

# CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

## University Faculty Personnel Committee

April 29, 2022

TO: The General Faculty, Cal Poly Humboldt  
FROM: The University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC)  
SUBJECT: 2021-2022 Annual Report

### **Unprecedented Times, Again**

AY 2021-2022 was another academic year of change and disruption for students, faculty, and staff. For the UFPC, all meetings were fully online, and there was considerable discussion of how to account for the myriad disruptions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in reviewing RTP files. In response, the committee edited and continued to add the following statement was included at the beginning of each of the recommendation letters:

*The UFPC recognizes that AYs 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 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 in AYs 2019-2021. Moreover, shelter-in-place orders led to the cancellation or postponement of research and creative activities as well as service opportunities. 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 unprecedented circumstances in mind that the UFPC reviewed candidate files in AY 2021-2022.*

### **UFPC Open Forum**

The annual end-of-the-year open information meeting with the UFPC is scheduled for Wednesday, May 11 at 9 am. Given concerns about health and access, the forum will again be held online:

<https://humboldtstate.zoom.us/j/82442896630?pwd=MldleEVoRWFTOEprUW50aisrZnFJZz09>

## **UFPC Membership 2021-2022**

Serving on the 2021-2022 UFPC were continuing members Nikola Hobbel (English, Chair), Yvonne Everett (Environmental Science and Management, spring only), and Benjamin Marshke (History). Tyler Evans (Math) served on behalf of Yvonne Everett in the fall, and new members [Rosemary Sherriff](#) (Geography, Environment, and Spatial Analysis) and Ethan Gahtan (Psychology) joined the committee.

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 2022-2023 should refer to this report to avoid common problems outlined throughout.

## **Action Items**

Given the numerous issues identified in the body of this report, the UFPC asks Academic Personnel Services (APS) and/or the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) of the University Senate to address the following items:

### *Early Tenure and Promotion*

The following two action items were initially requested by the UFPC in 2020-2021; however, they have yet to be implemented. Members of the UFPC met with members of Academic Affairs and the RTP Criteria & Standards Committee in March, 2022 to renew discussion of the following points:

- The UFPC asks APS to provide aggregate data (to protect confidentiality in personnel matters) for the past ten years 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
- The UFPC urges the University Senate to enact a policy regarding early tenure and promotion.

### *Service Credit*

The UFPC suggests that APS is the appropriate arena for sharing information with candidates and new hires regarding service credit. Currently, newly hired faculty receive a range of advice, or none at all, regarding negotiation of service credit. These varied approaches have resulted in significant differences in career trajectories for faculty. Centralizing information and resources regarding service credit has the potential to increase new faculty retention.

### *Student Evaluations*

- The UFPC asks APS to:
  - provide aggregate statistics summarizing student response rates on Class Climate Surveys;
  - develop a process to increase response rates on student evaluations for all faculty;
  - identify more valid and reliable student evaluations of teaching effectiveness;
  - and develop guidance to address student and collegial biases in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of women faculty and faculty of color.

### **Early Tenure and Promotion**

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

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Early Tenure and Promotion</b>	<b>Total Group V Candidates</b>	<b>Percent of Group V Candidates Seeking early Tenure/Promotion</b>
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%

Likewise, two of 11 Group VI files under review in academic year 2021-2022 were from candidates seeking early promotion to the rank of Professor/Librarian.

Existing 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 each letter. 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.*
- 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.1.3 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.1.3), 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).*

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 a reasonable amount of teaching experience for excellence during the probationary period, nor are there specific definitions of the levels of achievement necessary for early 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 at its core it highlights essential questions regarding the equity of personnel processes in higher education. While no data has been collected, the inconsistencies across campus open up real potential for inequity and discrimination. Further, Cal Poly Humboldt is one of very few CSU campuses that does not have a policy on early tenure.

### **Evaluations of Teaching/Librarianship**

The UFPC observed several deficiencies in the evaluation of teaching/librarianship. One shortcoming was the absence of collegial observations referenced in collegial letters. Many collegial letters began with the caveat that “due to the COVID pandemic” the letter writer was unable to observe the candidate's teaching. This is particularly problematic when there were opportunities to observe in person before the pandemic related shelter-in place orders were issued (mid-March 2020). Moreover, online instruction *must* be observed and evaluated. This applies to both synchronous and asynchronous modalities. Academic Personnel Services provides resources on best practices in conducting collegial observations of online instruction.

The UFPC also continues to find an insufficient number of collegial observation letters given the number of tenure-line faculty in some departments. 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 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.<sup>1</sup>

Second, 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.

Third, 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>

individual faculty. 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.

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 evaluations as well as reflect on how new strategies affected course effectiveness. Reflection that focuses exclusively on refuting student criticisms does not support an impression of growth as an instructor.

