



April 16, 2013

TO: The General Faculty, Humboldt State University

FROM: The University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC)

SUBJECT: 2012-13 Annual Report

The annual end-of-the-year open forum with the UFPC will be held on Friday, April 26 from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in Goodwin Forum. This year we will have a joint meeting with Colleen Mullery on preparation of the WPAF. Each department is urged to have at least one representative from their Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) attend this meeting. Candidates eligible for any personnel action (retention, tenure, promotion, or range elevation) are also urged to attend this meeting.

Those serving on the 2012-13 UFPC were continuing members Laura Hahn (Chair) from Communication and Llyn Smith (Anthropology) and new members Kathleen Doty (English), Tasha Howe (Psychology), and Dale Oliver (Mathematics).

During the Fall and Spring terms of the 2012-13 academic year, the UFPC reviewed 26 Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) and 1 Range Elevation Portfolio (REP). The UFPC is very impressed with the high quality of teaching, scholarship, creative activity, and service work demonstrated by the accomplished and outstanding faculty of Humboldt State University.

Beginning in Fall 2010, all candidates for tenure and/or promotion were required to use the “new” version of Appendix J. Under Appendix J criteria, the IUPC, the Chair, the College Personnel Committee (CPC), and the Dean are expected to rate the candidate’s scholarly/creative activities and the candidate’s service as “Minimum essential,” “Good” or “Excellent.” Reasons for each ranking are expected to be included in the IUPC letter. The reasoning should be based on clear, consistent and thorough application of the department’s approved standards and criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) — or the standards and criteria in Appendix J if the department’s standards have not been approved — to the evaluative and non-evaluative evidence provided in the WPAF.

In 2010-11 the UFPC found a high degree of variability in the standards and criteria for RTP among those departments that have developed and adopted standards. For example, some departments require a minimum average numerical score on a specific item on anonymous student evaluations for all courses in order for a candidate’s teaching to be considered excellent. Some departments add a time cycle to the categorizing and ranking of scholarly activities. Other departments use amount of time spent to rate service activities, resulting in a couple of hours out of dozens determining the difference between a “good” and “excellent” rating. Often none of these complex systems is actually applied by the IUPC or is even possible to apply based on the information provided in the WPAF. Because of the unevenness and

obfuscation of the process of departments developing, adopting and applying standards and criteria for RTP, the UFPC sent a memorandum to Provost Snyder on March 4, 2011, outlining the major issues.

Since then, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate has been tasked with considering these issues and developing a plan of resolution. On April 10, 2012 the University Senate had the first reading of the Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.

(<http://www.humboldt.edu/senate/currentyeardocs/12-04-10Packet/Resolution37-11-12-FAC.pdf>)

For those departments with unapproved standards, or those wishing to revise their standards, the process for doing so can be found in Section IX. A. 1. (e) of Appendix J: "Beginning in 2009/2010, departmental/unit criteria and standards will be subject to approval by the College/Library Dean, the UFPC, and the Provost."

The UFPC has some general recommendations for all candidates and reviewers. These include the following.

Evaluation of Teaching:

- Colleagues can optimize the effectiveness of peer-reviewed teaching evaluations with several visits to different classes. Their letters are most effective when the content is both descriptive and evaluative, as specified in Appendix J:

Teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of student evaluations by peers. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from colleagues within the candidate's academic discipline(s). The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observation can take place in a variety of ways, such as classroom visitations, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes (Appendix J, Section IX.B.1. a)(4)).

To assist in this endeavor, the Faculty Affairs Committee developed a checklist to help focus collegial peer teaching evaluations. The intent was to provide a tool to help focus collegial letters, not to replace them. The UFPC appreciates their work and the positive contribution to the RTP process. The checklist is available on the [UFPC website](#).

- Faculty members serving on peer review committees may write collegial letters which include evaluation of teaching effectiveness based on classroom observations. If there are relatively few faculty members in a department, the IUPC or the candidate should solicit teaching observations by faculty members from other departments.

- If the candidate teaches a course that students consistently rate low, no matter who teaches the class, it is important for the IUPC to explain those ratings in their letter.
- 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 the student evaluations, and to include in those comments or explanations any plans (and their results) to improve low or otherwise unusual student evaluations.
- The IUPC or the candidate should explain circumstances leading to a low percentage return rate of student evaluations. This might include the number of students who have stopped attending the class without an official drop.
- Courses currently being taught should be listed in the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) Section II.a. Courses that are taught multiple times need to be described fully only once, although changes each semester may be included in addition to the full description. Descriptions should not be taken verbatim from the catalog or copies of sections of the syllabus. The descriptions should be geared toward informing evaluators of the overall nature of the course as well as special circumstances (such as students enrolling in the course multiple times).
- When reviewing a candidate's file, averaging anonymous student ratings across more than one category is not statistically meaningful and thus should not be included in the WPAF or in evaluative letters.
- The IUPC and/or the candidate should verify that student evaluations have been properly scanned. In some years there have been whole sets of evaluations in which only a handful of evaluation forms were "read," leading to inaccurate average scores assessing teaching effectiveness. Since the University has moved to online student evaluations this will become less of an issue. However, those candidates submitting a WPAF with a combination of online and print evaluations need to be mindful of this problem.
- The procedure for soliciting signed student letters should be provided in Section 3 of the WPAF. Candidates should not solicit letters individually from students with whom they have an on-going supervisory relationship. Solicitation of letters from current students should be carried out by the IUPC to avoid any indication of coercion or inappropriate actions by the candidate.
- Candidates should respond to and reflect upon collegial and student evaluations of their teaching performance in their Teaching Philosophy statement and/or Course Descriptions in the PDS.
- As the frequency of online instruction increases, departments offering online courses need to develop methods for the evaluation of these courses.

