

## **ARTP Policies and Procedures**

Department of Public Policy and Administration  
California State University, Sacramento

Revised Version Approved: February 13, 2008

## **Introduction**

This document sets forth departmental policies and procedures with respect to faculty appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion (ARTP). The aim is to provide the clarity and transparency necessary for those within and outside the department.

The body of this document is divided into two sections. The first covers probationary and tenured faculty. The second deals with part-time faculty.

Department policies and procedures are intended to amplify and implement those of the University and the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies (SSIS). University and College policies and procedures supersede those of the department when the departments are silent or in conflict with those of the University/College.

Each faculty member within the department will be provided a copy of this document and an on-line version will be available at the department's web site. New faculty will be provided copies at the time of hiring.

Both the earlier version of this document and the revisions incorporated in this version were approved by the unanimous vote of the probationary and tenured faculty within the department. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs approved this version in a memorandum dated June 28, 2005.

## **I. Appointment, Retention, Tenure, Promotion and Periodic Evaluation (for Probationary and Tenured Faculty Members)**

*Important note: The department divides responsibilities for 1) appointment of new faculty members and 2) review, tenure, promotion, and periodic review of current faculty.*

### **A. Appointment of New Faculty Members: Committees**

Current probationary and tenured faculty will select an affirmative action/equal opportunity representative; any such faculty member will be eligible to serve as that representative.

Following are guidelines for establishment of appointment committees:

1. Current probationary and tenured faculty will establish one or more appointment committees as appropriate and needed.
2. The voting members of each committee will consist of at least three probationary and/or tenured faculty members, at least one of whom is tenured; the exact number of committee members will be determined by the entire group of probationary and tenured faculty. The department may choose to create a committee of the whole. Faculty

members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on an appointment committee. Nominees for the committee may be self-nominated or nominated by others with consent.

3. The department chair will serve as an ex officio, non-voting member of each appointment committee.

4. Faculty members who also hold administrative appointments may serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of appointment committees (university policy bars their full participation).

5. The department's affirmative action/equal opportunity representative will serve on each appointment committee, whether in a voting (if eligible) or ex-officio capacity.

6. The voting members of the committee shall choose one of their number to serve as chair.

Each appointment committee will have responsibility for: 1) writing position specifications; 2) developing an advertising strategy; 3) reviewing files; 4) developing a list of candidates recommended for interview; 5) attending interviews and other on-campus evaluation activities; 6) developing a recommended ranking of the interviewed candidates; and 7) other related duties as necessary. Appointment committee recommendations about specific candidates (e.g., recommending a "short list" for interview; ranking the finalists) shall be made by majority vote.

The department chair may participate in the appointment committee's discussion but may not participate in the final vote. The department chair may (but is not required to) submit an independent recommendation to be shared with other probationary and tenured faculty members in the department.

#### B. Appointment of New Faculty: Hiring Criteria

The department recognizes that appropriate hiring criteria are likely to vary significantly depending on the position level, area of specialization, size of pool, anticipated mix between teaching and other responsibilities for the person hired, etc. Nevertheless, in all cases attention shall be given to academic preparation (including receipt of an appropriate degree), appropriateness of specialization for the department's needs, teaching experience and potential, scholarly activity and potential, and relevant professional experience.

#### C. Review, Tenure, Promotion, and Periodic Review of Current Faculty: RTP Committee and Periodic Review Committee

Responsibility for review of probationary faculty, tenure, and promotion decisions at the departmental level is vested in the RTP Committee. The RTP Committee is an

annually constituted body consisting of the department chair and at least two tenured faculty members, to be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty at the beginning of the academic year. If possible the faculty members shall be from within the PPA Department, but faculty from other departments may serve on the RTP Committee if sufficient PPA faculty are not available. Faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on the RTP Committee, but the Committee may not be composed exclusively of Faculty in that program. The probationary and tenured faculty also will select an alternate RTP committee member eligible to replace a regular member unable to serve (e.g., because he/she is on leave, is himself/herself under review, or is not at a higher level than the candidate under consideration).

Beyond the department chair, the regular members of the RTP committee and alternate member may be self-nominated or nominated by another faculty member with consent.

Unless a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty members decide by majority vote on another arrangement, the department chair will serve as chair of the RTP Committee.

The RTP Committee shall use the following procedures: 1) committee members shall attend every scheduled meeting; 2) committee decisions will be made by majority vote, with all such votes recorded; 3) evaluation decisions shall be based solely on materials contained in the candidate's Working Personnel Action File, or WPAF (see the University ARTP policy for a detailed description of what is to be included in this file), for which the Department Chair will assume temporary physical custody during the period of primary review; 4) a faculty member being evaluated may appear before the Committee to present his or her case, at the Committee's discretion; 5) at the conclusion of an evaluation a written statement shall be forwarded to the SSIS dean along with the candidate's WPAF; and 6) the Committee's deliberations shall be kept confidential.

