SONOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Tenured and Probationary Faculty

Recommended By: Academic Senate
Approved: Ruben Armiñana, President
Issue Date: Wednesday, September 1, 1971
Current Issue Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2016
Effective Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2016
Contact Office: Academic Affairs
Policy number: 2009-3

Preamble: This policy is intended to protect both the right of the University to exercise judgment in the granting of reappointment, tenure, and promotion and the rights of the faculty to a complete and impartial evaluation, to confer at any level of review, and to have access to the criteria and information used as a basis for the decisions made by the University for regular tenure track faculty. Furthermore, this policy is intended to support candidates in their careers at Sonoma State University.

Authority for the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Procedures and Criteria: These procedures and criteria are based on and derived from several documents. Procedures are set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, hereafter known as the CBA; and Title 5, California Code of Regulations. Criteria are set forth in Title 5 and policy statements of the Board of Trustees. Although these procedures and criteria are intended to stand alone, candidates and RTP Committees may wish to consult all of these documents, which are available in the Office of Faculty Affairs, for a full understanding of the procedures and criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Departmental criteria (see below II.A) provide guidance but do not supersede this policy.

Definitions:
Definitions are based on the Collective Bargaining Agreement and SSU policy.

- **Candidate** – Faculty member applying for reappointment or promotion.

- **CBA** – Collective Bargaining Agreement, Unit 3, between the Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association

- **Day** – A calendar day. The time in which an act provided in this policy is to be done is computed by excluding the first day and including the last day, unless the last day is a holiday or other day on which the campus in not regularly open for business, and then it is also excluded. (cf. CBA 2.11)

- **First Probationary Year at SSU** – The first or second academic year a probationary faculty is employed at SSU in a tenure track position, regardless of service credit.

- **Periodic Evaluation** – This **brief** evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) occurs in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th probationary years, and in the 2nd PY 1st year at SSU.

- **Performance Review** – This **full** review, longer and more comprehensive (cf. 15.31), occurs in the 2nd, 4th, 6th probationary years, and for tenure and promotion.

- **Personal Action File (PAF)** – The one official personnel file (housed in Faculty Affairs) containing employment documents and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty employee. (see WPAF) (cf. CBA 2.17)

- **Probationary Faculty** – A full-time faculty unit employee appointed with probationary (i.e., not tenured) status and serving a period of probation. (cf. CBA 2.13c)

- **Probationary Year** (PY) —A year of service for a faculty unit employee in an academic year position is two (2) consecutive semesters within an academic year. For the purpose of calculating the probationary period, a year of service commences with the first fall term of appointment. (cf. CBA 13.6)

- **Review cycle** – The time frame of Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review of a faculty employee. For probationary faculty, this is annual, starting at the beginning of the academic year. For probationary faculty under consideration for promotion, this review cycle is since they were hired. For tenured faculty under consideration for promotion, the review cycle is at least 5 consecutive years since last promotion. (cf. CBA 14.3)

- **Working Personal Action File (WPAF)** – The file specifically generated for use in a given review cycle, which includes all required forms and documents. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. At the end of each review cycle, it is incorporated into the candidate's PAF (cf. CBA 15.8-15.9).

I. **Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Procedures**

    A. Dissemination of the Evaluation Criteria
    Note: Professional development may be included in any of these categories, as appropriate for the department.

        1. It is the obligation of the Chair of the Department to provide the faculty member, upon appointment, with copies of the Departmental criteria, procedures, and standards at all levels of review (see Part II of this policy). Policy-making bodies shall provide all faculty with revisions of the policy or criteria as they occur. Once the annual RTP process has begun, there shall be no changes in the criteria and/or procedures used to evaluate a faculty member.

        2. At each level of review, a faculty member being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall be evaluated according to criteria in each of the following categories (cf. CBA 20.1) in priority order, with primary emphasis placed on teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs):

            a. Teaching effectiveness (or equivalent).

            b. Scholarship, research, or creative achievement

            c. Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

        3. This policy goes into effect at the beginning of the academic year following its adoption and applies to all reappointment, tenure and promotion candidates, except as specified elsewhere in the document.

