. 3.1

B.  Amendments may be proposed either by a majority vote of a faculty session of the University Senate or by a petition signed by 10 percent of the members of the General Faculty.

C. The President of the General Faculty shall notify the General Faculty of the complete wording of any proposed amendment at least seven days prior to the meeting at which the amendment will be discussed.

D. Proposed amendments shall be ratified by a majority of votes cast in an election of full-time tenured faculty, full-time probationary faculty, FERP faculty and administrators with retreat rights. Eligibility to vote on amendments will not be affected if the faculty member is on leave or is not teaching during the semester in which the election is held. 2.13 The Senate Appointments and Elections Committee shall administer the election, consistent with the provisions in section 8.0 of the Constitution of the General Faculty.

E. Ratified amendments shall be recommended to the University President of the University for approval. 2.13 The University President's approval is required prior to implementation of policy changes.

**FIGURE 1**

## LEVELS OF EVALUATION OR REVIEW

| HSU YEAR | APPT YEAR | DEPARTMENT | | COLLEGE | | UNIVERSITY | | PRESIDENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | IUPC | DC | DEAN | CPC | UFPC | PROVOST | |
| 1 | 2nd | MODIFIED PERFORMANCE REVIEW | | | | | | |
| 2 or 1 YSC | 3rd | PERFORMANCE REVIEW | | | | | | |
| 3 or 2 YSC | 4th | PERIODIC EVALUATION | | | | | | |
| 4 | 5th | PERFORMANCE REVIEW | | | | | | |
| 5 | 6th | PERIODIC EVALUATION | | | | | | |
| 6 | 7th with T+P | PERFORMANCE REVIEW | | | | | | |

NOTES:     YSC = Year Service Credit (equivalent to HSU Year)

**FIGURE 2.** From: <u>Scholarship Assessed: An Evaluation of the Professoriate</u>, Glassick, et. al (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, c1997), p. 36.

Exhibit 2.1 Summary of Standards

**Clear Goals**
Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

**Adequate Preparation**
Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring the resources necessary to move the project forward?

**Appropriate Methods**
Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

**Significant Results**
Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?

**Effective Presentation**
Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

**Reflective Critique**
Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

# Cal Poly Humboldt.

**TWO-YEAR PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP)** [1]

Academic Years: _____ **20--/--** _____ to _____ **20--/--** _____

Name: _____ Department: _____ Date: _____

*Maximum Length:  2 pages*

The Professional Development Plan (PDP) is a flexible document that reflects the strengths of the candidate and her/his professional development goals.  It should align with the department, college, and university goals and serves as a guideline for professional growth and development.  It is not a contract that obligates the candidate or university to specific actions or commitment of resources.

PROFESSIONAL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

A.      Teaching/Counseling/Librarianship comments:

B.      Scholarly/Creative Activities comments:

C.      Service comments:

D.      Other (special projects, contributions):

_____                              _____
FACULTY/COUNSELOR/LIBRARIAN                                        DATE

*The following have reviewed and had the opportunity to comment upon this PDP:*

_____                      _____
DEPARTMENT CHAIR (Academic Depts. Only)                         DATE

_____                      _____
DEPARTMENT/UNIT PERSONNEL CMTE. CHAIR                       DATE

_____                      _____
DEAN/DIRECTOR                                                              DATE

---

[1] The PDP is developed every two years during the probationary period starting during the candidate's first semester at Humboldt.  The two-year PDP cycle may not always coincide with a candidates' RTP cycle.  The PDP inserted into the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) may have been written and reviewed during the previous year.

Form revised September 2022/APS

# Cal Poly Humboldt.

## PERSONNEL DATA SHEET (PDS)

Name: _____          Date: _____

At what rank were you first employed at HSU? _____

Date of initial appointment: ____          Present rank: _____

Effective date of appointment or promotion to present rank: _____

Have you been awarded tenure?          Yes ____          No _____

Terminal degree received?          Yes ____          No _____

If No, Expected completion date: _____

*OR*  Date equivalency or compensatory strengths approved: _____

## I.    EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND

a.  Education (in reverse chronological order – insert rows as needed)

| Name of Institution/Location | Dates Attended | Major Emphasis | Credits Earned | Degree and Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Since Last Promotion at HSU | | | | |
| Since Initial Appointment at HSU | | | | |
| Before Appointment at HSU | | | | |

b.  Employment (in reverse chronological order – insert rows as needed)

| Employer (Institution) or Organization/Location | Nature of Employment | Position/Rank | Dates |
|---|---|---|---|

HSU Personnel Data Sheet (PDS)
Revised April 2022

# Directions:

Probationary faculty/librarians/counselors:
List all relevant activities and accomplishments since your initial appointment at HSU. If the President has granted one or two years probationary credit for previous service, then activities and accomplishments at other institutions from those one or two academic years should be included.

Tenured faculty/librarians/counselors:
List only the activities and accomplishments completed since your last promotion, or appointment if not yet promoted. Include activities and accomplishments completed after the previous Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) was closed to new additions.

Equity and Inclusion
All faculty/librarians/counselors are expected to create inclusive learning environments and ensure that students are provided with equitable opportunities for success.  Faculty may make contributions toward equity and inclusion in scholarly/creative activities and service aspects of their duties. In each of the sections below, please include contributions and achievements which further the University's goals of providing an equitable education to all students and an inclusive community of scholars.

Assigned time responsibilities are listed in Section II. "Assigned time" or "release time" responsibilities are different from regular assigned duties. Responsibilities with "assigned time" are accompanied by a number of weighted teaching units (WTUs), in lieu of teaching responsibility, and are given to an individual for carrying out a specific assignment. The assignment or responsibility extends beyond the 3 WTUs normally given for collateral duties. Evaluation of assigned time responsibilities should be included in section 6 of the WPAF.

All accomplishments and activities in Sections II through V should be listed in reverse chronological order (i.e., beginning with the most recent). Cite accomplishments and activities only once, under the most appropriate section. Those that are relevant to more than one section should be cited in the most appropriate section with a note "Relevant also to Section 'blank' " (Appendix J. Section VII. B.2.b)(2)(b)).


Evidence for items in the PDS must be included in the appropriate sections of the WPAF.

## II.      EFFECTIVENESS (Appendix J, Section IX, B.1.)


a. Teaching Effectiveness

1. List and describe courses taught, by course number and title, and assigned time for which WTUs were given. Use a table format to summarize WTUs, name/number of course, semester taught, enrollment.

HSU Personnel Data Sheet (PDS)
Revised April 2022

*Sample Table Format:*

| Course | Title | Format | WTU | Enrollment |
|--------|-------|--------|-----|------------|
| *Fall 2012* | | | | |
| *EGYPT 204* | *History* | *Lecture* | *3* | *25* |
| *EGYPT 208* | *Art Works* | *Lecture* | *3* | *21* |
| *EGYPT 208L* | *Art Works Lab* | *Lab* | *2* | *15* |
| *EGYPT 208L* | *Art Works Lab* | *Lab* | *2* | *23* |
| *EGYPT 440* | *Nile Field Trip* | *Field Trip* | *1* | *29* |
| *Assigned Time* | *Graduate Coordinator* | | *1* | |
| | | *Total* | *12* | |

2. Include a teaching philosophy that illustrates your efforts to create an inclusive learning environment and employ effective educational practices for a diverse student population.

3. Include additional information which relates to teaching effectiveness. This may include methods you use to improve your effectiveness, such as attendance at conferences/ meetings which promote professional development.

4. Academic Advising Responsibilities (summarize)

5. List and describe all "assigned time" responsibilities (see definition of <u>assigned time</u> in Directions above).

b. Librarianship Effectiveness

1. List and describe librarian assignments. Indicate degree of complexity, responsibility and innovative nature.

2. Include a philosophy of librarianship that illustrates your efforts to create an inclusive learning environment and employ effective practices for a diverse student population.

3. Include any additional information which relates to your effectiveness as a librarian. This may include methods you use to improve your effectiveness, such as attendance at conferences/meetings which promote professional development.