Responsibility for periodic review of tenured faculty (i.e., "post-tenure review") is vested in the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will generally follow the same procedures as the RTP Committee, including election by the probationary and tenured faculty members. However, unless and until University policy is modified to allow the department chair to serve on periodic review committees, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will consist of at least two other tenured faculty members with at least the same rank as the faculty member being reviewed. Faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Unless and until such time as University policy regarding the ability of the chair to serve on the committee is modified, the department chair will prepare a separate periodic review report.

#### D. Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Current Faculty: Performance Criteria

The RTP and Post-Tenure Review Committees shall use similar criteria for reviewing probationary faculty for retention or tenure, reviewing tenured professors for promotion, and periodic review of tenured professors. In addition, the same percentage weights will be used for retention, tenure, and promotional reviews. However, such weights are not applicable to periodic review because post-tenure review does not result in a recommendation about the faculty member's employment status (i.e., periodic review evaluations are simply advisory to the faculty member being evaluated).

To the extent relevant to specific assignments, faculty will be evaluated in terms of the four areas of performance defined by University and College policy: teaching, creative and scholarly activity, service to the institution, and service to the community. In making an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance, the RTP committee will apply the following weights to the components of performance: teaching- 51%, scholarship and creative activity- 30%, contributions to the institution- 14%, and contributions to the community- 5%.

The faculty development plan is a critical element in considering all aspects of the work of untenured faculty members. In general, the faculty member's performance should meet the expectations set forth in that plan.

The RTP and Post-Tenure Review Committees may request documentation regarding entries in the candidate's Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). For example, the Committee may request documentation of participation in Faculty Senate or University committees.

The following paragraphs set forth more specific explanations of what is included in each performance area and identify departmental expectations for each area.

### *Teaching (51%)*

Teaching encompasses any activity that involves interactions with students. These include, but are not restricted to, classroom activity, advising, thesis supervision, teaching or research assistantship supervision, co-authoring papers and reports with students, etc. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated according to a variety of indicators, with no application of a quantitative formula. Qualitative judgments necessarily will be applied to the available indicators within a framework of commonly understood dimensions of effective teaching practices.

Student evaluations of teaching constitute a primary gauge of teaching in the classroom. By departmental policy, student evaluations of teaching are conducted at the end of the semester for *every course offered by the department*, thus providing a rich source of data. Three components of the numerical results will receive particular attention: 1) the "overall rating" response, 2) the average of responses to all questions, and 3) the variation among responses to all questions. Additionally, careful attention

will be given to the verbatim responses to open-ended questions on student evaluations (which are transcribed by departmental staff before evaluation summaries are provided to faculty). Such qualitative information may be as important, or more important, than the numerical rankings.

The chair of the RTP Committee also shall solicit signed comments from the current students and alumni regarding the candidate's teaching performance. The request for such input shall be sent to the entire current student and alumni rosters.

As appropriate, other indicators of teaching effectiveness will be considered. These may include, but are not limited to: quality of syllabi, appropriateness of pedagogical methods, extent of innovation including use of new technology, extent of development of new courses, advising load, thesis load, quality of theses produced, and receipt of teaching related awards and honors.

When an instructor is under consideration for tenure, promotion, or periodic review a member or members of the department faculty shall conduct at least one in-class evaluation of her or his teaching effectiveness (different members of the faculty may be involved if multiple in-class evaluations are conducted). Multiple in-class evaluations are appropriate if 1) necessary to cover dissimilar courses (e.g., a "methods" course and a course with a substantive focus) and/or 2) prior reviews indicate cause for concern about teaching performance. The faculty member under review and faculty member conducting the evaluation will jointly determine which class(es) to review as well as arrange a mutually agreeable and appropriate time for the in-class visit (e.g., it might not be appropriate to conduct the evaluation on a day in which an exam is being administered). "Surprise visits" will not be used. The RTP Committee shall consult the Associate Dean if a mutual agreement cannot be reached about an appropriate class and time for the visit(s), and seek the Associate Dean's assistance in resolving the situation. The faculty member(s) conducting the evaluation shall provide a written report to the SSIS dean for inclusion in the personnel file of the faculty person being reviewed; the faculty person will be provided an opportunity to respond in writing.