    B. RTP Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

        1. Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to reappointment, tenure, promotion, non-reappointment, or any other personnel action shall be based solely on material contained in the Personnel Action File (PAF), which incorporates the WPAF by reference. (cf. CBA 15.9)

        2. The University RTP Subcommittee shall provide to candidates, departments and schools a format to be used for submission of recommendations and supporting materials.

        3. Contents of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

            a. The **Candidate** shall provide up-to-date documentation for the WPAF showing evidence of his or her achievements and professional development. Candidates may place additional materials in their department office and reference them by index.

            b. For a Periodic Evaluation (brief) the candidate will include:

                i. current curriculum vitae

                ii. self-assessment discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching and professional activity (typically no more than two pages)

      iii. One peer observation from the current review cycle.

      iv. Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for all classes (cf. CBA 15.15) Institutional Research provides faculty with summary copies of SETEs for all classes. These should be included.

      v. Index of appropriate evidence to support a record of growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, professional development and service. Materials in index will be on file in the department office.

  c. For a Performance Review (full) the candidate will include:

      i. current curriculum vitae

      ii. self-assessment of teaching and professional activity (typically no more than seven pages)

      iii. Two peer observations of teaching since the last Performance Review.

      iv. Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs) are required for all classes (cf. CBA 15.15) Institutional Research provides faculty with summary copies of SETE's for all classes. These should be included.

      v. Index of appropriate evidence to support a record of growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, and quality of service to the University, to the profession, and to the community. Materials in index will be on file in the department office

  d. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which consists of:
This forms the working document that is forwarded to subsequent levels of review.

      i. department RTP recommendation

      ii. curriculum vitae

      iii. evaluation document prepared by the Department RTP committee (see I.C)

      iv. department criteria

      v. department chair report, if any

      vi. candidate's self-assessment

      vii. peer observation(s) of teaching

      viii. student evaluations of teaching effectiveness

      ix. index of materials available

      x. all previous reappointment letters from the President

      xi. all reappointment, tenure and promotion recommendations added at any level of review, including candidate responses

4. Evidence from unidentified sources shall be excluded from the WPAF except that the University's SETE shall be anonymous.

5. A candidate shall have access to his or her WPAF at any time, but may not remove material therefrom.

6. The WPAF shall be declared complete with respect to documentation of performance for the purpose of evaluation five working days before the date by which the Department RTP Committee must notify the candidate of the Committee recommendation. Insertion of material after this date must have the approval of the University RTP Subcommittee, and shall be limited to items that become accessible after the WPAF is declared complete. Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the Department RTP Committee, with a copy to the candidate, for review, evaluation, and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review.

C. RTP Evaluation Document

1. The Department evaluation document, not including attachments, shall not exceed two pages for Periodic Evaluations (brief) and ten pages for Performance Reviews (full). The department RTP committee shall not attach any additional materials, other than those specified in I.B.3

2. It is the Department RTP Committee's responsibility to write the document, supported by factual statements (documented or referenced as appropriate), which evaluates the candidate's performance under each of the criteria as described in Section II.

3. The Performance Review (cf. CBA 15.31) is used for candidates in their 2nd, 4th, 6th probationary years and for tenure and promotion. This full evaluation document shall not exceed 10 pages and will include:

   a. an overview or introduction.

   b. an evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs).

   c. an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research and creative achievements.

   d. an evaluation of the candidate's service to the University and community

4. A Periodic Evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) is used for candidates in their 1st year at SSU regardless of service credit, 3rd and 5th years. This "brief" evaluation shall typically be 2 pages in length, and answer the following questions:

   a. What are the candidate's strengths? Explain.

   b. Does the RTP committee have any concerns or see any areas for growth in the candidate's performance? Explain, especially as related to the department criteria.

D. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion

1. The normal period of probation shall be a total of six years of full-time probationary service, including credited service. In the case of an outstanding candidate, a deviation from the normal six-year probationary period shall be the decision of the President following his or her consideration of Performance Review recommendations.