4. List and describe all "assigned time" responsibilities (see definition of <u>assigned time</u> in Directions above).

5. If applicable, list and describe courses taught by course number and title. Use the table format illustrated in Section II. a.1. to summarize WTUs, name/number of course, semester taught and enrollment.

c. Counseling Effectiveness

1. List and describe counseling assignments. Indicate degree of complexity, responsibility and innovative nature.

2. Include a philosophy of counseling effectiveness that illustrates your efforts to create an inclusive environment and employ effective practices for a diverse student population.

3. Include any additional information which relates to your effectiveness as a counselor. This may include methods you use to improve your effectiveness, such as attendance at conferences/meetings which promote professional development.

4. List and describe all assigned time responsibilities (see definition of <u>assigned time</u> in Directions above).

5. If applicable, list and describe courses taught by course number and title. Use the table format illustrated under Section II. a. 1. to summarize WTUs, name and number of course, semester taught and enrollment.

## III.     SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (Appendix J, Section IX.B.2.)

a. List all scholarly/creative activities, such as publications, professional presentations, exhibitions, recitals, demonstrations, etc. Indicate where and when publications appeared or presentations were made, and indicate if peer-reviewed. Include complete bibliographic citations. Specify the intended audience, for example, the general public and/or members of your profession.

b. List scholarly/creative activities in progress, with a brief description of the work completed thus far, the work remaining, the intended audience, and the expected date of completion.

c. Non-evaluative evidence of scholarly/creative activities is included in Section 8 of the WPAF.

## IV.     SERVICE (Appendix J, Section IX.B.3.)

a. Describe service responsibilities. Indicate type/level of service (university, profession, community), the period of service, amount of time spent on the activity (i.e., hours per week), and leadership position(s) held, if applicable.

b. List the professional and scholarly organizations in which you have current membership. Describe position(s) and dates of leadership, committee responsibilities, and any other contributions (e.g., editorial responsibilities, review of manuscripts, etc.).

c. Non-evaluative evidence of service is included in Section 9 of the WPAF.

## V.     MISCELLANEOUS

List other accomplishments and activities which do not conveniently fit one of the above categories (Teaching/Librarianship/Counseling Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activities, or Service).

**Overview View of Interfolio Case**

| Unit | Type | Candidate Instructions |
|------|------|------------------------|
| Department of English | Reappointment | View Instructions |

Overview  Packet

Below you will find an overview of the packet requirements outlined by your institution. This page will be updated as you make progress toward your packet. To learn more, read the Candidate's Packet Guide.

**WPAF Cover Page**
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked
Edit

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|------|-----------|---------|
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |
| ● | WPAF Cover Page | 7 required | 0 |

**Section 1: Index of materials (Section 8, 9 and Supplemental Materials Only)**
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked
Edit

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|------|-----------|---------|
| ✓ | Index of Supplemental Materials | 0 required | 0 |
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

**Section 2: Appointment, Promotion and Leave Documentation**
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked
Edit

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|------|-----------|---------|
| ✓ | Appointment, Promotion & Leave Documentation | 0 required | 0 |
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

**Section 3: IUPC Policies and Procedures and Departmental RTP Criteria & Standards**
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked
Edit

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|------|-----------|---------|
| ✓ | Personnel Policies | 0 required | 0 |
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

**Section 4: Personnel Date Sheet (PDS) & Professional Development Plan (PDP)**
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked
Edit

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|------|-----------|---------|
| ✓ | Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) and Professional Development Plan (PDP) | 0 required | 0 |
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Updated August 2022

## Section 5: Letters from Personnel Committees and Administrators
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | RTP Review Letters - Current Cycle | 0 required | 0 |

[Edit]

## Section 6: Collegial Letters (Evaluative)
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | IUPC Verification of Letters | 0 required | 0 |
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

[Edit]

## 6A: Teaching
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

[Edit]

## 6B: Scholarship and Creative Activities
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

[Edit]

## 6C: Service
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

[Edit]

## Section 7: Evidence of Effectiveness (Teaching / Librarianship / Counseling)
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| | Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

[Edit]

Updated August 2022

## 7A: Student Letters
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|
| ✅ Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Edit

## 7B: Student Course Evaluations
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|
| ✅ Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Edit

## 7C: Other Relevant Evidence
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|
| ✅ Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Edit

## Section 8: Non-evaluative Evidence of Scholarly / Creative Activities
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|
| ✅ Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Edit

## Section 9: Non-evaluative Evidence of Service
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|
| ✅ Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Edit

## Supplemental Materials
Not Yet Submitted Unlocked

| Type | # Required | # Added |
|---|---|---|
| ✅ Additional Documents | 0 required | 0 |

Edit

Updated August 2022

**Packet View of Interfolio Case**

# 2021/22 Group III: WPAF Performance Review (Reappointment)

Preview Packet

**Unit**
Department of English

**Type**
Reappointment

**Candidate Instructions**
View Instructions

Overview   Packet

☐   ⊕ **Expand All**   ⊖ **Collapse All**   ⊞ **Add Section**

---

☐   ⌄   **WPAF Cover Page**
Not Yet Submitted   **Unlocked**

Submit

**0 of 0**
Required Files

Candidates should complete the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) cover page form below providing information about their appointment.

**Additional Documents**   0 Added

Add

No files have been added yet.

**WPAF Cover Page**   7 required questions,

Fill Out Form

This form has not been complete.

---

☐   ⌄   **Section 1: Index of materials (Section 8, 9 and Supplemental Materials Only)**
Not Yet Submitted   **Unlocked**

Submit

**0 of 0**
Required Files

The Index should provide a clear guide to the organization and content of the supplemental section of your file.  It should contain the candidate created sections of the WPAF, in the order they are to be found. The numbered sections of the index should match Section 8, Section 9, and the supplemental section in the case file. Samples of things to include in the supplemental section are syllabi, publications, documentation of creative activities such as slides, DVD's, CD's or print material.

All materials should be in **reverse chronological order**. Indexing should accurately reflect the content of your file.

**Index of Supplemental Materials**   0 Added

Add

Upload here a document listing the "supplemental materials" you linked in Section 8, Section 9 and supplemental section below.

No files have been added yet.

**Additional Documents**   0 Added

Add

No files have been added yet.

Updated August 2022

## Section 2: Appointment, Promotion and Leave Documentation

Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**

0 of 0
Required Files

This section must contain the following documents regarding the history a candidate's employment at HSU (**in reverse chronological order**):

- **ALL** letters regarding original appointment
- **ALL** recommendation letters regarding subsequent retention, tenure and promotion and decisions from Committees and Administrators, from previous cycles (current year materials are placed in Section 5 by the college/committee chair)
- Reports and/or letters regarding leaves intended to count as time in academic rank (i.e. sabbaticals, DIPs, LWOPs)
- Clarification of terminal degree status, if not readily apparent

Document naming convention: Date, Candidate Last Name, Document Description; list in reverse chronological order. Ex) 4-1-2019 Jones Appointment Letter.

**Appointment, Promotion & Leave Documentation**  0 Added

**Add**

Document naming convention: Date, Candidate Last Name, Document Description; list in reverse chronological order. Ex) 4-1-2019 Jones Appointment Letter.

No files have been added yet.

**Additional Documents**  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## Section 3: IUPC Policies and Procedures and Departmental RTP Criteria & Standards

Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**

0 of 0
Required Files

This section should include current and complete policy and procedure documents such as:

- Copy of approved Departmental RTP Criteria & Standards (posted on the APS website)
- Announcements of invitations for student and collegial testimony
- Department invitations for colleagues to observe classes
- If applicable, copy of the most recent Initiating Unit Personnel Committee policy and procedure (which indicates how IUPC members are elected)

**Personnel Policies**  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

**Additional Documents**  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## Section 4: Personnel Date Sheet (PDS) & Professional Development Plan (PDP)

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit**

The PDS is a summary form used in the RTP process by the candidate to present basic data on qualifications for RTP. The PDS is a candidate's opportunity to explain the significance of each entry or each item included in her/his WPAF. Information should be current, accurate, and complete. All data in the PDS should be entered **in reverse chronological order**.

