Date: July 22, 2024

To: Sue C. Escobar, Chair, University ARTP Committee

From: Carlos Nevarez, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (Interim)

Subject: Department of Environmental Studies (SSIS) Policy on Retention, Tenure, and
                Promotion Amendments

I received the memorandum from the Faculty Senate Office on May 24, 2024 about the changes
proposed by the Department of Environmental Studies for their ARTP document. I thank the UARTP
Committee and the department faculty for working so diligently on this document.

The Department of Environmental Studies has made revisions to the UARTP policy, specifically
addressing the role of alternates, workload unit minimums for probationary faculty, reassigned/
release time, and teaching standards. I have reviewed these changes and find them satisfactory. The
revised policy aligns with both the University ARTP Policy and the Collective Bargaining
Agreement. Based on this, I endorse the approval of the updated policy for Fall 2024.

Sincerely,

Carlos Nevarez, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (Interim)

cc: Carolyn Gibbs, Senate Chair
        Kathy Honeychurch, Senate Analyst
        Dianne Hyson, Dean, College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies
        Rebecca Cameron, Vice Provost for Faculty Success (Interim)
        Jackie Kernen, Director of Academic Personnel

Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy Approval Status	
Department of Environmental Studies: ARTP Policy	
Date of the Provost's approval of prior document: March 13, 2013	
Date of Unit Faculty Vote: April 23, 2024	
Date of UARTP Committee approval: May 6, 2024	
Date of Provost's approval of current document: July 22, 2024	
Effective Date of Policy: Fall 2024	

Department of Environmental Studies

College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy

Notice: *All citations to University ARTP Policy herein are to the Policy as it stood when the University last approved this document. Subsequent changes to the language and enumeration of University ARTP Policy sections may not be reflected in this document. The reader is therefore strongly advised and urged to consult the most recently adopted text and enumeration of cited sections of University ARTP Policy posted in the University Policy Manual on the University's website. Any discrepancy between the University policy and this document will be resolved in favor of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and University policy.*

Table of Contents

1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

1.1 Governance of University and College Policies

1.1.1 In accordance with University policy (§UARTP 3.02.B2), the probationary and tenured Faculty of the department must vote to approve its policies and procedures.

1.2 Faculty Access

1.2.1 The Chair of the Department shall provide a copy of the Departmental ARTP document to all Faculty members in Environmental Studies no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process as per UARTP 9.01.F and CBA 15.3.

1.2.2 All Faculty members shall have access to current University and SSIS ARTP policies on-line, or on file in the Departmental Office.

1.2.3 The Chair of the Department shall notify, in a timely manner and in writing (no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term), all Departmental Faculty of any changes in any ARTP policy or procedure.

1.3 ARTP Committees

1.3.1 ARTP Committees in the Department of Environmental Studies shall include the Primary Committee and the Search Committee.

1.3.2 Eligibility to serve:

   a. FERP faculty are eligible to serve on all these committees during the period of their active employment (UARTP 5.06.B.4.a).

   b. Serving faculty must have higher rank (probationary vs tenured) than the candidates reviewed, and Primary Committee nominees must be tenured or FERP.

   c. The chair of each committee shall be elected by and from its members.

   d. Faculty external to the Department of Environmental Studies may also serve, as needed, to fulfill the minimum committee membership requirement. They are nominated by the eligible Faculty (probationary, FERP, and tenured) who first confirm nominees' willingness to serve. The Committee's chair compiles those nominations.

   e. A rank-choice vote of the n nominees is held by all eligible faculty. Individual faculty rank the nominees from 1 (most preferred) to n (least preferred). The Committee Chair invites nominees to serve on the committee in their aggregate rank order until positions are filled.

1.4 The Search Committee

1.4.1 The Search Committee shall comprise at least three elected tenured/tenure-track faculty (which may include the Department Chair; 6.06.B.1 UARTP). The department may invite tenured or tenure-track faculty from another department within or outside of the College of SSIS (see 1.3 ARTP Committees for nomination and selection for invitation procedure), particularly if there are fewer than three faculty from the department available to serve.

1.4.2 The faculty of the Department of Environmental Studies shall also elect an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity representative from among the eligible, probationary and tenured, faculty in the department to serve on the Search Committee (§6.06 C 2 UARTP).

1.4.3 The Search Committee shall conduct the review, selection, and appointment procedures of the department in accordance with University, SSIS, and Departmental policies and procedures.

1.4.4 The Search Committee shall make substantive evaluations and final recommendations only if all members of the Search Committee are in attendance and participated in the review process.