2. A probationary faculty member normally shall be considered for promotion at the same time he or she is considered for tenure; however, a faculty member with an exceptional record, with a positive recommendation from the department RTP committee, may be considered for promotion earlier than normal. Non-tenured faculty unit employees shall not be promoted to the rank of Professor (or equivalent) without tenure (cf. CBA 14.2).

3. Promotion of a tenured faculty member normally shall be considered after he or she has been five years in his or her current rank or has reached the maximum salary for the rank, unless the faculty member requests in writing that he or she not be considered.

E. Evaluation Procedures: Reappointment

1. Evaluation for reappointment

   a. Evaluation for reappointment must be undertaken annually for each probationary faculty member. Subsequent evaluation shall reflect teaching performance and professional growth and development since the most recent evaluation. Copies of the previous department recommendations shall be transmitted along with the current evaluation so that a coherent professional history and measure of growth can be ascertained. Each evaluation document shall explicitly identify areas that need improvement (if any), or any other specific conditions or factors, which may affect future consideration for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

2. Document Submission Timelines

   a. Candidates in their 1st year in a tenure track appointment at Sonoma State with any years of service awarded at hire, will receive a brief evaluation as specified in section I.C.4. These candidates shall receive a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment from the President or designee by the following February 15.

   b. Candidates in their 2nd probationary year, and two years of service at SSU or in their 4th and 6th probationary years will receive full evaluations as per section I.C.3; 2nd year candidates shall receive a letter of reappointment

or non-reappointment from the President or designee by the following February 15; 4th and 6th year candidates will be notified no later than June 1.

   c. Candidates in their 3rd and 5th probationary years will receive brief evaluations, and they shall receive a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment from the President or designee no later than the following June 1.

   d. All evaluations will follow the annual Sonoma State University RTP schedule as established by Faculty Affairs.

3. Candidates in their first year of a tenure track appointment are advised to consult with their departments in order to receive feedback, guidance, and assurance on the path to tenure and promotion. All such candidates will meet with their respective Department RTP committees, or their representatives, in the Spring semester no later than May 1st to discuss the candidate's progress. In this meeting, candidates and representatives will discuss the Department's criteria, SETEs and peer observations (or equivalent for librarians, counselors and SSP-ARs), scholarship, research and creative assignments, and service. A one-page summary of this meeting, prepared collaboratively by the candidate and department representatives, shall be included in the candidate's subsequent WPAF.

F. Evaluation Procedures: Tenure & Promotion

1. Faculty who apply for tenure & promotion to Associate will prepare only one document under the timeline for tenure. Should a candidate decide to apply for early promotion only, they will need to prepare two separate WPAFs. Any applicant for early tenure or promotion must request a Performance Review and notify Faculty Affairs prior to the deadline for the WPAF.

2. Advancement in rank shall be based upon documentation of professional achievement and growth measured in accordance with criteria and standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion documents as outlined in Part II of this policy and departmental criteria.

3. The evaluation for the first promotion to Associate or Professor (or equivalent) shall provide a thorough assessment of the candidate's performance from the time of his or her initial appointment in their current rank. Evaluations for subsequent recommendations for promotion shall reflect professional growth and development since the most recent promotion or application for promotion. Copies of evaluations from previous promotion recommendations shall be transmitted along with the current evaluation, but reviewers shall not be bound by previous recommendations. Each evaluation document shall explicitly identify areas that need improvement, or any other specific conditions or factors that may affect future consideration for promotions.

4. The President, after reviewing and considering the evaluations and recommendations, shall make a final decision on promotion and shall notify the faculty member in writing of the final decision as per section I.I.7.

5. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in an administrative position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and positive recommendation by the appropriate Department and the University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Subcommittee or its designee. Individuals appointed with tenure must have previously earned tenure by serving a probationary period at a post-secondary educational institution.