The PDP is a document that describes a program of professional development goals in each of the three areas of performance for RTP (Appendix J, Section VI.C.). In consultation with the Department Chair and IUPC Chair, candidates should develop a PDP, prior to the Performance Review or Periodic Evaluation. The PDP is a flexible document that reflects the strengths of the candidate and her/his professional development goals.  Goals should align with the department, College, University goals and serve as the guideline for professional growth and development. "Candidates are encouraged to discuss their professional development goals with the Department/IUPC Chair prior to a Performance Review or Periodic Evaluation. This discussion should include identifying strengths of the candidate, areas that may benefit from mentoring and professional development, and resources needed to achieve the stated goals. Any resources required or that might be anticipated as necessary to support the Professional Development Plan must remain consistent with what can reasonably be offered by the department, college or university" (Appendix J, Section VI.C.).

A template for the PDS, and Guidelines for Preparation of the PDS are available on the APS website.

**Only the most recent versions of PDS and approved PDP with Dean Commentary should be uploaded.**

Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) and Professional Development Plan (PDP)  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

Additional Documents  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## Section 5: Letters from Personnel Committees and Administrators

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit**

**Candidates should not upload any materials into this section and should remain empty upon submission.** This section is where letters for the current evaluation cycle from the IUPC, CPC, UFPC, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost will be placed during the current review cycle.

The College Designee uploads recommendation and decision letters into this section, and sends a notification to the candidate when the letters have been uploaded. The candidate has 10-days to submit a response to any recommendation letter via email to their College Designee. The College Designee will upload the response into this section and notify the reviewer(s).

**Evaluation materials from Committees and Administrators from previous review cycles are placed in Section 2.**

RTP Review Letters - Current Cycle  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## Section 6: Collegial Letters (Evaluative)

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit** | 0 of 0 Required Files

This section contains evaluative letters from HSU faculty, administrators and staff, as well as from colleagues and professionals at other institutions or organizations, that address one or more of the three areas of performance. Evaluative evidence speaks to the quality of the candidate's work. Candidates are to place letters in one of the three marked sections:

- 6A: Teaching
- 6B: Scholarship & Creative Activities
- 6C: Service

When a letter speaks to more than one area, candidates should name the file to reflect the relevant areas (e.g., 12-1-2019 Smith Letter - Teaching & Scholarship), then place in the primary area of the letter's content. Candidates may write a response to any letter in this section. Full Professors in the department are expected to write collegial letters (Appendix J, Section VIII.B.3.a).

**Student letters are not included in this section**: They should be in Section 7. Committee and administrator recommendation letters from past review cycles should in Section 2.

Note: IUPCs should ensure that there is adequate peer evaluation of performance; however, it is the responsibility of the candidate to upload collegial letters before the file closes.

"The effectiveness, relevance, and value of a candidate's accomplishments and activities in each performance area shall be determined primarily on the basis of written statements from colleagues within the university and, where appropriate, from peers outside the university" (Appendix J, Section VII.A.1.b). Evaluative statements from colleagues shall be based on and supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance.

**IUPC Verification of Letters**  0 Added

**Add**

The IUPC is responsible for reviewing candidate letters and verifying that all letters are included in the file. The IUPC chair may upload here the IUPC verification memo or can address their verification in the IUPC recommendation letter.

No files have been added yet.

**Additional Documents**  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

---

## 6A: Teaching

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit** | 0 of 0 Required Files

Document naming convention: Date, Last Name of Letter Writer, Document Description, area(s) of performance; **list in reverse chronological order**. Ex) 12-1-2015 Jones Response to Smith Letter - Teaching; and 11-15-2015 Smith Letter - Teaching

**Additional Documents**  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

---

## 6B: Scholarship and Creative Activities

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit** | 0 of 0 Required Files

Document naming convention: Date, Last Name of Letter Writer, Document Description, area(s) of performance; **list in reverse chronological order**. Ex) 12-1-2015 Jones Response to Smith Letter - Scholarship; and 11-15-2015 Smith Letter - Scholarship

**Additional Documents**  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## 6C: Service
Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**    0 of 0
Required Files

Document naming convention: Date, Last Name of Letter Writer, Document Description, area(s) of performance; **list in reverse chronological order**. Ex) 12-1-2015 Jones Response to Smith Letter - Service; and 11-15-2015 Smith Letter - Service

**Additional Documents  0 Added**    **Add**

No files have been added yet.

---

## Section 7: Evidence of Effectiveness (Teaching / Librarianship / Counseling)
Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**    0 of 0
Required Files

This section is divided into three types of evidence: Student Letters, Course Evaluations, and other relevant evidence.  Candidates should place materials in one of the three marked sections:

- 7A: Student Letters
- 7B: Course Evaluations
- 7C: Other Relevant Evidence

Letters from colleagues and teaching observation letters/memos should be included in Section 6.

7A) Student letters collected must be identified by name and must be verified by the department. **University Senate policy disallows candidates from soliciting letters from current students** – Department Chairs and/or IUPC Chairs may solicit letters from current students.

7B) Student evaluation data collected as part of the classroom student evaluation process (anonymous and identified only by course and/or section). The IUPC is responsible for providing statistical summaries from anonymous student evaluations; however, candidates may provide their own analysis or statement for each set of student evaluations. If necessary, candidates can include a statement about any negative student evaluations or comments with each summary. It is also helpful to explain, if applicable, the circumstances resulting in a low percentage return rate of student evaluations. NOTE: "All classes taught by faculty shall be evaluated by students completing a quantitative or a combination of quantitative and qualitative written questionnaire ..." (Appendix J. Section VII.A.2.a).

7C) Any other relevant evidence (i.e. professional development, teaching awards).

**Additional Documents  0 Added**    **Add**

No files have been added yet.

---

## 7A: Student Letters
Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**    0 of 0
Required Files

Document naming convention: Date, Last Name of Letter Writer, Document Description, area(s) of performance; **list in reverse chronological order**. Ex) 12-1-2015 Jones Response to Smith Student Letter - Teaching Effectiveness; and 11-15-2015 Smith Student Letter - Teaching Effectiveness

**Additional Documents  0 Added**    **Add**

No files have been added yet.

**7B: Student Course Evaluations**
Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**

0 of 0
Required Files

Incorporate semester, year, and course into label (e.g. Spring 2014 SOC 104 Introduction to Sociology) and organize **in reverse chronological order**. Narrative interpretation/contextualization of evaluations belongs in "Section II.a Effectiveness" of the PDS.

Additional Documents  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

---

**7C: Other Relevant Evidence**
Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**

0 of 0
Required Files

Ex) Professional development

Additional Documents  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

---

**Section 8: Non-evaluative Evidence of Scholarly / Creative Activities**
Not Yet Submitted  **Unlocked**

**Submit**

0 of 0
Required Files

This section should include non-evaluative evidence of scholarship and/or creative activities.

Non-evaluative documentation evidences that work occurred, but it does not provide an assessment of given work. A candidate might link conference programs (direct reviewer to page #), book contracts, presentation flyers, invitations to speak or other forms of evidence. It is helpful to highlight where your name appears in programs, etc.

Candidates should create subcategories by adding sections to their file and label each section with the section number and desired subcategory description (e.g., 8A: Peer Reviewed Journal Articles; 8B: Presentations; 8C: Grant Applications, etc.), listing **in reverse chronological order** within subcategory mirroring their PDS (e.g. Books, Peer Reviewed Journal Articles, Reports, Films, Scripts, Directed Productions, Juried Exhibition).

**Candidates can add subcategory section labels to best reflect their work in this area; however, subcategory sections will appear at the bottom in the order created and CANNOT be moved once created. Please create subcategories in the order to you wish them to appear.**

**Note:** Letters evaluating your scholarly/creative activities are placed in Section 6. A list of those letters may be placed, as a cross-reference, in this section. Published evaluative reviews of scholarly/creative activities may also be included in this section.