Neither candidates nor reviewers should average across evaluation items because averaging anonymous student ratings obscures variability in item ratings. Instead, address the range of scores with a focus on areas for improvement and strengths.

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.

Evaluative letters are those submitted to the IUPC as part of the review process. 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. If a candidate wishes to include such materials, they should be placed in Section 8.

### **Evaluations of Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service**

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 peer review and effective presentation 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 these activities as service.

External reviews of scholarship/creative activities are particularly useful for tenure and promotion evaluations and represent standard practice in higher education. Moreover, 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). IUPCs, in consultation with candidates, should work to secure such letters well in advance of file close.

Collaborative work should include 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.

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. 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. Works in progress, while important elements of a candidate’s scholarly/creative activity, do not carry the same weight as completed activities.

The UFPC observes that reporting of some community service activities appears to differ across faculty. Of particular note are volunteer activities with local schools, preschools, and other youth groups. The UFPC encourages faculty to report all such activities. 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.

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 candidates meet 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.

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 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 and Department Chair Responsibilities in Preparing the WPAF**

The IUPC is responsible for ensuring that department faculty and university librarians evaluate the candidate's teaching/librarianship based on direct classroom observation. Appendix J [Section VII. A.1.a] states that "IUPCs shall ensure that there is adequate substantive peer evaluation of candidates." While only faculty at the rank of professor are required to provide

written evaluations of candidates [Section VIII.B.3.a], the UFPC reminds IUPCs of their responsibility to invite all tenure-line faculty and lecturers to provide collegial observations.

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 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.

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)

The UFPC notes that there appears to be considerable variation in how IUPCs approach their responsibilities. The IUPC must assist candidates in preparing WPAFs that contain supporting materials addressing RTP criteria and standards. 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 in advance of file close to make sure that candidates—particularly those undergoing their first review—put forward the strongest file possible.

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.

### **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’ website, which is separate from the directions embedded in the blank PDS form. These guidelines are particularly useful for faculty undergoing their first review.

Numerous files failed to include complete documentation of previous reviews. Others did not include all candidate activities for the review period. 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. 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.

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.

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 often restricted Personnel Action Dates for file review. 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.

### **Departmental Standards**

The UFPC is pleased that all departments have approved standards. In some cases, however, candidates included incorrect standards in the file. Candidates should include only official documents (i.e., those posted on the Academic Personnel Services website). Additionally, the UFPC directs candidates to the Appendix J standards (summarized in the WPAF cover sheet)

that explicitly limit use of expired standards to only those expired for less than two years and only for tenure/promotion files.

Several departmental standards are unclear. 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. 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 they provide evidence that demonstrates how they met the Category I standard.

Another issue is requiring “peer-reviewed disseminations” without a clear definition for peer-reviewed dissemination. 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. The UFPC urges departments using this or similarly imprecise language to revise standards to clarify expectations.

Several departments have standards that qualify a quantitative standard. 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 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. Departments with standards that include such qualifiers should revise for clarity.

Lastly, the UFPC recommends that departments, when revising their RTP standards, eliminate the counting of hours for service and points for scholarship and service. In terms of counting hours, the process 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.

In terms of using points to quantify scholarly/creative activities, this approach is perhaps simple at the initiating unit level, but becomes another cumbersome layer for reviews beyond the department or unit. Instead, 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.

### **Use Departmental Standards**

The UFPC reminds all IUPC and CPC members as well as college 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.

### **Chairs and IUPCs as well as Deans and CPCs Provide 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 college Deans and College Personnel Committees. Not only is this independence essential for the integrity of the RTP review process, but it also affords each body the capacity to provide its own unique recommendation independent of each other and IUPC recommendations. Whereas the UFPC is bound by Appendix J to endorse the recommendations of prior reviews for retention when they are in agreement (Appendix J Section VIII.D.1.a.1), the Dean and CPC recommendations can diverge. In the case of retention recommendations, two-year reappointments are not required (Appendix J Section VII.B.5.a).

### **Files Reviewed**

During the 2020-21 academic year, the UFPC reviewed the following numbers and types of files:

Group 3 Retention (reappointment) for Probationary Faculty	12
Group 5 Retention with Tenure/Promotion	16
Group 6 Promotion of Tenured Faculty	<u>11</u>
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 provides opportunities to identify areas for improving the RTP process for candidates and review committees alike. Importantly, the UFPC is able to concurrently advocate for faculty candidates while helping improve the integrity of the RTP process.

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.

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

Sincerely,

Nikola Hobbel, Chair  
Yvonne Everett (spring only)  
Ethan Gahtan  
Benjamin Marschke  
Rosemary Sherriff  
Tyler Evans (fall only)