6. Tenured faculty may request in writing that he or she not be considered for promotion.

G. Levels and Sequence of RTP Review

1. Levels and Membership

   a. There are three levels of peer review: the Department, School, and University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committees. Review by the Dean constitutes a fourth level of review. Department Chairs may make separate recommendations, which are forwarded on to subsequent levels of review. If the department chair makes a separate recommendation, s/he shall not also serve on the other RTP committees for that candidate.

   b. A faculty member shall not serve on more than one level of review in the same review cycle. Only Professors may serve on committees for candidates for promotion to Professor.

  c. Performance Reviews are evaluated by all levels. Periodic Evaluations (except for first year at SSU) are reviewed by the Department and School RTP Committees and the Deans. Candidates may request a review by URTP in cases of contrary recommendations.

2. Department RTP Committee

  a. The formal recommendation, along with the evaluation document, for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall originate in the Department. The Department RTP Committee is composed of three or more eligible faculty members elected by the Department. Any information or recommendation from a Department Chair regarding a candidate shall be directed to the Department RTP Committee before the WPAF is closed to further documentation (see I.B.6.above) The formal recommendation shall be added to the WPAF. The Committee shall complete its work (as described in I.G.2.c. below) and forward the WPAF to the School RTP Committee according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

  b. Committee Membership and Eligibility. To be eligible, a faculty member must be full-time and tenured, and must hold a rank equal to or above the rank to which advancement of the candidate is being considered. If a Department has fewer than three eligible faculty members, the Committee shall be composed of eligible faculty members within the Department, augmented by tenured faculty members of appropriate rank from related disciplines. The Department Chair, if tenured, may, at the discretion of the Department, be a member of the Department RTP Committee. Committee membership shall be for at least one year, contingent on an eligible faculty's availability for the entire year.

  c. Committee Responsibilities. The Department RTP Committee shall review and evaluate the materials submitted by the candidate, write an evaluation document, and make a formal recommendation. The Committee is responsible for the completeness of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The completed WPAF, including any minority reports, and any separate report from a Department Chair, shall be forwarded to the School RTP Committee in a timely manner according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Late documents shall be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation. Under extraordinary circumstances, URTP and FA, at their discretion, can allow for adjusted timelines without affecting candidates 10-day review

  d. The candidate shall have access to the WPAF according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

3. School RTP Committee

  a. Committee Membership and Eligibility. Members of the School RTP Committee shall be full-time and tenured, and shall hold a rank equal to or above the rank to which advancement of the candidate is being considered. Members of the School Committee shall be elected by tenured and probationary faculty from their School according to each School's election procedures, with a minimum of three members serving staggered two-year terms.

  b. Committee Responsibilities. The School RTP Committee shall review the WPAF and prepare a formal recommendation, which shall be incorporated into the WPAF. Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The School RTP Committee shall forward to the School Dean the WPAF and its recommendation. Late documents shall be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation. The candidate shall have access to the School recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

4. School Dean

  a. Following receipt of the WPAF the School Dean will review all materials and then write a separate, independent evaluation of each candidate based on the URTP policy and departmental criteria.

  b. The School Dean shall forward the evaluation and formal recommendation for candidates in their 2nd/2nd, 4th, and 6th years, tenure and promotion to the University RTP Subcommittee. Deans, as President designee, will notify candidates in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th years of the decision to reappoint. Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The candidate shall have access to the Dean's recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs.

5. University RTP Subcommittee

    a. Committee Membership and Eligibility. The University RTP Subcommittee shall be elected at large from among the eligible tenured professors or equivalent of the instructional faculty and librarians. Members may not hold an administrative appointment except as Department Chair. Committee members will serve in staggered three-year terms.

    b. Committee Responsibilities. The University RTP Subcommittee, in addition to its other responsibilities, shall make formal recommendations to the President concerning reappointment in the 2nd PY/2nd at SSU, 4th, and 6th years, tenure, and promotion. The candidate shall have access to the URTP recommendation according to the schedule established by Faculty Affairs. Reappointment expectations shall be explicit and clear. The University RTP Subcommittee may forward a separate ranked list of candidates recommended for promotion to the President.