Additional Documents  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## Section 9: Non-evaluative Evidence of Service

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit**

In this section, candidates should include non-evaluative evidence of service. For example, include a certificate recognizing a volunteer activity, an appointment letter to a board or a letter acknowledging service on a committee. Do not link to actual policies or manuals authored by a candidate. These should be linked in the "supplemental" section below.

Candidates should create subcategories by adding sections to the file and label each section with the section number and desired subcategory description (e.g., 9A: Service to the Department; 9B: Service to the University; 9C: Service to the Profession; 9D: Service to the Community, etc.).

**Candidates can add subcategory section labels to best reflect their work in this area; however, subcategory sections will appear at the bottom in the order created and CANNOT be moved once created.  Please create subcategories in the order to you wish them to appear.**

It is helpful to divide this section by activities related to candidate academic discipline and those less related to academic discipline.

Additional Documents  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

## Supplemental Materials

Not Yet Submitted **Unlocked**

**Submit**

In this section, candidates can include examples of materials which support performance areas. For example, 2 to 3 syllabi, a few selected assignments, published research, or research in progress. For video and audio recording evidence, candidates should confirm stable internet location and link to that location in a separate document, then upload the document into their file.

Subcategories can be created by adding sections to the file. Candidates should label each section with a section number and desired subcategory description (e.g., Supp A: Sample Syllabi; Supp B: Selected Assignments & Exercises; Supp C: Scholarship/Creative Activities (Presented/Published); Supp D: Scholarship/Creative Activities (In Progress), etc.).

**Candidates can add subcategory section labels to best reflect their work in this area; however, subcategory sections will appear at the bottom in the order created and CANNOT be moved once created.  Please create subcategories in the order to you wish them to appear.**

Keep in mind that its purpose is to enable colleagues to review actual work products as they write their evaluative letters on the candidate's behalf. Additionally, the inclusion of this evidence helps the IUPC verify documentation in the PDS. Clear and logical organization will be appreciated.

Additional Documents  0 Added

**Add**

No files have been added yet.

Updated August 2022

# 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

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/s/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 <u>not</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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

**Instructional Observation Guide**
FACE TO FACE/SYNCHRONOUS ONLINE: Narrative Version **(May 2021)**

**Note:** *Not all features in this form will be observable in every Canvas site. Examples listed are not comprehensive; criteria below can take many forms, including but not limited to those listed here.*

**Essential Evidence of Excellence in Inclusive Teaching Includes:**

1. **Teaching Effectiveness:** Instructor allows students time to process and answer questions, listens to student comments and questions using supporting/reflective listening skills, and elicits responses requiring reasoning.

2. **Reflective Practice and Continual Refinement:** Instructor is reflective of their own characteristics, positionality, and power and the effects of these factors on student learning.

3. **Multilogical Thinking:** Instructor endeavors to provide more than one perspective, identify strengths and limitations of perspectives presented, and engage students in reflective critiques of disciplinary perspectives.

4. **Equity:** Instructor designs the course to elicit funds of knowledge or prior knowledge from students in relation to the subject, provides support in response to student performance, takes steps to remedy the situation when students express confusion, and facilitates intercultural communication.

5. **Inclusive Learning Environment:** Instructor ensures that all students feel safe and welcomed and have an equal opportunity to learn; students report that the classroom environment is respectful of diversity; instructor responds constructively to changes in student attentiveness; students report that they feel welcomed in class and office hours.

**Suggestion:** *For best practice, read the guide carefully BEFORE the observation. Discuss the guide with the candidate BEFORE and AFTER the observation, using the criteria as discussion points for reflection and professional development.*

# Organization

| Observation Criteria | Examples/Descriptors | Observed | | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | N/A | |
| Begins class on time in an orderly, organized fashion | ● Session begins on time and is organized, as evidenced by flow of instruction from activity to activity | | | | |
| Clearly states the goals or objectives for the period | ● Goals/objectives are stated clearly for class session<br>● Reviews or mentions prior class material | | | | |
| Effectively uses online course management systems and communication tools to facilitate student learning | ● Lists due dates for all assignments so they appear in student "To Do" lists and Canvas calendar<br>● Includes an easy-to-find schedule of all due dates or consistent due date structure that is clearly stated<br>● Uses regular Canvas announcements to update students about due dates, important activities, etc.<br>● Canvas site is laid out simply, is easy to navigate, and offers logical and consistent means for navigating the course | | | | |

# Active and Engaged Learning

| Observation Criteria | Examples/Descriptors | Observed | | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | N/A | |
| Answers/poses questions clearly and intentionally | ● Provides students with strategically directed and/or scaffolded questions throughout instruction<br>● Allows students time to process and answer questions<br>● Elicits responses requiring reasoning; i.e. few Yes/No questions, more questions that ask students to elaborate their reasoning, often using both course materials and extracurricular materials/experiences (metacognition/synthesis)<br>● Poses questions that focus on disciplinary perspectives, including strengths, limitations, and critiques (for example, delineating the state of disciplinary knowledge but contextualizing it historically, politically, socioculturally, etc.)<br>● Communicates why the discipline emphasizes/values what it does/does not; may offer competing/differing perspectives | | | | |
| Solicits and incorporates students' prior knowledge in class activities | ● Asks explicitly, What do you know/not know/want to know about [discipline, skill, topic]? How have you felt about [discipline, skill, topic] in your education?<br>● Frames assignments and lectures/input with prior knowledge in mind. May take the form of an attitude quiz, padlet, poll, etc. | | | | |
| Creates learning environments that welcome and support all students | ● Addresses students by name and listed pronouns<br>● Allows all students opportunities to participate and contribute<br>● Attendance and participation policies use positive reinforcement rather than a punitive, subtractive approach<br>● Articulates policies regarding maintaining personal wellness during class (bio-breaks)<br>● Provides clear information regarding access to technology and related resources required in course | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demonstrates effective pedagogies for engaged learning where all students have opportunity to participate | ● Uses pairs, small groups, and large groups<br>● Uses flipped classroom methods | | | | |
| Facilitates online discussion boards or zoom interactions | ● Students demonstrate working knowledge that enables them to go beyond recall of material to analysis, synthesis, creativity, and/or evaluation<br>● Student responses indicate engagement with the course goals | | | | |

# Rapport and Facilitation

| Observation Criteria | Examples/Descriptors | Observed | | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | N/A | |
| Responds respectfully to student lack of knowledge or understanding and takes appropriate measures to refocus student understanding | • Provides multiple opportunities to give feedback on student learning and helps students "self-check" their learning (formative assessment)<br>• Provides feedback in a timely manner<br>• Responds to student work with not only correction but also highlights student work that is done correctly/to standards, etc. | | | | |
| Treats class members equitably, including but not limited to ensuring all voices are heard, inviting students to share their personal experiences as worthy knowledge, and reflecting on the role of their own power and position in relation to student learning | • Uses participation rosters; includes students in eliciting voices from all, e.g. by asking, "Who hasn't had a chance to talk or offer their ideas yet?"<br>• Uses closure at the end of a session; may include quick review of curriculum addressed during session; "What is your takeaway for today?"<br>• Online: Uses Chat or Raise Hand functionality to maximize participation and check over-sharing by a few students<br>• Anticipatory set for next session/Previews upcoming activities<br>• Engages students in critical self-reflection by modeling and inviting different worldviews/perspectives<br>• Online: Creates multiple access points for student responses: face-to-face, polls, response assignments, discussion boards, clickers, etc. | | | | |
| Listens carefully to student comments and questions using supporting/reflective listening skills | • Creates a safe and welcoming environment to maximize the opportunities for all students to learn, including but not limited to inviting students to share cultural experiences, validating students' experiences, reflecting on learning<br>• Encourages student questions and feedback | | | | |

