CAMPUS CRITERIA
(from SSU RTP policy)

II.   Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Probationary Faculty
Preamble: Candidates shall possess the appropriate terminal degree as noted in their appointment letter to be eligible for tenure and promotion. As indicated in Part I.E. above, advancement shall be based upon documentation of professional achievement and growth since appointment or the most recent evaluation, in accordance with the appropriate departmental criteria and standards.

A. Departmental Criteria
1. Each department shall develop criteria that will describe what is expected of candidates in all evaluation areas.
2. The departmental criteria will be reviewed by FSAC to ensure that they are consistent with this policy and the University mission. Department criteria will be accepted unless they are found to be inconsistent with this policy and/or the University Mission. If they are found to be inconsistent, FSAC will consult with the department to resolve the issue. Departments should regularly review their criteria to ensure their currency; any changes must be reviewed by FSAC in time for the next review cycle.
B. **Criteria and Methods for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness** (or Equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs)
1. Criteria. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating all pertinent evidence to show that the candidate:
    a. Displays enthusiasm for teaching his/her subject
    b. Presents material with clarity. Uses teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content.
    c. Clearly specifies course goals, and employs course materials to achieve course goals.
    d. Enables students to participate actively in their own education.
    e. Fosters appreciation for different points of view.
    f. Demonstrates competence and currency in course material.
    g. Consults and advises effectively outside of class.
    h. Engages in professional development to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness.
2. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (or equivalent for Librarians, Counselors and SSP-ARs).
    Evaluation is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence, or methods of collecting information, on teaching effectiveness. The Department shall assess the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of the criteria listed in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above. The three required methods are Peer Observations of Teaching (section 2a. below), Student Evaluation of Teaching (section 2b. below) and Self-Assessment of Teaching and Professional Activity (Section c. below). In evaluating the evidence gathered by these different methods, the evidence

is to be considered as a whole in addressing teaching effectiveness. If a Department deems it necessary to use additional methods of measurement it shall specify the method in writing in the department criteria, give a copy to each member of the Department in advance of a review cycle, and include the statement in the Personnel Action File (PAF) of all candidates. The candidate has the right to add comments to any document or data submitted into the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) as a measure of teaching effectiveness.

a. Peer Observations of Teaching

    i. Each Department is required to conduct peer observations of the teaching activity of each candidate and shall develop written procedures for such observations. The observer shall be mutually acceptable to the Department RTP Committee and the candidate. If mutual agreement cannot be reached on an observer from within the Department, then a mutually acceptable observer from outside the Department may be used.

    ii. At least one observation from each of at least two observers is required per review cycle. At least one observer shall be tenured. Each observation shall be carried out at a time that is mutually agreeable to the candidate and the observer. For candidates for reappointment and tenure, the observations shall occur annually. For candidates for promotion, the observations shall occur during the fall Semester in which the promotion review commences, or during the prior academic year. The evaluation shall address the criteria in II.A.1. and II.B.1 above, and include recommendations as appropriate. The candidate may discuss the evaluation with the observer and may submit a written response to the evaluation. The candidate may also request subsequent observations by the same or another observer during any given semester. Within ten days of the observation the evaluation shall be signed by the observer and delivered to the candidate. The candidate then has 10 days to sign the document, acknowledging receipt, but not necessarily agreement with the content of the document. These peer observations are to be included in the candidate's WPAF before the established deadline. At the end of the evaluation cycle these documents become part of the PAF.

b. Student Evaluation of Teaching.

    i. Each Department shall utilize evaluation methods appropriate to the modes of instruction within the Department to assess student evaluation of instruction. The evaluation shall have both a qualitative and a quantitative component. The evaluation shall address the criteria listed in Section II.A 1 and II.B.1. It is the responsibility of the

Department, not the candidate, to summarize the data, making reference to both the qualitative and quantitative components. The summary of the Department RTP committee includes an analysis and interpretation of the data that explain the data within the context of the teaching experience of the Department. For tenure documents the RTP Committee should include a summary table and analysis of data over the whole probationary period; for promotion, the summary table and analysis should include data since the candidate's initial date of employment at SSU or the candidate's last promotion, not just the previous yearA discussion of this data analysis includes implications of the data for the instructor, the student, and the Department curriculum.