1.4.5 Members of the Search Committee charged with arranging candidate interviews and other presentations shall make every effort to arrange for all interviews, presentations, and meetings at times when every member of the Search Committee is able to attend. Only Search Committee members who have been in attendance for, and participated in, the entire review process may contribute to the substantive evaluations and final recommendations.

1.5 The Primary Committee

1.5.1 The Primary Evaluation Committee shall comprise 4 tenured faculty members. Three committee members must be present for a vote to occur. The membership of the committee shall not fall below three.

1.5.2 Faculty on a Primary Committee shall have higher rank than the candidate under consideration for retention, tenure, or promotion.

1.5.3 The Department shall elect a Primary Committee only if needed. A Primary Committee may not be required in some years.

1.5.4 The Primary Committee shall set timelines for the conduct and completion of the primary review in keeping with SSIS and University calendars (§9.01 UARTP).

1.5.5 All members of the Primary Committee must review the candidate's WPAF and must attend each and every meeting of the committee at which substantive deliberations take place. (§9.01 UARTP)

1.5.6 The Department Chair shall not be a member of the Primary Committee but instead conduct a separate and independent evaluation of candidates.

2. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

2.1 Full-time, Tenured, or Probationary Appointments

2.1.1 The Search Committee shall develop a position description based on the department's anticipated programmatic needs and subject to approval by the Dean of SSIS (CBA 12.17).

2.1.2 In making appointments, the Search Committee shall give primary consideration to the following factors:

    a. Academic and professional experience at the Ph.D., or equivalent level, with initial appointment at the 'all-but-dissertation' level possible with the approval of the Dean and Provost.

    b. Teaching experience or teaching potential

    c. Promise of professional growth

    d. Relevant professional experience

    e. Experience working with diverse populations of students, faculty, and community members.

2.1.3 To assess candidates on each of the factors listed above, the Search Committee shall request that all candidates provide, at a minimum, information that addresses the following:

    a. Transcripts and evidence of degrees

    b. Curriculum vita

    c. Minimum of three references

    d. Evidence of previous teaching performance or evidence of teaching potential.

    e. Publication list and sample publications

    f. Evidence of relevant professional experience

    g. Evidence of experience with diverse populations of students, faculty and community members

    h. Evidence of inclusive pedagogy and professionalism

2.2 Appointment Process

2.2.1 The Search Committee shall solicit applications by advertising the position in accordance with §6.10 UARTP Policy.

2.2.2 When the review date is reached, the Search Committee will determine whether each application is complete.

2.2.3 The Search Committee shall review all complete application files and develop a list of potential candidates for the position.

2.2.4 The Search Committee may conduct voice-only or visual and voice interviews (teleconference) with potential candidates as part of the process to identify candidates to be included on the list of finalists for an on-campus interview.

2.2.5 The Search Committee shall meet and agree on a shorter list of potential candidates based on teleconference interviews that, with the approval of the SSIS Dean, shall be invited to campus for in-

person interviews.

2.2.6 Each on-campus interview will include, but will not be limited to:

    a. The candidate teaching one class, or providing a course-based lecture, as a demonstration of their teaching.

    b. The Search Committee interviewing each candidate using a standardized list of questions previously approved by a majority vote of the Search Committee and by CSUS Office of Faculty Advancement.

    c. A meeting with the Department Chair, who shall present the candidate with a written copy of the Department's criteria for evaluating the teaching, scholarship, community service, and university service (§6.02 UARTP), among other documents and information.

    d. Each candidate meeting with the Dean of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

    e. Each candidate meeting Department staff.

2.2.7 The Search Committee shall contact the references of each of the candidates invited to an on-campus interview. The members of the committee contacting references shall use a standard list of questions previously approved by a majority vote of the Search Committee and CSUS Office of Faculty Advancement.

2.2.8 After all candidates have completed the on-campus interview, the Search Committee shall rank candidates, stating its reason for the rankings.

2.2.9 The Search Committee Chair, assembles and transmits to the Dean of SSIS the Department's recommendation of the candidate(s) for appointment, supported with the appropriate documentation.

2.2.10 After a candidate accepts the appointment, the Department Chair notifies the other interviewed candidates for the position of the Department's decision and thanks them for applying.

2.3 Temporary Faculty Appointments

2.3.1 During the Spring semester, the Chair of the Department of Environmental Studies with the Faculty shall identify anticipated teaching vacancies for the coming academic year.