- The IUPC's responsibilities include assisting and mentoring Lecturers concerning the process of submitting an REP. Further, the IUPCs should do all they can to ensure that the required observations of teaching and course evaluations for lecturers are included in the REP.

Ancillary Areas:

- It is the task of the IUPC to assist candidates in preparing WPAFs that contain supporting materials which address RTP performance criteria and standards (Appendix J, Section VIII.B.1.b) and to confirm and evaluate the information listed in the PDS of a candidate. This responsibility includes verifying and confirming that non-evaluative evidence for activities in ancillary areas exists and is placed in the appropriate section of the WPAF. During the current year, there were several cases where, for example, scholarly contributions listed as peer-reviewed in the candidate's PDS had no corresponding evidence in Section 8 of the WPAF.
- While Appendix J references the Boyer criteria for evaluating scholarly/creative activities, the UFPC wishes to emphasize that these criteria do not preclude the necessity of some external peer evaluation of the significance of activities in ancillary areas. The IUPCs and candidates should solicit letters attesting to the quality and significance of each accomplishment, whether the accomplishment is service work, creative activity or scholarship. This documentation is vital to the review process.
- Publications should be listed in full bibliographic format in the PDS with descriptions of audience, venue, and peer-review status.
- The Index in Section 1 of the WPAF should include a complete list of all material in the WPAF, as well as what is contained in the supplementary binder.
- Supplemental binders of course syllabi, scholarly works, etc. should be retained by the IUPC. Subsequent reviewers may request a candidate's binder from the IUPC if necessary. The IUPC and/or colleagues should evaluate the contents of any supplemental binder(s) in their evaluative or committee letters. Furthermore, the candidate's work should be described within the context of its impact and/or contribution to the academic discipline.
- The faculty candidate should cite accomplishments and activities only once under the most appropriate section of the WPAF and the PDS. Those accomplishments that are relevant to more than one section should be referenced in the main section with a note "Relevant also to Section 'blank'" (Appendix J, Section VII.B.2.b)).

General file suggestions:

- "Material in each section [of the WPAF] shall be in reverse chronological order, most recent material first" [Appendix J, Section V.E.2.].

- All levels of review (IUPC, Chair, CPC, and Dean) must use the terms “Excellent,” “Good,” or “Minimal Essential” when evaluating a candidate’s performance in each area of review in accordance with the Department Standards and Criteria or Appendix J.
- In preparing the PDS, the candidate should utilize their departmental standards and criteria (if they are approved) and create a strong and explicit argument that demonstrates exactly how they have met the standards. In cases where activities may be counted as either scholarly/creative activities or service, the candidate can only count the activity once and should make it clear why the activity belongs in the particular category.
- If the candidate’s department does not have *approved* Standards and Criteria then these unapproved Standards and Criteria may not be placed in the WPAF and may not be used in the evaluation of a candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure.
- Copies of all solicitations from the IUPC and/or academic support personnel should be placed in Section 3 of the WPAF.
- Faculty members who have had a sabbatical leave should include the report of the results of the leave in Section 2 of the WPAF.
- Appendix J, Section IX. B.1.a)(3) begins with: “Faculty are expected to participate in professional development activities that enhance teaching effectiveness.” Candidates should list all such activities in their PDS. Non-evaluative evidence of participation can be included in Section 7 of the WPAF.
- Candidates are allowed to add written responses to recommendations and evaluations as part of their WPAF. These responses are helpful to the UFPC in clarifying differing perceptions of the candidate’s work and service.
- It is the IUPC’s responsibility to ensure that all evaluative peer letters are in the file by the appropriate closing date and that each is initialed by the candidates.
- Each candidate has a Personnel Action File that is maintained in the office of the appropriate Dean. A member of the IUPC should consult that file to be sure everything from it that is relevant to the current personnel action is included in the WPAF.
- The UFPC urges each IUPC or department to select a mentor for junior faculty who can assist with general file organization and presentation. Disorganized files are a disservice to the candidate and a hindrance to the review process.

The UFPC worked with both the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel Services in developing a comprehensive set of Personnel Action Dates for the 2013-14 academic year. Those timelines may be found on the APS [website](#). Candidates should refer to their reappointment letter to determine whether they are on the fall or spring schedule. Please note that anyone who did not receive a 2-year reappointment this academic year will have a file that is due to their IUPC on August 31, 2013.

Appendix J and K clearly require the UFPC to do a thorough evaluation of each WPAF or REP. We strive to be full, fair, and impartial evaluators, and we welcome any suggestions about how to do our collective work more effectively. We also believe we can function as mentors by offering detailed recommendations for constructing a strong file; a well-organized file is more easily read and evaluated.

In closing, the members of the UFPC are honored by the trust vested in us.

Sincerely,

Laura K. Hahn, Chair
Kathleen Doty
Tasha Howe
Dale Oliver
Llyn Smith