ii. Faculty shall be evaluated annually by students in at least two classes typical of their teaching assignment. Each year for reappointment, tenure and promotion purposes, (including from Associate to Full) SETEs from a minimum of two classes (CBA 15.15) each year shall be included in a candidate's WPAF. If evaluations have been collected from more than two classes, the candidate, together with the Chair of the Department RTP committee, shall decide which class evaluations are to be added to the WPAF. Any disagreement in this regard shall be resolved by the Department's RTP Committee as a whole.

iii. Each Department shall provide for full student participation in the evaluation process and preserve the anonymity of student participants. Administration of student evaluations of instruction shall take place for all faculty within the last three weeks of instruction. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that students, while completing the evaluations, are free from influence by the instructor and each other. The Department Chair shall ensure the integrity and security of the data. The instructor shall not have access to or any knowledge of the contents of these evaluations until grades have been submitted to the Admissions and Records Office.

c. Self-Assessment of Teaching (or Equivalent) and Professional Activities: A self-assessment is a reflective statement written entirely by the candidate and unmodified by the Departmental RTP Committee. The Self-Assessment (typically no more than 5 pages or 2500 words) shall include:
   i. an outline or description of courses taught by the candidate summarizing course materials, goals, and methods.
   ii. a statement of the candidate's goals for teaching
   iii. a discussion of new course development

   iv. an explanation of how the candidate's scholarly activities contribute to the classroom experience. an indication of methods by which the diverse learning styles of students are addressed.

   v. a discussion of the candidate's teaching strengths and weaknesses and the ways in which he or she is attempting to improve their teaching.

   vi. an assessment of the candidate's scholarship, service and professional activities.

C. **Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievement**s

1. The Department RTP Committee is responsible for substantiating by appropriate evidence that the candidate demonstrates scholarship, research or creative achievements, and professional development.

2. Departments are responsible for developing and explaining to candidates a statement of professional standards and expectations in their discipline. It is to be expected that the balance among scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development will vary among the disciplines.

3. The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing appropriate evidence of a record of significant growth and contribution in the area of scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development.

4. Publication of scholarly books and/or publications in a professional journal in an appropriate field, especially if refereed, are traditionally considered unquestionable accomplishments, but other publications, which are generally considered credible within the intellectual community, are acceptable.

5. Scholarship that does not result in publication must be in a form that can be shared with peers (beyond what is shared in the classroom) and must be capable of being evaluated. Candidates must demonstrate that they have made a substantive contribution to their discipline(s).

6. Examples of scholarship, research or creative achievement, and professional development include but are not limited to:

  a. Published professional or scholarly books and articles (complete citation required).

  b. Published textbooks and other instructional materials (complete citation required).

  c. Reports or other products that result from consultancies, software development and electronic media products, designs, or inventions.

  d. Creative activities in the arts.

  e. Funded grants.

  f. Submitted proposals.

  g. Research reports or scholarly papers presented at conferences, colloquia, and other appropriate gatherings.

      h.   Participation in professional meetings as discussant, committee member, or organizer of colloquia/seminars. Service as critic, reviewer, editor, or consultant.

      i.   Awards, honors, exhibitions, shows, performances, or speaking engagements.

      j.   Contributions to discipline outside his/her primary area of specialization.

      k.   Post-doctoral studies or continuing education.

D. Criteria for Evaluating Service to the University

   1. The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing all appropriate evidence to the Department RTP Committee, which is responsible for substantiating and evaluating service to the University. The Department RTP Committee shall: (1) evaluate the quality of service, and (2) specify whether the candidate is supported by released time for any given assignment. Examples of service to the University include but are not limited to:

      a.   Contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the University, including participation on committees and with student organizations.

      b.   Activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional, and prospective students.

      c.   Activities that enhance the University's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising.

      d.   Representation of the University in an official capacity to the CSU and other institutions.

      e.   Leadership in professional organizations at local, state, and national levels.

E. Criteria for Evaluating Public Service and Service to the Community

   1. The candidate has the primary responsibility for providing all appropriate evidence to the Department RTP Committee, which is responsible for substantiating and evaluating public service. The Department RTP Committee shall (1) evaluate the quality of that service, and (2) specify whether the candidate is financially rewarded for any particular activity. Examples of public service and service to the community include, but are not limited to, membership or participation on:

      a.   Local, State, and Federal boards, commissions, and committees.

      b.   Civic organizations.

      c.   Community service organizations.

      d.   Schools.

      e.   Charitable organizations.

      f.   Social agencies.

      g.   Political groups/organizations.

      h.   Recreational agencies and groups.

      i.   Cultural organizations