2.3.2 Temporary appointments may be for periods of a semester or one (1) year or more.

2.3.3 Following two consecutive semesters of employment within an academic year, should the Department offer the temporary Faculty member a similar or equivalent assignment, the department shall offer a one (1) year appointment, subject to enrollment and budget considerations. (§6.04.A.1 and 6.04.C.1 UARTP)

2.3.4 The application deadline shall be the same as the date set by the Office of Faculty Advancement in the University's general announcement of anticipated vacancies.

2.3.5 Each applicant shall submit a current Curriculum Vita and a statement of qualifications relevant to the teaching position sought.

2.3.6 Incumbent temporary faculty members who wish to be considered for re-appointment must provide written notification to the Department Chair by the deadline specified by the Office of Faculty Advancement in the University's general announcement of anticipated vacancies.

2.3.7 Criteria beyond those of the UARTP pertaining to entitlements used in initial and subsequent temporary faculty selection shall include:

    a. Degree(s) earned in relevant disciplines

    b. Relevant teaching experience

    c. Relevant professional experience, both paid and voluntary

    d. Recommendations, including peer evaluations of teaching, student recommendations and experience working with diverse populations of students

2.3.8 The Department Chair shall recommend the most qualified person to the Dean for appointment based on the candidate's merit and competence, consistent with the requirements of the UARTP campus policy related to the teaching assignment or other Department or equivalent unit needs.

2.3.9 Placement on the pay scale of an applicant selected for initial temporary appointment shall follow University guidelines and be determined by the SSIS Dean.

2.3.10　The Department shall maintain a list of temporary faculty members the Department has evaluated. If an individual on the list of previously evaluated temporary Faculty subsequently applies for a position in the Department, the Chair shall give careful consideration to the employee's previous evaluations and application. (§6.04.A.3 UARTP)

2.3.11　Reappointment of Temporary faculty shall follow UARTP §6.04.B.2.

3. EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY - GENERAL

3.1 University Guidance

3.1.1　The faculty member's performance in each of the prescribed areas of Faculty responsibility will be evidenced in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Written evaluative statements should be specific enough to provide reinforcement on performance in areas that the candidate has met or exceeded the prescribed criteria and standards, and to provide guidance on aspects that need to improve or be strengthened (§9.01.D UARTP).

3.1.2　Although evaluative criteria are the same for retention and tenure, the evidence to support a recommendation to grant tenure shall be considerably more substantial than that to support a recommendation to retain a probationary employee (§5.05.C UARTP).

3.1.3　In general, retention decisions in the early years of service rely heavily on the faculty member's preparation and ability, while tenure, promotion and later retention decisions place more emphasis on contribution and performance (§8.01.B UARTP).

3.1.4　For information and procedures regarding having material reviewed by an external reviewer, please see UARTP section 9.01.Q.

3.2 The Faculty Development Plan

3.2.1　During the first semester of a probationary faculty member's appointment, the faculty member, in conjunction with the Department Chair, shall develop a Faculty Development Plan setting out teaching, research, and service goals for the subsequent three years.

3.2.2　As part of each subsequent evaluation, the faculty member, in conjunction with the Department Chair and Primary Committee, shall outline a Faculty Development Plan setting out teaching, research, and service goals for the subsequent three years.

3.2.3　Activities addressed in the Faculty Development Plan include, but are not limited to:

    a. A discussion of the faculty member's goals and objectives in each of the four areas of responsibility: teaching; scholarly or creative achievement; contribution to the local, state, national or international community; contribution to the institution.

    b. A general timeline with anticipated milestones for meeting the goals and objectives.

3.2.4　A faculty member, in conjunction with the Department Chair and the Primary Committee, may revise the Faculty Development Plan at any time.

3.2.5　The Faculty Development Plan is not a formal agreement or contract, but rather a set of academic goals and objectives the faculty member intends to pursue in meeting the individual's professional responsibility, consistent with the Department's performance expectations.

3.3 Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

3.3.1　The Department Chair and Primary Committee must conduct a periodic evaluation of all probationary faculty members during the second semester of their appointment and in any subsequent year in which a faculty member is not subject to a Performance Evaluation for Retention. (§9.05 UARTP)

3.3.2　The Primary Committee shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendations for submission to Office of the Dean of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies (SSIS).

3.3.3　The Department Chair shall write a separate, independent letter of evaluation and recommendation to the Office of the Dean of SSIS.