The RTP and Post-Tenure Review Committees are urged to use classroom visits not only as an opportunity to evaluate a faculty member under review, but as an opportunity to gain information about pedagogy that may be helpful for the department as a whole. For example, a classroom visitor may observe that the faculty member being reviewed uses a particularly effective method for encouraging classroom discussion. This method could then be shared with colleagues at a subsequent departmental meeting.

Expectations. Consistent with any specific guidelines set forth in an applicable faculty development plan, student evaluations of teaching, peer reviews, and other information should provide clear evidence that the faculty member being reviewed is an effective teacher. The faculty member's course content should be up to date and

consistent with catalogue course description. There should be clear evidence that the faculty member is maintaining currency in the discipline. The faculty member should also be meeting departmental expectations with respect to teaching load, thesis supervision, and advising.

### *Scholarly and Creative Activity (30%)*

The Department of Public Policy and Administration's focus is on scholarship rather than other types of creative activity (as would be an appropriate concern for the Department of Music, for example). Scholarship is broadly defined as the production and dissemination of knowledge related to the fields of public policy and administration. Examples include (but are not restricted to) books and book chapters, refereed journal articles, non-refereed journal articles and conference proceedings, papers prepared for a conference, working papers, book reviews, popular press articles, op-ed pieces, final or periodic report on the progress of a grant, written text of a speech given, etc. A clear distinction that is drawn between scholarship and service is that scholarship normally requires the production of a written piece of work. However, there may be exceptional circumstances in which the dissemination of scholarship most appropriately occurs in some other manner, such as an oral presentation to an audience in a foreign country.

When the department or individual faculty member under review believes that special circumstances warrant an external review of scholarly materials submitted by the faculty member, either party may initiate the request for such a review. The request will document the special circumstances and the nature of the materials to be reviewed. Such circumstances may include but are not limited to instances in which the department has insufficient expertise to evaluate the scholarly contributions of a faculty member under review. Requests must be approved by the College Dean, with the concurrence of the faculty member under review and the chair of the RTP Committee. When a request for external review has been approved, the chair of the RTP Committee shall solicit opinions from a group of academic and/or policy peers outside of California State University, Sacramento. The RTP Committee chair, working with the faculty member, will determine the appropriate group of reviewers. Reviewers may include professionals working in the fields of public policy and/or public administration as well as academics. The faculty member under review may suggest up to six possible outside reviewers. The RTP Committee chair shall include at least three of the names from the faculty member's list, but will retain the option of selecting up to three additional and appropriate experts. The faculty member under review will be responsible for providing the RTP Committee chair a current vita and hard copies of the documents subject to external review; the chair will forward copies of these documents to each selected reviewer. The RTP Committee chair will make a concerted effort to secure reviews from at least three of the selected reviewers (and preferably secure comments from every reviewer).

External reviews of scholarship will not be used for periodic review of tenured faculty members.

The RTP and Post-Tenure Review Committees shall determine the significance that different types of written scholarship carry in the total evaluation of an individual's scholarship activity. Consideration may be given to such factors as the extent to which the product is subject to peer review, the publisher's or journal's reputation, the evaluation of any reviewers, the extent to which the audience for a written product (e.g., a report to a government agency) judges it to be helpful, the receipt of any awards for the scholarship, etc.

In addition to scholarly work, consideration should be given to service to the professional community. Such service may include (but is not limited to) sitting on a professional board or advisory committee, serving as an editor or referee, and chairing a panel or acting as a discussant at a professional meeting.

Expectations. Consistent with any applicable faculty development plan, it is expected that the faculty member under review will have maintained an ongoing scholarship program. Such a program should include production of work described earlier in this section. Faculty are also normally expected to perform some professional service, although the amount may vary substantially from individual to individual.

*Service to the Institution (14%) and Service to the Community (5%)*

In evaluating any particular candidate, the department recognizes the need for some flexibility in the weights to be assigned to each of the above areas. Given the limited time available for activities unrelated to teaching and scholarship, tradeoffs between service to the institution and service to the community are very likely. While all tenure track and tenured faculty are expected to engage in *some* of each activity, the appropriate proportions may vary depending on the needs of the department and the interests of individual faculty members. For these reasons, the RTP Committee may allow greater involvement in one area to substitute for less involvement in another.

**Institutional service** is defined as service to the California State University System and/or California State University, Sacramento. This includes (but is not restricted to) work on departmental committees, SSIS committees, University-wide committees, system-wide committees, the CSUS Faculty Senate, and the CSU Academic Senate.

**Community service** is defined as a faculty member using his or her expertise to benefit the geographical community. Service to the geographic community may include (but is not restricted to) presentations and speeches to community groups, serving on community advisory boards, talking to the local media, and advising area policymakers.