# Credibility and Content Knowledge

| Observation Criteria | Examples/Descriptors | Observed | | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | N/A | |
| Demonstrates depth of subject knowledge | ● Includes a diverse set of scholarly examples <br> ● Engages in general and specific reflection regarding disciplinary perspectives and learning | | | | |
| Introduces/discusses historical development and context of discipline, including intradisciplinary controversies and/or development of disciplinary principles | ● Presents/makes central diverse disciplinary contributions, including but not limited to cultural practices/traditions, indigenous knowledge, historical contexts of knowledge production <br> ● Threads examples of scholars from various backgrounds and cultures throughout the coursework and readings <br> ● Honors contributions from indigenous cultures and scholars | | | | |
| Responds confidently to student inquiries | ● Speaks about course content with confidence and authority <br> ● Is willing to admit error; understands limits of own expertise | | | | |

| Demonstrates openness to student input, including but not limited to showing humility, eliciting students' prior knowledge about content, engaging in mutual inquiry | ● Facilitates and encourages intercultural experiences, including but not limited to co-creating classroom norms/agreements, encouraging multilogical thinking, practicing perspective taking | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## Presentation

| Observation Criteria | Examples/Descriptors | Observed | | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | N/A | |
| Presents information in a clear and understandable manner | ● Course site is simple and obvious to navigate<br>● Information in class is offered in multiple forms, e.g., video, text, interactive puzzles/games, lecture, etc. | | | | |
| Engages with class and responds to changes in student attentiveness | ● Changes direction of class activities in response to student learning needs (flexibility)<br>● Acknowledges and affirms effects of external circumstances, e.g. disaster, pandemic, loss/grief<br>● Communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement | | | | |
| Materials adhere to Universal Design Learning (UDL) principles; are clear, legible, and effective; acknowledge diversity | ● Materials integrate multiple identities through cultural histories, local histories, and contributions<br>● Multiple formats are offered, e.g. text, video, audio | | | | |

**Additional Comments:**

A. Things that went well for the instructor/class:

B. Challenges in this particular class:

C. Specific suggestions for enhancing the online learning environment:

D. How does this observation provide evidence based on departmental RTP standards for teaching?

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**
**University Senate**

**Resolution on Adoption of a Laboratory Teaching Evaluation Instrument**

25-16/17-FAC – April 25, 2017 - Second Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached laboratory evaluation instrument be adopted as an option to the standard teaching evaluation instrument; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the instrument be implemented beginning in fall 2017; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That Faculty Affairs shall obtain feedback on the efficacy of the instrument one year from implementation to allow any needed changes to be made by the University Senate.

*RATIONALE:* The current teaching evaluation instrument does not provide adequate feedback on lab instruction. It lacks questions on lab-specific aspects of teaching, such as lab safety and one-on-one assistance to students. Lab instructors and personnel committees will benefit from evaluative feedback that appropriately addresses the lab environment. A separate lab evaluation also will reduce the confusion that arises when students are asked to evaluate an instructor's lecture and lab with the same instrument.

**Laboratory Instructor Evaluation**

**This evaluation is for Laboratory/Activity courses. In the case of mixed Lecture/Lab courses, this applies only to the Laboratory portion and Laboratory instructor.**

**1.  Background Information**

1.1  My class standing is:
Freshman        Sophomore   Junior              Senior              Graduate / Other

1.2  This Laboratory course applies to (check all that apply):
Major              Minor              Elective        Don't Know

General Education (GE) / Diversity & Common Ground (DCG)

1.3  The average number of hours per week I spent outside of the Laboratory preparing for this Laboratory and completing the Lab reports/assignments was:

Less than 1 hour      ~1        ~2        ~3        ~4        ~5        6 or more hours

[The following are the "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" response questions.]

**2. Laboratory Instructor Evaluation**

2.1  The lab instructor clearly explained safety issues and/or hazards and how to avoid them, if applicable.

2.2  The lab instructor gave me assistance, when needed, with lab procedures.

2.3  The lab instructor's assistance helped me to carry out the experiment or activity.

2.4 The lab instructor clearly communicated the course goals and activities, as well as the due dates for Laboratory assignments and reports.

2.5  The lab instructor created an atmosphere during the Laboratory activity that was respectful of diversity (for example, diversity based on ethnic, racial, or gender identity).

2.6  The lab instructor created an atmosphere that was conducive to student engagement in the Laboratory experiments/activities.

2.7  The lab instructor feedback was timely.

2.8   The lab instructor provided directions for improving my work.

3  ["Free response" questions] ["Student Code of Conduct" acknowledgement.]

3.1  Overall, the moments during the Laboratory activities during which I was the most engaged, excited, and involved as a learner were when …

3.2  Reflecting on your experience in this Laboratory activity, what changes would you recommend to the instructor?

**Resolution on Protocol for Conducting In-class Electronic Course Evaluations**

23-15/16-FAC - April 12, 2016 - Second Reading

**RESOLVED**: That the University Senate recommends the following protocol for instructors (Unit 3 employees) to administer in-class electronic course evaluations.

1. Instructors should notify students least one class period in advance that evaluations will be performed in-class on a specified date. As part of the notification, instructors should ask students to bring some kind of portable electronic device (smartphone, laptop, tablet) to class on the designated day.

2. In accordance with Appendix J, section VII.A.2.a (1), instructors must leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted.

3. Best practices in survey research suggest that participation and quality of responses will improve if a proctor is present to conduct the survey. To ensure maximum participation, instructors should arrange for the evaluation to be completed at the beginning of class and should allow ten to fifteen minutes for the evaluation. The instructor should indicate the course name, instructor name and course CRN (for example by writing them on the board) so that students are clear about the correct course evaluation link to access in their HSU email. A designated student or the proctor should notify the instructor when course evaluations have been completed so that the instructor may re-enter the classroom to resume instruction.

4. The instructor should remind students who were not able to complete the evaluation in class on the designated evaluation day that they may complete the evaluation outside of class until the course evaluations period close date.

*RATIONALE:* Faculty have expressed concern that the response rates on their course evaluations have dropped precipitously since the adoption of electronic-only evaluation processes, which could be affecting the reliability of course evaluation data used in personnel review processes. Prior to the adoption of electronic-only evaluations, response rates for all classes averaged between 70% and 80%. A preliminary Institutional Research and Planning analysis of Fall 2015 response rates indicates that the electronic-only response rate average for all classes is approximately 47% ,and rates among the same course number but different sections of a class can vary widely (for example, BIOL 105 rates range 25 to 58%). The most immediate way for many faculty to increase their course evaluation response rate is to designate class time for students to complete course evaluations.

**Protocol for In-Class Electronic Evaluations:**

1. Instructors should notify students least one class period in advance that evaluations will be performed in-class on a specified date. As part of the notification, instructors should ask students to bring some kind of portable electronic device (smartphone, laptop, tablet) to class on the designated day.

2. In accordance with Appendix J, section VII.A.2.a (1), instructors must leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted.

3. Best practices in survey research suggest that participation and quality of responses will improve if a proctor is present to conduct the survey. To ensure maximum participation, instructors should arrange for the evaluation to be completed at the beginning of class and should allow ten to fifteen minutes for the evaluation. The instructor should indicate the course name, instructor name and course CRN (for example by writing them on the board) so that students are clear about the correct course evaluation link to access in their HSU email. A designated student in the class or the proctor should notify the instructor when course evaluations have been completed so that the instructor may re-enter the classroom to resume instruction.

4. The instructor should remind students who were not able to complete the evaluation in class on the designated evaluation day that they may complete the evaluation outside of class until the course evaluations period close date.

**Resolution on Course Evaluations by Students (CEbS) Evaluation Period**

22-15/16-FAC - April 12, 2016 - Second Reading

**RESOLVED**: The University Senate designates the last two weeks of instruction plus the weekend following (ending at 11:59pm on the Sunday before the Monday of exam week) as the period that on-line course evaluations by students (CEbS) shall be open. This policy applies to semester-long courses during the regular academic semester.  For courses that meet for shorter periods than a semester or courses conducted during the summer session, the course evaluation period shall be determined by the appropriate Dean or Associate Vice President.