3.3.4　The letters of evaluation and recommendation shall be based on the entire contents of the WPAF. The conclusion about performance under each of the four areas of Faculty responsibility (see §3.6) shall be based on the preponderance of evidence in that candidate's WPAF. (§4.04.C UARTP)

3.3.5   The Dean shall provide copies to the faculty member who shall have the option to rebut the evaluation. The Dean shall place the evaluative statement and any rebuttals in the faculty member's PAF.

3.3.6   The Primary Committee and Department Chair may permit the candidate to appear before them to make a statement or meet to discuss the evaluation, or both. A representative may accompany the candidate. (§9.02 UARTP)

3.4   Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

3.4.1   Evaluation of tenured Faculty members who are not subject to a Performance Evaluation for Promotion shall be reviewed as outlined in UARTP §9.06 – "Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty".

3.4.2   Tenured Faculty shall be evaluated at intervals of no greater than five years. An evaluation for the purposes of promotion shall fulfill the requirement. For information and procedures regarding having material reviewed by an external reviewer, please see UARTP section 9.01.Q

3.4.3   Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator.

3.5   The Personnel Action File (PAF)

3.5.1   The Personnel Action File (PAF) shall be defined as the one (1) official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or actions regarding a faculty unit employee. (§4.01A UARTP)

3.5.2   The President has delegated custody of probationary and tenured Faculty PAFs to the Dean of SSIS, and the Dean's Office maintains these files.

3.5.3   Faculty members have the right of access to all material in their PAF, exclusive of pre-employment materials. If the University uses pre-employment materials in subsequent personnel actions other than appointment, the faculty member also has a right of access. (§4.05 UARTP)

3.5.4   The contents of the PAF shall include (§4.08 UARTP):

   a. Record of the location of all other files relevant to the faculty member

   b. An access log

   c. Appointment letter and any other relevant appointment information

   d. Peer evaluations, if any

   e. All evaluation, recommendations, and decisions for the appropriate time periods (§4.09 UARTP)

   f. A current curriculum vitae (CV)

   g. An annual report of the faculty member's activities for which WTUs were assigned

   h. Standardized student evaluations for each year under review. (§5.05.E.1.b UARTP). All classes taught by each Faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations conducted.

   i. An index of all material submitted by the faculty member (§4.03A UARTP)

3.6   The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

3.6.1   Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) shall be defined as that file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle.

3.6.2   Faculty members have the right of access to all material in their WPAF

3.6.3   The WPAF file shall include, at a minimum:

   a. An access log

   b. A current CV

   c. Peer evaluations, if any

   d. All evaluations, recommendations, and decisions for the appropriate time periods specified below (§4.09 UARTP):

      i.   First Promotion: Materials submitted/received since date of initial appointment to probationary status

ii. Subsequent Promotions: Materials submitted/received since the date the files closed immediately prior to the evaluation that resulted in the last promotion

iii. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty: Material submitted/received since the date of the last evaluation

iv. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty: Materials submitted/received during the previous five years.

e. Reflective Statement that provides a summary of and perspective on the candidates teaching, scholarly and creative activities, service to the institution, and service to the community, as evidenced in the WPAF, since the last review

f. The Faculty Development Plan

g. A signature page affirming that the candidate is fully aware of the WPAF, which is being submitted to all levels of review, and certifies that upon request, the candidate can provide substantiating documentation for those references in the current indexes that are not supported by materials in the file.

h. Information provided by Faculty unit employees, students, and academic administrators provided it is identified by source. (i.e., author, committee, campus office or name of the officially authorized body generating the material)

i. Course syllabi, assignments, exams, grading policies, and other course-related material

j. Standardized student evaluations for each year under review. (§5.05.E.1.C UARTP). All classes taught by each Faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations conducted.

k. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside the regular departmental standardized review provided the student is identified by name.

3.6.4 The candidate for retention, tenure or promotion, with the help of the Department Chair, shall ensure the WPAF is complete and meets all the Departmental requirements for review by the deadline specified by Department, SSIS, and the University. (§9.01.P UARTP)

3.6.5 Materials placed in the WPAF by the candidate shall be deemed incorporated by reference into the PAF. At the beginning of an evaluation cycle, the faculty update the index and indicate new materials added to the WPAF. At the end of the cycle, the index shall become a permanent part of the PAF incorporating the material by reference and actual material shall be returned to the faculty.