In evaluating both institutional and community service, the RTP committee will give consideration to the depth as well as the different types of participation. Faculty members will be given appropriate credit for evidence of in-depth participation, including



(but not limited to) leadership roles, drafting of key documents, and receipt of service awards or recognition.

Expectations. Consistent with any applicable faculty development plan, all faculty members are expected to participate actively in the collegial processes of faculty governance and provide service to the community.

## **II. Appointment, Selection, and Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty**

### **A. Appointment of Part-Time Faculty**

The department vests authority for appointing part-time faculty in the Part-Time Faculty Appointments Committee (PTFAC). The PTFAC is an annually constituted body consisting of the department chair and two tenured departmental faculty members, to be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty at the beginning of the academic year. Faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on the PTFAC. Beyond the department chair, PTFAC members may be self-nominated or nominated by another faculty member with consent. Member of the PTFAC may also serve on the department's RTP Committee and the Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Committee (discussed in the following section of this document). Unless the probationary and tenured faculty decide on another arrangement by majority vote, the department chair will serve as chair of the PTFAC.

In accordance with the extensive University rules on part-time faculty hiring, the PTFAC establishes and oversees the part-time pool, determines part-time faculty eligible for multi-year appointment, identifies specific screening criteria, ranks candidates for specific teaching openings, and performs related activities.

Appropriate criteria for screening candidates for hire will vary by the nature of the teaching assignment. At minimum, the PTFAC shall consider the following: 1) academic preparation, including possession of an appropriate degree; 2) relevant teaching experience at the college level; and 3) evaluations of actual college level teaching performance, including (but not limited to) Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Committee reports, department chair reports, and student evaluations of teaching.

### **B. Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty**

The department uses a Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Committee (PTFEC) for reviewing part-time faculty performance. The PTFEC is an annually constituted body consisting of two tenured departmental faculty members other than the department chair, to be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty at the beginning of the academic year. Faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on the PTFEC. PTFEC members may be self-nominated or nominated by another faculty member with consent.

Both the PTFEC and the department chair will conduct periodic reviews for each part-time faculty member teaching in the department. The reviews normally will be conducted at the end of the academic year or during the summer immediately following the academic year (or in the fall for a part-time faculty member with an assignment over the prior summer). The Committee's review will be done prior to the chair's review. Part-time faculty will be evaluated only in terms of the teaching assignments for which they were hired.

The only exception to a yearly review of part-time faculty members is for temporary faculty unit members holding three (3) year appointments pursuant to Article 12 (section 6.04 of University UARTP Policy) who shall only be evaluated in the third year of their three-year appointment. They may be evaluated more frequently at the request of either the employee or the President (M.O.U. 15.26).

In consultation with the PTFEC, a probationary or tenured faculty member shall conduct at least one in-class evaluation of the performance of each part-time faculty member. The in-class evaluator need not be a member of the PTFEC and different faculty may participate if multiple in-class evaluations are conducted. Multiple in-class evaluations are appropriate if 1) necessary to cover dissimilar courses (e.g., a "methods" course and a course with a substantive focus) and/or 2) prior reviews indicate cause for concern about teaching performance. The faculty member under review and faculty member conducting the evaluation will arrange a mutually agreeable and appropriate time for the in-class visit. Surprise visits will not be used. The PTFEC chair shall consult the Associate Dean if a mutual agreement cannot be reached about an appropriate class and time for the visit(s), and seek the Associate Dean's assistance in resolving the situation. The faculty member conducting the in-class evaluation shall provide a written report to the PTFEC members and the part-time faculty member being reviewed. The part-time faculty member will be provided an opportunity to respond in writing to the review. *Note:* at the discretion of the PTFEC, the in-class evaluation may be waived for a part-time faculty member with more than two years experience in the department and a strong record of performance.

In evaluating performance, the PTFEC and department chair shall give consideration to: 1) student evaluations of teaching; 2) reports on in-class visits and any written response from the faculty member under review; 3) course syllabi and other class materials, as appropriate; 4) evidence of appropriate response to departmental requests on such subjects as preparation of a timely textbook order; 5) evidence submitted by the candidate; and 6) prior reviews (to be used to establish a pattern of performance).

Each current part-time faculty member is to be informed of the current membership of the PTFEC. Committee deliberations will be confidential.

The PTFEC will prepare a written report on each candidate. The department may develop a suitable form for such purpose; any such form shall include space for

written comments (i.e., the form cannot simply provide for boxes to be checked). Copies of the evaluation will be sent to the department chair who will notify the candidate and place a copy in the candidate's personnel file. The instructor shall be permitted to prepare a written response for placement in the file.

The department chair will prepare a final, written evaluation report, giving consideration to both the PTFEC report and any response from the part-time faculty member.