*RATIONALE:* Senate Resolution 13-13/14 regarding the on-line administration of teaching evaluations states that the "administration of the on-line teaching evaluations is the responsibility of the dean of each college". The resolution states that "the administration of online teaching evaluations should begin no sooner than the first day of week 14; research suggests that exam week solicitations of evaluations contributes to lower scores". The current close date for the CEbS survey is 11:59pm on Friday of the last week of instruction. In Fall semester, 2015, in order to increase response rates on course evaluations, college office staff opened CEbS Monday, 11/16/15, a full week before Thanksgiving break. The concern of many faculty is that date is far too early for students to be able to evaluate the structure, materials and pedagogy of a semester-long course. College staff responsible for administering CEbS asked Faculty Affairs Committee for guidance regarding standard open/close dates.

Results from a google search of standard on-line course evaluation periods (completed March 15, 2016), show that colleges and universities vary widely regarding the period in which on-line course evaluations remain open (See Appendix A). The last two weeks of instruction are typically very busy for students; to accommodate students who are not able to complete evaluations or forget to fill out evaluations before the last day of classes, we recommend that the course evaluations remain open through the weekend before exam week begins.

Appendix A: Selected examples of on-line course evaluation periods

Note that data for most CSU's were not available because 1) most CSU's have not migrated to fully on-line evaluations (for example, CSU-Chico and CSU-Long Beach remain fully paper-based) and 2) some campuses, like CSU-Stanislaus, publish the on-line evaluation period information each semester and the current semester information was not yet posted.

Boston College: Open two weeks before the end of the final examination period and close the day after the last final exam

CSU-Sacramento: Open Last three weeks of the semester

CSU-San Marcos: Open last two weeks of instruction (excluding exam week)

San Diego State: Open no later than one week prior to the last day of instruction and run through the last day of the semester (when grades are due)

San Francisco State: Open last two weeks of instruction + plus two days (closes at 11:59pm the night before the first day of exams)

Georgia State University: Open last two weeks before classes end until 5 days after grades become available

SMU (Southern Methodist University):  Open during a three-week window (last week of classes, exam week, week after exams),

St. Louis University: Open 11 days before final exams begin through final exam week

MIT: Open for a two week period ending at 9:00am on the first day of exam week

UCLA: Open last two weeks of instruction (excluding exam week)

University of South Florida: Open 7 days ending 11:59pm on the last day of instruction.


.

## HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
### University Senate

**Resolution on Revision to Student Course Evaluation Questions**

31-14/15 FAC – May 12, 2015 – Second Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached set of questions be adopted for use in a revised Student Course Evaluation instrument; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the University community recognizes that student evaluations of instruction are a supplement to the primary method of evaluating teaching effectiveness, as outlined in Appendix J: "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" (Appendix J, Section IX.B.1.a)(4); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That use of the new Student Course Evaluation questions begin in the Fall of 2015, with a review date of one year from implementation to allow for any needed changes to be made by the University Senate.


*RATIONALE: The current course evaluation instrument has been in place for approximately a decade. In AY 13-14, the Faculty Affairs Committee established a task force to review the survey and to suggest changes as necessary. Faculty Affairs brought forward Resolution #40-13/14-FAC (Resolution on Revising the Standard Course Evaluation Form) at the end of the spring semester. The Resolution and proposed revised survey questions were voted down.*

*Faculty Affairs took up the issue again this year. Building off the work that had previously been completed, and assisted by the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, the Committee created two versions of a new instrument, which were vetted across campus this spring. The committee received a great deal of very valuable feedback and commentary, and using that information, revised the document accordingly. The questions presented here are the result of this considered work.*

**Revised Student Course Evaluation Questions Effective AY 2015/16**

1 The amount of time per week I spent preparing for this course was:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Less that 1 hour | 1-3 hours | 4-6 hours | 7-9 hours | 9+ hours |

2 The activities used in class (like group work, discussions, presentations) helped me better understand the course content.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

3 The materials used in class (like readings, articles, textbooks, videos) helped me better understand the course content.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

4 The instructor clearly demonstrated how each topic fit into the course.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

5 I received feedback on things like tests, assignments and projects that helped me improve.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

6 The instructor was available to help me when they said they would be.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

7 I felt encouraged to explore materials outside of class to improve on what I was learning.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

8 The instructor was able to create an atmosphere that was respectful of diversity (for example, diversity based on ethnic, racial or gender identity).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

9 The instructor set goals that challenged me to do my best work.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Hardly Ever | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always | |

10 The course syllabus clearly outlined class objectives, policies and expectations.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | |

11 After taking this course, I am able to apply what I learned to improve on my thinking, problem solving, or decision making.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | |

12 Overall, the moments in this course when I was the most engaged, excited, and involved as a learner were when…

13 Reflecting on your experience in this class, what changes would you recommend to the instructor?

14 My Class Standing is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Freshmen | Sophomore | Junior | Senior | Graduate/Other |

15 This course applies to (check all that apply):

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Major | Minor | GE | Elective | Don't Know |

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate

**Resolution on the Student Evaluations of Teaching in Low Enrollment Courses**

#29-12/13-FAC – April 2, 2013 – 2nd Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that course sections enrolling three or fewer students be exempted from the requirement for student evaluations, and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That thesis courses (numbered 490 or 690), comprehensive examination courses (numbered 491 or 691), baccalaureate and master's project courses (numbered 492 or 692), senior and master's field, applied, and directed research course (numbered 495 or 695), and independent study courses (generally numbered 199, 299, 399, 499, 599, 699, or 799) also be exempted from the requirement for student evaluations, and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That faculty teaching courses exempted from the requirement for evaluation under this resolution be permitted to request student evaluations of exempted courses provided steps to ensure student anonymity are taken, and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That this policy become effective immediately upon approval by the President.

*RATIONALE: The new Collective Bargaining Agreement mandates the evaluation of all courses but also mandates that student anonymity be protected in the course evaluation process. In small course sections, these two requirements are at odds. This change would generally protect student anonymity, by exempting very small courses enrolling three or fewer students from mandatory course evaluations.*

University Senate:       PASSED, 04/02/13

President Richmond:    Approved, 04/03/13

Available online at: https://hraps.humboldt.edu/aps-collective-bargaining-agreements

# Bargaining Agreement: Unit 3

**California Faculty Association (CFA)**

February 3, 2022 – June 30, 2024

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSTIY**
**University Senate**

**Resolution on Humboldt State University Institutional Learning Outcomes**

06-18/19-ICC – January 29, 2019 – Second Reading

**RESOLVED**: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached revisions to the HSU Institutional Learning Outcomes be adopted; and be it further.

**RESOLVED:** that these Institutional Learning Outcomes be revisited and reevaluated by the Integrated Curriculum Committee in AY 2021-22; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** that a report of the ICC's analysis be brought forward to the University Senate in AY 2021-22.

*RATIONALE:* According to the CSU's *Program Planning Resource Guide: Academic Programs and Faculty Development* (2017), each CSU must have institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) that "highlight the general knowledge, skills, and dispositions all students are expected to have upon graduating from an institution of higher learning," that represent "the collective expression of the learning environment the university offers."  Such learning outcomes must be thoroughly and methodically developed across the university's curriculum. Institutions are expected to identify specific behaviors that demonstrate the outcomes, and they are expected to regularly evaluate these behaviors in order to assess student learning.

According to the standards presented in the WASC Senior College and University Commission *(WSCUC) 2013 Handbook of Accreditation*, WSCUC institutions shall "ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking." In addition, "the institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance [shall be] clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level."

The WSCUC team's report for reaffirmation of HSU's accreditation, March 2018, noted that "there is a lack of integration and alignment of program-level outcomes to university-level outcomes."

Adoption of these revised, assessable ILOs is a necessary first step for the development of the university's institutional assessment plan, which will ultimately include all five of the core competencies required by WSCUC and will formally align and integrate course- and program-level learning outcomes with the outcomes we expect to see in every graduating HSU student.