4. REVIEW OF FACULTY FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION – SPECIFIC CRITERIA

4.1 Performance Areas, Weightings, and Standards

4.1.1 The Primary Committee and the Department Chair shall accord the following weights to the faculty member's performance in each of the four areas of faculty responsibility (§9.01.H UARTP):

a. Teaching Performance 60%

b. Scholarly or creative achievement 15%

c. Contribution to local, state, national or international community 15%

d. Contribution to the institution 10%

4.1.2 In each area, the Committee and Department Chair, in their respective reviews, will evaluate and rank the faculty member as unsatisfactory, needs improvement, meets expectations, exceeds expectations, or outstanding.

4.1.3 The Environmental Studies Department has adopted the following performance standards in each of the four areas (§4.1.1) of faculty responsibility for retention, tenure, and promotion for all ranks:

a. Outstanding performance surpasses all standards for tenure or promotion. This ranking requires the unanimous agreement of the committee and is reserved for highly meritorious WPAFs.

b. Exceeds expectations indicates that a faculty member has clearly gone beyond the normal or

average expectations for retention, tenure or promotion.

     c. Meets expectations (satisfactory performance) is expected of every faculty member for tenure or promotion. This standard indicates that a faculty member has submitted appropriate material for review and is performing at the expected level for the area evaluated.

     d. Needs improvement indicates that a faculty member falls short of the Environmental Studies Department's expectations in a category evaluated for retention, tenure or promotion. This ranking is given when there is sufficient reason to believe that a faculty member can alter performance and meet expectations in a future review.

     e. Unsatisfactory performance is used to describe an area where the faculty member has not demonstrated the ability to meet the requirements for retention, tenure or promotion, and there is no evidence that the problem can be corrected in the time before the next review.

4.1.4   Faculty who are evaluated for retention must show an appropriate trajectory in the majority of areas evaluated. Satisfactory performance (meets expectations) is required in all areas for tenure or promotion.

4.2   **Teaching Performance Criteria**

4.2.1   The Primary Committee and the Department Chair shall evaluate teaching performance based on three areas:

     a. Content mastery and currency in the field: The faculty member shall demonstrate knowledge of their field, be well organized, show evidence of periodic course redesign, and assign appropriate and current materials in the field.

     b. Student-Faculty rapport: The faculty member should create an environment that motivates students to learn, stimulates intellectual curiosity, and encourages students to become active learners. The faculty member should show respect for students, give attention to students as individuals, and be approachable within and outside the classroom.

     c. Good pedagogical practice: The faculty member should develop and use teaching techniques that facilitate the communication of complex subjects and issues to students. For each course the faculty member should design an appropriate assessment plan to demonstrate the achievement of academic goals and student learning.

4.3   **Teaching Evidence**

4.3.1   The Environmental Studies Department is committed to the use of multiple sources of data in its evaluation of teaching performance. Specifically, evidence of teaching effectiveness should include the following:

     a. Material presented by the individual Faculty member who is under review for retention, tenure, or promotion including at a minimum course syllabus, copies of examinations, evidence that the course materials are consistent with the stated course goals, evidence of pedagogical development in the course materials, and any teaching awards.

     b. Results of assessment of student learning and samples of student work

     c. Nature of the teaching assignment: number of course preparations, variety of courses, class enrollment sizes, level of courses (lower, upper, graduate, required/elective).

     d. Departmentally approved standardized student course evaluations in all classes.

     e. Additional helpful evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to:

        i.   Development of any new courses

        ii.   Professional development related to instruction

        iii.   Supervision of independent study projects and theses

        iv.   Evidence of mentoring and student advising

        v.   Material offered by professional colleagues both on and off campus such as letters of evaluation and recommendation regarding teaching performance, teaching awards or honors, opinions, and/or evaluation of peers.

        vi.   Written student testimony including letters, emails, etc. submitted by the Faculty member. Written student testimony should be signed and dated by the student.

4.4 Teaching Standards

4.4.1 The Primary Committee and Department Chair should recognize the implicit biases of subjective evaluation when assessing faculty teaching performance. To reduce risk of implicit biases due, for example, to gender, sex, sexual orientation, race, or ethnicity, the Primary Committee and Department Chair are highly encouraged to use multiple sources of evidence in their evaluation of teaching performance and integrate qualitative and quantitative evidence. Teaching evaluation scores should not be the sole determinant of faculty performance.

4.4.2 The Primary Committee and Department Chair may take into account all the factors listed below as standards and evidence as well as course type, size and number of courses taught in their evaluation. Faculty under review are encouraged to discuss such context in their Faculty Development Plan and (optional) Reflective Statement.