H. Communication of Action Taken

1. The formal recommendations at each level of review are included in the WPAF.

2. Recommendations at each level of review shall be acknowledged by the candidate and, at the Committee levels, by all members of the Committee. The candidate's acknowledgement that they have received the recommendation does not mean they necessarily agree with the content of the recommendation.

3. A Record of Action Taken form is prepared by Faculty Affairs. At the end of each review cycle the candidate, the Department, School, URTP chairs and Dean are required to sign the Record of Action Taken as an acknowledgement that they have seen the recommendations at all levels. The signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the content of the recommendations.

I. Candidate's Right to Respond and Opportunity to Confer

1. At any level of review, within ten days of receipt of the recommendation and reappointment expectations, a candidate may submit a response in writing and/or request that a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation and the reappointment expectations.

2. Upon such request, the candidate shall be provided an opportunity to confer with the Committee at each level of review and the School Dean.

3. This provision shall not change the evaluation timelines.

4. The Committee or School Dean shall notify Faculty Affairs of any request by a candidate for rebuttal or meetings.

5. The Committee or School Dean shall summarize the conference in writing, and include in its recommendation matters discussed at the conference that affect the recommendation.

J. Reports and Recommendations

1. Positive Recommendation. At each level of review a report shall be written in sufficient detail to impart a reasonable understanding of the grounds for the positive recommendation to members of the academic community.

2. Negative Recommendation

    a. If, at any level of review, the candidate receives a negative recommendation, this recommendation shall be detailed in writing to a degree sufficient to communicate a reasonable understanding of the grounds for the negative recommendation to members of the academic community.

    b. If, at any level of review beyond the Department level, the candidate receives a negative recommendation, the written notification to the candidate shall specify any grounds upon which the negative recommendation is based that differ from those used by the prior Committee.

3. No Recommendation. Documents that cannot be completed in a timely manner will be forwarded to the next level of review without recommendation.

4. Minority Reports. A Committee member at any level of review may submit a recommendation that differs from that of the majority. This document shall be forwarded along with all other documents to subsequent levels of review.

5. Only the President can grant additional time to the tenure clock, and only under circumstances explicitly stated in the CBA (13.8).

6. The President, in consultation with the URTP Subcommittee, may grant a conditional one-year reappointment to a candidate who displays remediable deficiencies in the areas of scholarship or service. Explicit expectations for such remediation will be outlined in the reappointment letter. Conditional one-year reappointment is not available to candidates applying for tenure.

7. The President's Letter

   a. It is the responsibility of the President to provide written notification to each individual who is granted reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

   b. If an individual is not granted reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the President's letter to the individual shall state the reasons for that action.

   c. If recommendations forwarded to the President note any areas for improvement, or any other conditions or factors, which may affect future consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the President's letter of formal notification shall bring these to the attention of the faculty member.

   d. The President should make every effort to concur with faculty recommendations about reappointment, tenure and promotion, except for compelling reasons, which should be stated in detail.

K. Appeals and Grievances

1. The candidate whose reappointment, tenure, or promotion has been denied shall have the right to appeal to the President for a reconsideration of the decision.

2. The request for a reconsideration shall be in writing, shall specify grounds for the reconsideration and be received within ten days of the date of notification.

3. If the appeal is denied, the candidate may seek remedy as provided for by the CBA.

II. **Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Probationary Faculty** Candidates shall possess the appropriate terminal degree as noted in their appointment letter to be eligible for tenure and promotion. As indicated in Part I.F. above, advancement shall be based upon documentation of professional achievement and growth since appointment or the most recent evaluation, in accordance with the appropriate departmental criteria and standards. (Note: professional development may be included in teaching effectiveness, scholarship, or service, as appropriate to the activity and department.)