Home > Course Syllabus Policy > Course Syllabus Policy

# Course Syllabus Policy

## Applies To:

- Faculty [1]
- Staff [2]
- Student [3]

**Month/Year Posted:** March, 2018
**Policy Number:** P18-01

**Applies to**: Faculty, Students, Staff

**Supersedes:** P16-03 Syllabi Policy and VPAA 07-02 HSU Policy on Content of Syllabi

### Purpose of the Policy

This policy updates the Syllabus Policy, as approved by the University Senate on February 9, 2016 and approved by the Provost on February 29, 2016.
The guiding logic behind this revision is to balance individual faculty workloads and freedom, on the one hand, with the identified needs of the students, the university, and the faculty as a whole on the other. This policy does so by:

1. empowering students to take responsibility for their own educational attainments. By making syllabi explicit and intentional about campus values and expectations for learning, it links instructors and students in advancing students' knowledge and thinking;

2. emphasizing coherence across the key curricular levels of courses and programs, and thus diminishing the potential disconnect between department, college, and university missions and goals course objectives;

3. addressing the requirements of accrediting bodies that expect coherent and explicit learning expectations for students.

### Policy Details

#### I. Guidelines Covering Syllabus Use in Courses

It is essential that all students have access to the basic information about the courses in which they are enrolled. Therefore, in every course, the instructor(s) must provide the students with a syllabus in at least 10-point type font and that meets the requirements for the Accessible Technologies Initiative and all other pertinent requirements for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. This syllabus must include, but is not limited to, the information included in this policy.
A. Students shall receive a written syllabus (at a minimum digitally but may also provide a hard copy) by the first course meeting or, in the case of courses taught in a hybrid format or online, it will be available to them when the course opens.

a. If the syllabus is only distributed electronically, the instructor must provide detailed instructions

on how to access the syllabus. Unless circumstances dictate otherwise, the syllabus must be provided on or before the time of the second-class meeting.

B. All courses with a C-classification must, at minimum, have an accessible syllabus posted in the course shell on the official Learning Management System of Humboldt State University.

C. During the semester, students shall be notified in writing (at a minimum digitally but may also provide a hard copy) of any substantive changes in the course syllabus. Colleges, schools, departments, or programs may specify additional syllabus requirements for their courses.

D. In the case of distance-learning classes that do not meet in person in the same physical setting, the enrolled students shall be provided with the electronic address, access instructions, and required information specified in the previous paragraph via either mail or e-mail.

**II. Course Syllabus**

Information that must be included in the course syllabus:

A. Instructor's name, office number, office telephone number and/or e-mail address, and office hours;

B. The course title and number;

C. Class term, meeting times, and location;

D. Statement of scope, content, course goals and/or objectives and/or expected student learning outcomes;

a. Including if the course meets any University Curricular Requirement (Institutions, DCG, specific area of GE, etc.).

E. Require text(s) and/or materials and information on any course fees;

F. Type and sequence of assignments and basis for assigning course grade;

G. A description of the teaching methods to be employed;

H. How the instructor will interpret the University withdrawal policy in this class;

I. A statement of, or reference to where students may find attendance policies and provision for makeup of assignments when there is an excused absence;

J. A reminder that it is the student's responsibility to notify the instructor in advance of the need for accommodation of a university verified disability;

K. Other information essential to the course, for example safety information, information about accessing online resources, information about assignments that must be accomplished at off-campus locations (e. g., field trips or service learning). Instructors should also refer students to the "General Regulations and Procedures" in the Catalog and are encouraged to discuss their interpretation of these General Regulations and Procedures, especially regarding cheating and plagiarism.

a. If students will be required to post course assignments on the Internet, outside of the official Learning Management System of Humboldt State University, this should be included in the syllabus with possible alternative arrangements or assignments.

i. Publicly viewable faculty review of student work may constitute a FERPA violation, and should

not be undertaken without careful consultation with the Registrar.

L. Any course that uses hybrid, local online, or distance education course delivery shall explain the following issues in the course syllabus:

a. How the instructor will communicate with the students and how the students will communicate with each other;

b. How online participation will be assessed and graded;

c. How the instructor will monitor the online activities of the students;

d. How the standards of appropriate online behavior will be maintained;

e. The level of technical competence required of the students;
f. What the minimum computer hardware and software requirements are for the class, and what department, college, or University facilities are available to support these requirements for students who cannot afford to buy the technology;

g. The alternative procedures for submitting work in the event of technical breakdowns; the on-campus meeting requirements, if any; how academic honesty will be enforced. If some of the information is subject to change, that fact should be noted in the syllabus (e.g., due dates and exam dates).

M. Any additional statements required by University Senate Policy.

Faculty members must submit copies of the syllabus for each course to the department office by the first Friday of instruction for the semester. Departments and programs will keep a copy of each syllabus for at least five (5) years.

A model syllabus has been prepared by the Center for Teaching and Learning and is available on the Center's website.

**III. Standard Course Outline**

For courses that are a standard offering by departments, programs, or colleges course syllabi must conform to the standard course outline (SCO) for the course.

Standard course outlines for all courses should be kept on file by the department, program, or college that offer them. Departments, programs, or colleges may choose to develop standard course outline templates appropriate to their disciplines.

At a minimum, all standard course outlines should contain the following:

A. The catalog description of the course;

B. A statement of course objectives and student learning outcomes, including those related to General Education, when applicable;

C. An outline of the subject matter to be covered. The outline may be thematic and/or sequential;

D. Any instructional requirements of all faculty teaching the course, including policies regarding textbooks, testing systems, grading systems, integration of laboratory or other non-lecture/discussion components of the course, and other "administrative" aspects of the course, such as repeatability and requirements for hybrid/blended, local online, or distance education courses.

A revised standard course outline for lower-division courses is required by the Curriculum Office if the change to the course changes the community college articulation agreement in any way or if an articulation agreement is being initiated.

### IV. Co-listed Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

Course syllabi for courses listed for both undergraduate and graduate credit must have separate syllabi for both the undergraduate and graduate course number;

A. The syllabi will demonstrate how the course meets the student learning outcomes of the undergraduate and graduate program, independently of each other.

B. Students receiving graduate credit for the course are expected to perform at a higher level than their undergraduate colleagues, the syllabus must demonstrate the higher expectations for graduate students.

### V. Course Syllabi Website

A. The Office of Academic Affairs will maintain a website with information about syllabus requirements, accessible templates, links to relevant campus policies and other resources. Access the Syllabus Resources page here [4].

B. The office will keep links updated and remind Deans and Department chairs of this policy before the start of each semester.

### VI. Syllabus Addendum Website

The Syllabus Addendum website (current URL listed below) has been created to house information about campus policies, procedures and resources for students centrally in one place. Faculty are required to include a link to the website in their syllabi, and are encouraged to list what is found there and describe why it might be useful. Suggested language is provided below:

A website, link below, has been created where you can find information about campus policies and procedures and resources for students. The site includes links such as Add/Drop Policy, Resources for Students with Disabilities, Academic Honesty Policy, Attendance and Disruptive Behavior Policy, Financial Aid, Emergency Procedures, and Counseling and Psychological Services.

http://www2.humboldt.edu/academicprograms/syllabus-addendum-campus-resou... [5]

### VII. Dissemination and Compliance

A. Syllabi information will be incorporated into new faculty orientation and added to the faculty, administrative, and Department Chair handbooks. Informing all faculty of this policy and other relevant policies will be a responsibility of department chairs.

B. As part of the program review process, all departments and programs will be required to provide evidence of the department's compliance with syllabus policy. Information about the syllabus policy will be appended to all Program Review policies.

Expiration Date (if any; optional)

## History

All changes must be listed chronologically in the format below, including all edits and reviews.