4.4.3 The standards and evidence for evaluation of teaching will be assessed through the three areas (see §4.2) using the descriptions of each area below.

   a. Outstanding performance: Evidence of outstanding performance is characterized by, for example, (1) documented teacher-training leading to the employment of new curriculum or pedagogy and its evaluation, (2) development of new courses to address measured student learning goals that were previously unmet, (3) documented changes in curriculum and pedagogy leading to measured improvements in students meeting course and degree learning objectives, (4) student mentoring and advising leading to documented professionalism, research products, improved grades or career readiness, and (5) receiving an average greater than 4.5 out of 5 across all global course and instructor criteria in student evaluations.

   b. Exceeds expectations: Evidence of performance exceeding expectations is characterized by, for example, (1) teacher-training leading to the employment of new curriculum or pedagogy, (2) development of new courses, (3) changes in curriculum and pedagogy to meet course and degree learning objectives, (4) student mentoring and advising to cultivate professionalism, research, grades or career readiness, and (5) receiving an average between 4.0 and 4.5 out of 5 across all global course and instructor criteria in student evaluations.

   c. Meets expectations: Performance meets expectations if it is, for example, characterized by (1) informed by participation in teacher training, (2) refinements of curriculum and pedagogy, (3) student mentoring and advising, and (4) receiving an average between 3.5 and 4.0 out of 5 across all global course and instructor criteria of student evaluations, (5) feedback from students' evaluations that are consistent with averages across faculty for similar types of courses.

   d. Needs improvement: Performance needs improvement if it is, for example, characterized by faculty demonstrating the ability to teach course material, course content, and apply teaching methods used in the discipline but (1) does not demonstrate attainment of course and degree learning objectives, (2) does not demonstrate improvement over time, academic rigor, or expertise in course content, (3) does not provide mentoring and advising in undergraduate development or (4) receives an average between 3.0 and 3.5 out of 5 across all global course and instructor criteria of student evaluations.

4.4.4 Unsatisfactory: Performance is unsatisfactory if, for example, if faculty does not (1) demonstrate ability to improve course material, course content, or apply teaching methods used in the discipline, (2) demonstrate attainment of course and degree learning objectives, (3) demonstrate improvement over time, academic rigor, or expertise in course content, (4) provide mentoring and advising in undergraduate development, or (5) Faculty receive less than 3.0 out of 5 across all global course and instructor criteria of student evaluations. An evaluation of Meets Expectations is required for recommending tenure and promotion. An evaluation of Unsatisfactory is grounds for recommending against retention.

4.5 Scholarly Achievement Criteria

4.5.1　The Department of Environmental Studies is committed to a broad definition of scholarly and creative achievement. The Department recognizes that there are many different expressions of scholarship. For purposes of ARTP evaluation, faculty members in Environmental Studies are expected to develop and maintain an active research program that results in tangible scholarly products that advance the field of environmental studies. Such a research program should be reflected in the Faculty Development Plan and Reflective Statement, including a clear articulation of how the proposed program of scholarly activity advances the field.

4.5.2　An active program of scholarly or creative work usually involves the processes of discovery and interpretation, and/or the application of knowledge. Whatever its form, scholarship and creative activity must have a public dimension, which means it should address an appropriate audience outside the classroom and there must be a written or otherwise demonstrable product for dissemination. The peer review process is considered the most common way to demonstrate that a work contributes to this advancement.

4.5.3　Other considerations in assessing the scholarly performance of faculty may include the amount of release time available for research, interdisciplinary nature of research, involvement of students in research, the relative impact of publication outlets, and authorship position in published works. Consideration may be given to the journal's or publisher's (book) quality, and the faculty's role in multi-authored publications. Consideration may be given to the professional standing of the audience and whether a presentation was invited or selected through a competitive process.

4.5.4　The following is a partial list of activities and products that will be considered in evaluating scholarly and creative achievement.

> a. Tier 1
>> i.　Publications in peer-reviewed journals (e.g., print or on-line) in the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.
>> ii.　Book chapters or books, also peer-reviewed in the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.
>
> b. Tier 2
>> i.　Research products in non-quality-assured outlets but consistent with the mission of the University, such as reports generated from grants, consultancies, or advisory roles.
>> ii.　Presentations at, for example, professional seminars, workshops, and conferences.
>> iii.　Published datasets that are publicly available.
>
> c. Tier 3
>> i.　Development and submission of grant proposals to support research
>> ii.　Review of the scholarly work of others for publishers or journals
>> iii.　Unpublished documents, which are in progress toward publication

