

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

#19-06/07-FA (Revised) – March 27, 2007

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached proposed revision to Sections IX.A.1 and IX.B. of Appendix J, "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion (*HSU Faculty Handbook*) be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection during the 2006-2007 academic year; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if this revision is passed by a vote of the General Faculty, it will become effective for the 2008-2009 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) cycle and will be applicable to all RTP candidates, except those faculty who will be evaluated for a promotion and/or tenure decision during AY 2008-2009 or AY 2009-2010; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if this revision is passed by a vote of the General Faculty, those faculty who will be evaluated for a positive promotion and/or tenure decision during AY 2008-2009 or AY 2009-2010 may use either the current Appendix J (Effective AY2007-2008) or the new Appendix J (Effective AY2008-2009); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if this revision is passed by a vote of the General Faculty, departments/units shall, during Fall 2007, submit their RTP criteria and standards to be vetted by an ad hoc university review committee. The committee shall be comprised of two probationary or tenured faculty from each college (appointed by the Senate Appointments Committee in consultation with the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC)) and the dean of each college (or his/her designee); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if a department/unit disagrees with the assessment of its RTP criteria and standards by the ad hoc university review committee, the department/unit may appeal to the UFPC and Provost (or Vice President for Student Affairs, as appropriate); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the UFPC devise a template to be used by departments/units when submitting their criteria and standards. The Administration, the UFPC, and the Faculty Development Committee will develop and provide educational workshops and training related to the implementation of the Appendix J revision.

RATIONALE: *During the past two years the Faculty Affairs Committee of the HSU Academic Senate has been working on a revision to Appendix J that addresses Section IX, Areas of Performance. After reviewing best practices in the CSU, holding two forums (March 2005 and April 2006), and reviewing results of a faculty survey, the Faculty Affairs Committee addressed the following issues:*

- *Reduce non-teaching areas of performance from three to two,*
- *include departmental standards and criteria to reflect "local" interpretation of University standards and criteria, and*
- *adapt the scholarly and creative activities section to more clearly reflect what today's faculty actually do (Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered).*

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY – March 27, 2007
RECONSIDERED AND AMENDED, UNANIMOUSLY – April 10, 2007

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure,
and Promotion

#19-06/07-FA (Revised) – March 27, 2007

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached proposed revision to Sections IX.A.1 and IX.B. of Appendix J, "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion (*HSU Faculty Handbook*) be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection during the 2006-2007 academic year; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if this revision is passed by a vote of the General Faculty, it will become effective for the 2008-2009 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) cycle and will be applicable to all RTP candidates; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if this revision is passed by a vote of the General Faculty, departments/units shall, during Fall 2007, submit their RTP criteria and standards to be vetted by an ad hoc university review committee. The committee shall be comprised of two probationary or tenured faculty from each college (appointed by the Senate Appointments Committee in consultation with the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC)) and the dean of each college (or his/her designee); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if a department/unit disagrees with the assessment of its RTP criteria and standards by the ad hoc university review committee, the department/unit may appeal to the UFPC and Provost (or Vice President for Student Affairs, as appropriate); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the UFPC devise a template to be used by departments/units when submitting their criteria and standards. The Administration, the UFPC, and the Faculty Development Committee will develop and provide educational workshops and training related to the implementation of the Appendix J revision.

RATIONALE: *During the past two years the Faculty Affairs Committee of the HSU Academic Senate has been working on a revision to Appendix J that addresses Section IX, Areas of Performance. After reviewing best practices in the CSU, holding two forums (March 2005 and April 2006), and reviewing results of a faculty survey, the Faculty Affairs Committee addressed the following issues:*

- *Reduce non-teaching areas of performance from three to two,*
- *include departmental standards and criteria to reflect "local" interpretation of University standards and criteria, and*
- *adapt the scholarly and creative activities section to more clearly reflect what today's faculty actually do (Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered).*

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY – March 27, 2007

Proposed Revision to Section IX.A.1.:**IX. AREAS OF PERFORMANCE FOR RTP**

- A. 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 establish 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.
- i. The department/unit standards amplify and add specificity to the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).
- ii. The departments shall establish clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements.
- b) Department/unit criteria and standards do not substitute for the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J).
- c) Department/unit criteria and standards are subject to ratification by a majority of tenured and probationary department/unit faculty members voting. Once approved, the criteria and standards shall be used at all levels of review.
- d) Departments/units shall, during Fall 2007, submit criteria and standards to be vetted by an ad hoc university review committee. The committee shall be comprised of two probationary or tenured faculty from each college (appointed by the Senate Appointments Committee in consultation with the UFPC) and the college deans (or designees).
- i. If a department/unit disagrees with the assessment of its criteria and standards by the ad hoc university review committee, the department/unit may appeal to the UFPC and Provost (or Vice President for Student Affairs, as appropriate). If the UFPC and Provost disagree, the request to investigate shall be submitted to the General Faculty President and the University President or designee for consultation and disposition. In the event that the University President's recommendation differs from that of the General Faculty President, the University President shall give reasons that are specific to the individual department/unit and sufficient to persuade any reasonable, disinterested person that the General Faculty President's recommendation should be overruled.
- ii. All such requests shall be in writing with copies to all review levels.
- e) Beginning in 2008/2009, departmental/unit criteria and standards will be subject to approval by the College/Library Dean, the UFPC, and the Provost.
- i. If a department/unit disagrees with the assessment of its criteria and standards provided at any subsequent level of review, the department/unit may request that the next higher level of review investigate. In the case of the UFPC/Provost, the request to investigate shall be submitted to the General Faculty President and the University President or designee for consultation and disposition. In the event that

the University President's recommendation differs from that of the General Faculty President, the University President shall give reasons that are specific to the individual department/unit and sufficient to persuade any reasonable, disinterested person that the General Faculty President's recommendation should be overruled.

ii. All such requests shall be in writing with copies to all review levels.

f) 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.

Proposed Revision to Section IX.B.:

B. Assessment of the Areas of Performance for RTP

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. —The primary emphasis of this area is on the quality of teaching. Evaluations of teaching 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 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. Each department shall organize and promote a system of peer evaluation which will aid in developing the written statements of the candidate's colleagues.~~

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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) 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.

(5) 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.

(6) 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, and availability of the faculty member on a regular basis to assist the academic needs of students.

(74) 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.

(82) Written student evaluation of teaching in at least two courses per year 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* – 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.

(1) 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.

(2) 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* – (This section to be developed by Counseling Faculty for inclusion vote).

2. Scholarly/Creative Activities

~~Scholarship and creative activities—Scholarship includes those activities that further knowledge and increase skill in the practice of a discipline. Such activities include, but~~

~~are not limited to the publication of scholarly works; research; exhibitions; performances; the scholarship of teaching, such as the development of curriculum and innovative methods of teaching/librarianship and practices that significantly enhance or add breadth to one's skills, abilities, and knowledge as a teacher and as a scholar. 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. Activities in each category which have an impact off campus shall weigh more heavily than those that do not.~~

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

The above list of university and community service activity examples is derived from faculty responsibilities described in "Article 20—Workload" of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

~~3. Service to the university and profession—~~

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.

~~In the area of participation in professional organizations, the attainment of positions of leadership shall be considered more significant than mere membership.~~

~~4. Service to the community—Candidates' participation in the community will be considered in this category. Activities such as speeches, projects, consultantship and active participation in community organizations are of particular importance when they bring recognition to the university and aid candidates in their professional growth. 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.~~

45. 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. 15.12

FIGURE 2. From: Scholarship Assessed: An Evaluation of the Professoriate, 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 together 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?