Note when the policy name or number changes. Note if an edit or revision date is exclusively for the policy section or the procedure section:

Issued: February 29, 2018
Supersedes: P16-03 Syllabi Policy and VPAA 07-02 HSU Policy on Content of Syllabi
Revised: MM/DD/YYYY
Edited: MM/DD/YYYY
Reviewed: MM/DD/YYYY

**Source URL:** https://policy.humboldt.edu/course-syllabus-policy

**Links**
[1] https://policy.humboldt.edu/applies/faculty
[2] https://policy.humboldt.edu/applies/staff
[3] https://policy.humboldt.edu/applies/student
[4] http://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-resources
[5] http://www2.humboldt.edu/academicprograms/syllabus-addendum-campus-resources-policies

Humboldt State University
University Senate

**Resolution on Policy Allocating Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students**
#14-14/15-EX – 2/10/2015—Second Reading

**Resolved:** That the Humboldt State University Senate recommends to the President that the attached Policy on the Allocation of Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students (dated January 27, 2015) be approved.


**Rationale:** Article 20, Section 20.37 of the 2014-2017 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) establishes a program under which the CSU will provide assigned time for faculty providing exceptional levels of service to students. That clause requires Campus Senates establish the specific criteria and process by which such awards would be made. Based on its current FTES, we anticipate that Humboldt State will receive 9-12 WTUs per semester under this program.

**UNIVERSITY SENATE**
**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Allocation of Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students**
**February 10, 2015**

## 1. OVERVIEW

To provide a process for all Unit 3 faculty to write proposals and compete for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students that supports the priorities of the California State University (CSU) system and support Humboldt State University's (HSU) Mission and Strategic Plan pursuant to Article 20, Section 20.37 of the 2014-2017 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA).

## 2. PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE

The Professional Leave Committee shall be charged with reviewing applications and making recommendations to the Provost on the allocation of assigned time subject to the provisions outlined below.

## 3. ASSIGNED TIME BUDGET AND REPORTING

Pursuant to Article 20, Section 20.37 of the CBA, the CSU has agreed to provide resources to each campus for assigned time for exceptional service to students based on the number of full-time equivalent students at that campus.

### 3.1 Accountability and Expenditures

3.1.1. Humboldt State University shall expend all funds allocated under this program. HSU shall provide an accounting of expenditures for this program for the prior fiscal year no later than November 1 of the subsequent year to the Professional Leave Committee, the University Senate, the Campus CFA President, and the CSU.

3.1.2. Any unused funds shall roll over for use in the following academic year for the 2014/2015 academic year and the 2015/2016 academic year. All funds must be expended in the 2016/2017 academic year.

For accounting purposes, costs of assigned time shall be calculated based on the vacant rate.

Awards from appeals shall not exceed 10% of the annual budget for assigned time and shall be funded in the subsequent academic year. During the last year of the agreement, appeals must be funded from the funds for that year, including any rollover from previous years.

3.1.3. Awards shall normally be provided in 3 WTU increments.

## 4. ELIGIBILITY AND RESTRICTIONS

### 4.1. Eligibility

All Unit 3 faculty employees are eligible to submit a proposal to request assigned time for exceptional service to students.

Faculty who have previously received assigned time under this program and have not filed a final report on their activities are not eligible to apply again until their final report has been received.

Faculty members already receiving assigned time for the same general category of activity (e.g., assigned time for excess enrollments, assigned time for committee service) shall not be eligible for support from this program.

### 4.2. Restrictions

Assigned time can only be utilized during the academic year (August – May) during which the activity is performed with the exception of assigned time granted in the 2014/2015 academic year which may be utilized in the 2015/2016 academic year.

## 5. TIMELINE

For activities in the 2014/ 2015 academic year and activities planned for the 2015/2016 academic year, applications will be due February 23, 2015, and awards announced on or before April 30, 2015.

For the 2016/2017 academic year applications will be due on October 1, 2015.Awards will be announced on or before December 15, 2015.

## 6. APPLICATION MATERIALS

An application for assigned time to support exceptional levels of service to students shall consist of: 1) a narrative proposal, not to exceed two pages; 2) a current curriculum vitae (CV), limited to two pages; 3) a letter from an HSU employee who can speak to the credibility of the project, not the proposer, in support of the application and 4) certification from the College Dean or VP for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (cc'd to the Department Chair) that the applicant is not currently receiving assigned time for the same general activity (see section 4.1). Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.

## 7. SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES AND REVIEW CRITERIA

### 7.1 The following activities may be supported

7.1.1 Student mentoring, advising, and outreach, especially as these activities support underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students.

7.1.2. The development and implementation of high-impact educational practices; curricular redesign intended to improve student access and success.

7.1.3. Service to the department, college, university, or community that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty.

7.1.4. Assignment to courses where increases in enrollment have demonstrably increased workload.

7.1.5. Other extraordinary forms of service to students.

### 7.2 Review Criteria

    7.2.1. Demonstrated or hypothesized impact on student success and/or educational experience; impact includes the quality of the activity as well as the number students served. (40%)

    7.2.2. Demonstration that the impact on and/or quality of student experience could not be maintained without an increase in workload and that it is above and beyond the faculty member's work assignment/regular duties (30%)

    7.2.3. Demonstrated impact on first-generation, underrepresented, or historically underserved populations (20%)

    7.2.4. Quality of the letter of support (10%)

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 The Professional Leave Committee shall assign each proposal one of three ratings: (A) Highly Recommended; (B) Recommended; or (C) Not Recommended.

8.2 The Professional Leave Committee shall submit its evaluations and the application materials to the Provost who, in consultation with the appropriate administrator responsible for assigning workload (e.g., Dean or Vice-President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs), shall make the final determination regarding the approval or denial of the proposal.

## 9. INFORMATION PROVIDED TO APPLICANTS

Once a decision is reached by the Provost, the Provost shall forward the decision to the candidate. If an application is denied, an explanation why the proposal was denied and the evaluation of the Professional Leave Committee shall be provided to the applicant.

## 10. APPEALS

Applicants may appeal the decision by the Provost to approve or deny their proposal. Decisions made by the Appeals Committee shall be final and binding and are not subject to the grievance procedures specified in Article 10 of the CBA.

### 10.1 Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee shall comprise one member of the Professional Leave Committee, two faculty Senators, and the Provost or designee who shall be a non-voting ex officio member. The Appeals Committee shall be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee.

### 10.2 Timeline and Notification of Appellate Decisions

Appeals of the decision made by the Provost shall be made, in writing, to the Chair of the University Senate and shall be filed no more than ten working days after the date upon which the Provost notifies the applicants of the decision. The Chair of the University Senate shall ensure the appointment of the Appeals Committee within ten working days of receiving the first appeal. The Appeals Committee shall complete their review in no more than thirty working days after receipt of the appeal. The Appeals Committee shall send the appellant notification of its decision.

## 11. CONDITIONS OF ASSIGNED TIME

A faculty unit employee granted assigned time under this program shall provide a final report to the Provost via the Office of Faculty Affairs office no later than the last day of the semester immediately following the use of assigned time. The report shall be copied to the Professional Leave Committee and the College Dean or Vice-President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs as appropriate. The report shall provide evidence that the proposed activities were completed and that the impact on the students was as claimed in the original application. Faculty are ineligible to receive further assigned time from this program until their report is received.

## 12. EFFECTIVE DATES

The policies and procedures in this document are an implementation of Article 20, section 37 of the 2014-2017 CBA. The 2016/2017 academic year marks the end of this program and, barring action by the University Senate, this policy shall no longer be in effect on or after September 1, 2017.

## 13. SUMMARY TIMELINE

|  | AY 2014/15 and 2015/16 | AY 2016/17 |
|---|---|---|
| Call for Proposals | January 2015 | August 2015 |
| Proposals Are Due | February 23, 2015 | September 15, 2015 |
| Awards Announced | April 2015 | October 2015 |
| Final Reports Due | The last day of the semester immediately following use of assigned time. (E.g., if the assigned time was used in spring 2016, the final report is due by the last day of the fall 2016 semester). | |
| Last day that this provision of the contract is effective | June 30, 2017 | |
| Last Effective Date of Policy | September 1, 2017 | |

**Please note that this program has been extended. The annual submission date is the first Monday in October for consideration for Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students to be used during the following academic year.**

**For more information, see: http://hraps.humboldt.edu/sites/default/files/docs/plc-sabbatical_leaveat-exceptional_service-2017.pdf**