4.6　Scholarly Standards

4.6.1　The evidence for scholarly achievement will be assessed (see §4.5) using the descriptions that follow:

> a. Outstanding performance: faculty publishes at least two tier-1 scholarly products or a combination of tier-1 and tier-2 products that equals an average of one product per year before tenure or promotion. Outstanding scholarly products are interdisciplinary, involve students, or have high, demonstrable impact among scholars or communities.
> b. Exceeds expectations: faculty publishes at least two tier-1 scholarly products or a combination of tier-1 and tier-2 products that equals an average of one product per year before tenure or promotion.
> c. Meets expectations: faculty is on track to publish at least two tier-1 or four tier-2 scholarly products before applying for tenure. Evidence of being on track may include tier-3 products.
> d. Needs improvement: faculty is not on track to publish at least two tier-1 or four tier-2

scholarly products before applying for tenure.

      e. Unsatisfactory: faculty is only on track to produce tier-3 or non-scholarly products.

4.6.2   An evaluation of Meets Expectations is required for recommending tenure and promotion. An evaluation of Unsatisfactory is grounds for recommending against retention.

4.7   **Contribution to the local, state, national or international community criteria and standards**

4.7.1   Faculty members are expected to contribute to the community in a way that is consistent with the faculty member's academic expertise and that advances the mission of the University.

4.7.2   The Department of Environmental Studies encourages faculty to volunteer their services to the local, state, national, or the international community in ways that are consistent with the broad field of environmental studies.

4.7.3   A program of service should be reflected in the Faculty Development Plan and Reflective Statement.

4.7.4   For the purpose of retention, probationary faculty members are expected to demonstrate service to the community. For the purpose of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty members are expected to demonstrate continued and consistent service to the community. For the purpose of promotion to Full Professor, faculty members are expected to demonstrate leadership in community-based activities.

4.7.5   In evaluating a faculty member's voluntary or paid contribution to the community, the department may consider, but is not limited to the following:

      a. Service as a board member, officer or directorship on a volunteer basis in local, regional, national, tribal or international environmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, or professional societies.

      b. Preparation of white papers influencing environmental policy

      c. Community outreach, social justice, and environmental education in service to the university mission.

      d. Participation in social media, blogging, public radio, television or journalistic media informing the public on environmental or social justice issues.

      e. Awarded professional or community recognition, honors, and awards.

      f. Participation in community outreach or public education activities in the form of acting as a docent, giving talks, serving on planning committees for say climate change conferences etc.

4.7.6   The following criteria shall be used to assess contributions to the community:

      a. Outstanding performance: Faculty member assumes leadership role, increased breadth of community service activity appropriate to their discipline.

      b. Exceeds Expectations: Faculty member assumes additional responsibility, increased breadth of service activities, and is active in organization of service activities.

      c. Meets expectations: Faculty member is actively engaged in community service on an ongoing basis.

      d. Needs improvement or Unsatisfactory: Faculty member fails to engage in community service or to mention community service explicitly in their ARTP document

4.8   **Contribution to the institution criteria and standards**

4.8.1   The Department values faculty governance and expects its members to be collegial and take an active role in the affairs of the institution. The Department expects its members to serve on Departmental committees and to take responsibility for the well-being of the Department. Members also are to serve on active College and/or University committees and to participate in College/and or University programs and activities. For the most part, the Department expects increased responsibility with increased time of service.

4.8.2   In evaluating a Faculty member's contribution to the University community, the department may consider, but is not limited to the following:

        a. Service on active Departmental, College, or University committees

        b. Participation in program development, assessment, review or other special assignments

        c. Peer coaching

        d. Extraordinary student advising responsibilities

        e. Service to student organizations

        f. Work with alumni groups

        g. Other University activities

4.8.3   Performance shall be evaluated as follows:

        a. Outstanding performance: Faculty member assumes leadership role for major Department, college or University committees, task forces, University outreach activities, etc.

        b. Exceeds Expectations: Faculty member assumes additional responsibility, increased breadth of service activities, and is active in organization of service at the Department, college or University level.

        c. Meets expectations: Faculty member is actively engaged in ongoing and responsible participation in Departmental governance.

        d. Needs improvement or Unsatisfactory: Faculty member fails to attend Department meetings or required activities in the affairs of the institution.

4.9   **Recommendations of the Primary Committee and Department Chair**

4.9.1   The Primary Committee shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation for submission to the Office of the Dean of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies.