A. Departmental Criteria

1. Each department shall develop criteria that will describe what is expected of candidates in all evaluation areas.

2. The departmental criteria will be reviewed by FSAC to ensure that they are consistent with this policy, the CBA, and the University mission. Department criteria will be accepted unless they are found to be inconsistent with this policy, the CBA, and/or the University Mission. If they are found to be inconsistent, FSAC will consult with the department to resolve the issue. Departments should regularly review their criteria to ensure their currency; changes cannot take place until they are approved by FSAC in time for the next review cycle.

B. Criteria and Methods for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (or Equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs)

1. Criteria. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating all pertinent evidence to show that the candidate:

   a. Displays enthusiasm for teaching his/her subject

   b. Presents material with clarity. Uses teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content.

   c. Clearly specifies course goals, and employs course materials to achieve course goals.

   d. Enables students to participate actively in their own education.

   e. Fosters appreciation for different points of view.

   f. Demonstrates competence and currency in course material.

   g. Consults and advises effectively outside of class.

   h. Engages in professional development to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness.

2. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (or equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs).
Evaluation of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The Department shall assess the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of the criteria listed in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above. The three required methods are Peer Observations of Teaching (section 2a. below), Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (section 2b. below) and Self-Assessment of Teaching and Professional Activity (section 2c. below). In evaluating the evidence gathered by these different methods, the evidence is to be considered as a whole in addressing teaching effectiveness. If a Department deems it necessary to use additional methods of measurement, it shall specify the method in writing in the department criteria, give a copy to each member of the Department in advance of a review cycle, and include the statement in the Personnel Action File (PAF) of all candidates. The candidate has the right to add comments to any document or data submitted into the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) as a measure of teaching effectiveness.
For a brief Periodic Evaluation, the candidate's self-assessment should discuss continuing strengths and areas for growth in teaching and professional activity (typically no more than two pages)

   a. Peer Observations of Teaching

      i. Each Department is required to conduct peer observations of the teaching activity of each candidate and shall develop written procedures for such observations. Departments should follow the guidelines approved by FSAC. The observer shall be mutually acceptable to the Department RTP Committee and the candidate. If mutual agreement cannot be reached on an observer from within the Department, then a mutually acceptable observer from outside the Department may be used.

      ii. One peer observation is required per Periodic Evaluation; two are required for Performance Reviews. At least one observer shall be tenured. The faculty member being observed should be notified 5 days prior. Each observation shall be carried out at a time that is mutually agreeable to the candidate and the observer. For candidates for promotion, the observation shall occur during the fall semester in which the promotion review commences, or during the prior academic year. The evaluation shall address the criteria in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above, and include recommendations as appropriate. The candidate may discuss the evaluation with the observer and may submit a written response to the evaluation. The candidate may also request subsequent observations by the same or another observer during any given semester. Within ten days of the observation the evaluation shall be signed by the observer and delivered to the candidate. The candidate then has 10 days to sign the document, acknowledging receipt, but not necessarily agreement with the content of the document. These peer observations are to be included in the candidate's WPAF before the established deadline. At the end of the review cycle these documents become part of the PAF.

   b. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE).

      i. The SETE is a standardized university-wide form administered at the end of each term. Each Department may add quantitative and qualitative questions to be used department-wide. It is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee, not the candidate, to use available qualitative and quantitative components as evidence in their evaluation document. The Department RTP committee's evaluation includes an analysis and interpretation of the data that explain the data within the context of the teaching experience of the Department. For tenure documents a summary table and analysis of data over the whole probationary period should be included; for promotion, the summary table and analysis should include data since the candidate's initial date of employment at SSU or the candidate's last promotion, not just the previous year. A discussion of this data analysis includes implications of the data for the instructor, the student, and the Department curriculum. Candidates and committees are encouraged to discuss themes and strengths or areas of growth across their classes rather than focus on SETEs for specific courses.

      ii. Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF.

      iii. Each Department shall provide for full student participation in the evaluation process and preserve the anonymity of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction shall take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of the semester. The instructor shall not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

  c. Self-Assessment of Teaching (or Equivalent) and Professional Activities: A self-assessment is a reflective statement written entirely by the candidate and unmodified by the Departmental RTP Committee. The Self-Assessment for a full Performance Review (typically no more than seven pages) shall include:

      i. an outline or description of courses taught by the candidate summarizing course materials, goals, and methods.

      ii. a statement of the candidate's goals for teaching

      iii. a discussion of new course development

      iv. an explanation of how the candidate's scholarly activities contribute to the classroom experience.

      v. an indication of methods by which the diverse learning styles of students are addressed.

      vi. a discussion of the candidate's teaching strengths and weaknesses and the ways in which he or she is attempting to improve their teaching.

      vii. an assessment of the candidate's scholarship, service and professional activities.

C. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievements

  1. The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing appropriate evidence of a record of significant growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, research or creative achievement.

  2. The candidate should explicitly state whether their scholarship is in progress, under review, accepted for publication (or equivalent), or published.

  3. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for substantiating and validating authenticity of appropriate evidence, and that the candidate demonstrates scholarship, research or creative achievements, and professional development, as delineated in the department's criteria.

  4. Departments are responsible for developing and explaining to candidates departmental criteria that delineate standards and expectations in their discipline. It is to be expected that the balance among scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development will vary among the disciplines.

  5. Publication of scholarly books and/or publications in a professional journal in an appropriate field, especially if refereed, are traditionally considered appropriate accomplishments, but other publications, which are generally considered credible within the intellectual community, are acceptable.

  6. Scholarship that does not result in publication must be in a form that can be shared with peers (beyond what is shared in the classroom) and must be capable of being evaluated and peer reviewed. As with all scholarship, it should demonstrate excellence, originality and impact. Candidates must show that they have made a substantive contribution to their discipline(s).

  7. Examples of scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development (complete citations are required) include but are not limited to:

    a. published professional or scholarly books and articles

    b. published textbooks and other instructional materials

    c. reports or other products that result from consultancies, software development and electronic media products, designs, or inventions.

     d.   digital scholarship

     e.   creative activities in the arts.

     f.   funded grants.

     g.   submitted proposals.

     h.   research reports or scholarly papers presented at conferences, colloquia, and other appropriate gatherings.

     i.   participation in professional meetings as discussant, committee member, or organizer of colloquia/seminars.

     j.   awards, honors, exhibitions, shows, performances, or speaking engagements.

     k.   contributions to discipline outside his/her primary area of specialization.

     l.   post-doctoral studies or continuing education.

D.   Criteria for Evaluating Service to both the University and Community. Service to the profession is included as community service.

   1.   The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing all appropriate evidence of both University and community service . The Department RTP Committee is responsible for substantiating and evaluating service to the University and Community.

   2.   The Department RTP Committee shall evaluate the candidate's contributions to both University and community service, including: (1) evaluate the quality and length of service, and (2) specify whether the candidate is supported by released time for any given assignment or 3) if the candidate was financially rewarded for any particular activity.

   3.   Examples of service to the University include but are not limited to:

     a.   Contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the University, including participation on committees and with student organizations.

     b.   Activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, non-traditional, and prospective students.

     c.   Activities that enhance the University's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising.

     d.   Representation of the University in an official capacity to the CSU and other institutions.

   4.   Examples of public service and service to the community include, but are not limited to, membership or participation on:

     a.   Local, State, and Federal boards, commissions, and committees.

     b.   Civic organizations.

     c.   Community service organizations.

     d.   Schools.

     e.   Charitable organizations.

     f.   Social agencies.

     g.   Political groups/organizations.

     h.   Recreational agencies and groups.

     i.   Cultural organizations.

     j.   Leadership in professional organizations at local, state, and national levels.

     k.   Service as critic, reviewer, editor, or consultant

Probationary Year	Evaluation Level	Levels of Review	Date of Presidential Notification
1st year at SSU	Periodic Evaluation	Department & Dean	Feb 15
2nd PY/2nd @ SSU	Performance Evaluation	All	Feb 15
3rd, 5th	Periodic Evaluation	Department, School and Dean	No later than June 1
4th, 6th, tenure & promotion	Performance Review	All	No later than June 1