4.9.2   Primary Committee evaluation and recommendations relating to retention, tenure, promotion, or any other personnel action shall be based on the entire contents of the WPAF. The conclusion about performance under each of the four areas (see §4.1.1) of Faculty responsibility shall be based on the preponderance of evidence in the WPAF. (§4.04.C UARTP)

4.9.3   Substantive evaluation and final recommendations shall require the participation of all elected committee members or duly elected alternates. (§9.01.S UARTP)

4.9.4   The Primary Committee shall base its recommendation on the majority opinion of the committee. The Primary Committee may vote by anonymous, secret ballot and the department shall retain all ballots that are used to make any determination with respect to appointment, retention, tenure, or promotion for a minimum period of three (3) years. The Chair of the committee shall identify the ballots as a group by reference to the personnel action and the list of committee members. Upon request, the candidate may have prompt access to the ballots cast regarding the recommendation of the committee any time during the three-year period following the vote.

4.9.5   The Department Chair shall write a separate, independent letter of evaluation and recommendation. The letter of evaluation and recommendation shall be based on the entire contents of the WPAF. The conclusion about performance under each of the four areas of Faculty responsibility (see §4.1.1) shall be based on the preponderance of evidence in that candidate's WPAF.

4.9.6   The Chair of the Primary Committee and the Chair of the Department shall include a signed statement to the WPAF affirming that the Departmental ARTP procedures were followed.

4.10 **Rebuttals**

4.10.1   Before forwarding their recommendations to the Office of the Dean of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies, the Primary Committee and Department Chair shall provide the Faculty member under review with a copy of their recommendation letter including the reasons for their recommendation. The faculty member under review may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing to each recommendation letter and/or request a meeting with the Primary Committee and/or Department Chair.

4.10.2   The rebuttal letters are due within 10 days of receiving the Primary Committee's and Department Chair's recommendation letters. A copy of the written responses or rebuttals shall be included in the WPAF alongside the recommendation letters.

4.11 **WPAF transmission to the Office of Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary**

Studies.

    4.11.1   The SSIS Dean's Office shall add the following information to the Faculty member's WPAF:

        a. Primary Committee's summary statement of evaluation and recommendation.

        b. The Department Chair's summary statement of evaluation and recommendation.

        c. Any responses or rebuttals the candidate may have made to the evaluations and recommendations of either the Primary Committee or the Chair of the Department thereof.

5. EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY

5.1   Each semester a temporary Faculty-member teaches, they shall provide to the department the syllabus and student learning assessment instruments (e.g., exams, tests and descriptions of assignments) for every course taught. Along with departmentally-administered student evaluations, these form the minimum WPAF for a temporary faculty.

5.2   At the end of each semester and after grades have been submitted to the Registrar, the Chair shall review the departmentally administered student evaluations and any other information on the course, providing temporary faculty interim feedback as necessary.

5.3   The Department Chair must conduct a review of all temporary faculty members appointed for their first two or more semesters, regardless of break in service. (§9.04D UARTP)

5.4   The source for the evaluative statement must be the temporary faculty's WPAF.

5.5   For the purpose of evaluating Temporary Faculty (i.e., for range elevation, promotion to 3-year contract etc.) a Temporary-Faculty Evaluations Committee (TFEC) is formed. Its membership will consist of the Department's Primary Committee as well as the Department Chair. Evaluations must result in a written statement from the TFEC.

5.6   The Chair shall provide a copy of the written statement to the temporary faculty member, who shall have the option to rebut the evaluation. The Chair shall place the evaluative statement, any rebuttal in the faculty member's PAF.

5.7   The Temporary Faculty may request a meeting with the Chair to make a statement or discuss the WPAF or both. A representative may accompany the candidate. (§9.02 UARTP)

5.8   Temporary Faculty unit employees shall be offered three-year temporary appointments following procedures defined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the CSUS Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association.

5.9   Evaluations accompanying recommendations for three-year temporary appointments shall include student evaluations of teaching performance, and an evaluation by the Department Chair as per §5.1-5.7. The evaluation shall rate the temporary Faculty unit employee as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary faculty unit employee is determined by the appropriate administrator to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of their position.

5.10   Temporary Faculty holding three-year appointments shall be reappointed to a subsequent three-year appointment following an evaluation of their WPAF, conducted pursuant to the University's provisions, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a temporary Faculty unit employee has performed the duties of their position in a satisfactory manner and absent documented serious conduct problems. This evaluation shall include student evaluations of teaching performance, and an evaluation by the Department Chair as per §5.1-5.7. The evaluation shall rate the temporary Faculty unit employee as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary Faculty unit employee is determined by the appropriate administrator to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of their position.