RTP Handbook
CSUSM Faculty Center



Updated Oct 10, 2022

Table of Contents

Dear Faculty Colleagues *3*

Definitions *4*

Guidance on the RTP Process *5*

Guidance on Constructing the WPAF *5*

eWPAFs *5*

Constructing the Very First WPAF *6*

Revising and Updating the WPAF for Subsequent Reviews *7*

Constructing your WPAF for Tenure or Full Professor *7*

Guidance on Reflective Statements *8*

Teaching and Learning in the Reflective Statement **10**

Student Evaluations of Teaching in the WPAF **11**

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity in the Reflective Statement **12**

Service in the Reflective Statement **13**

Guidance on "What is an Item?" **14**

Department/College RTP documents *14*

General Guidance on the Evaluation of the WPAF *14*

Appendix *15*

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) Required Items Checklist **16**

Sample Memo #1--Periodic Evaluation **17**

Sample Memo #2--Performance Review **17**

Sample Index **19**

Sample Curriculum Vitae **20**

Selected References *24*

California State University
SAN MARCOS

Faculty Center California State University San Marcos 333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Road San Marcos, CA 92096-0001
Tel: 760.750.4019 **Fax:** 760.750.3151 facctr@csusm.edu www.csusm.edu/fc

Dear Faculty Colleagues

The Faculty Center provides this handbook to tenure-track faculty to address frequently asked questions and highlight important aspects of the evaluation process. The handbook is regularly updated to incorporate the results of faculty feedback and our own assessment. The official documents for the evaluation process may be found on the website of the Office of Faculty Affairs.

At the Faculty Center, we recognize that it takes time and perseverance to master the governing documents for retention, tenure, and promotion, and we recognize the challenge of creating and presenting a dossier that addresses the requirements and presents one's work effectively. This is true for new faculty preparing their first Working Personnel Action File, for faculty submitting for tenure and promotion, and also for faculty submitting for promotion to Full Professor. The Faculty Center offers workshops each semester designed for faculty submitting files the following semester. RTP workshops address two themes: 1. guidance on actually assembling an effective file, and 2. insight into the approach of PRC members, Deans, the University Promotion & Tenure Committee, and the Provost in evaluating the WPAF. We do not offer workshops immediately before deadlines.

Since 1994, when the faculty envisioned, planned, proposed, and secured approval for a comprehensive "Faculty Center," the mission of the Faculty Center has been "to support faculty in their multiple roles as teachers, researchers, scholars, artists, intellectuals, and members of the university and wider community." The Faculty Center provides a variety of programs and services in faculty professional development for faculty across the university and throughout the faculty career.

I hope that you will find this handbook to be useful, and I encourage you to attend the Faculty Center RTP workshops where we discuss the issues in more detail.

Rebecca Lush
Director, Faculty Center

Definitions

This list of definitions is designed to be helpful, but faculty should consult the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the University RTP Document for definitive information.

CBA - Collective Bargaining Agreement; Faculty contract with the Chancellor's Office

CFA - California Faculty Association; Faculty union that negotiates the contract

PRC - Peer Review Committee: PRCs are composed of at least three full-time tenured faculty elected by tenure-track faculty in the Candidate's department (or equivalent).

RTP – Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.

"RTP" is sometimes used as shorthand to refer to University, College, or Library procedure documents.

P&T or **PTC**– Promotion and Tenure Committee: A representative committee of full professors/librarians elected through the Academic Senate election process

Periodic Review – Evaluation of tenure-track faculty usually in the 1st, 3rd, & 5th years.

Performance Review – Evaluation of tenure-track faculty for retention (renewing the probationary contract) usually in the 2nd & 4th years. In the 6th year, faculty are reviewed for tenure and promotion.

PAF - Personnel Action File: Confidential file with exclusive access of the faculty member and designated administrators and administrative staff. The official personnel file for employment information relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a Candidate.

WPAF - Working Personnel Action File: The WPAF is created by the faculty member specifically for the purpose of evaluation. All evaluators review the WPAF.

Guidance on the RTP Process

The Collective Bargaining Agreement empowers faculty members to construct the file of material that will be used to evaluate them. The University RTP Document, specifies a mandatory format for the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), but faculty members are responsible for the content of the file. Even considering the format requirements for the WPAF, there is still considerable opportunity for faculty to create a file that suits their unique record of development and achievement.

It is useful to distinguish between the *construction* (and revision) of the WPAF on one hand, and the *evaluation* of the WPAF on the other.

Guidance on Constructing the WPAF

The evaluation procedures assume a "portfolio" model instead of an "archive" model for the file you will submit. The reflective statement and the items should present *representative examples* of your work. This portfolio model for the WPAF is balanced out in practice by including a curriculum vitae that is *comprehensive*, including full information about your work in the area of instruction.

eWPAFs

WPAFs are created in Moodle on the Community server. Please note that the platform that supports Community is not the same platform that supports Cougar Courses, the leaning management system. Cougar Courses uses Canvas, while Community uses Moodle. You will be notified when your WPAF containers have been created, by the Dean's Office for periodic reviews, or Faculty Affairs for performance reviews. During the review period, only the appropriate reviewers will have access to your container.

WPAFs should be well organized, and easy to navigate. A popular choice for organizing include creating topic areas with separate folders within your container (for example, background documents, teaching, research, and service). Be sure to familiarize yourself with the software you are using first (e.g, Adobe Acrobat) and double check that all links to work are accessible to a reviewer. If you have a physical item as evidence (e.g. a book), speak to the Dean's Office or Faculty Affairs about your options.

Here are some general guidelines on compiling digital WPAFs:

1. Include a label at the top of the Moodle page with the candidate's name, department, and rank;
2. Use links whenever possible and make sure all the links work and are navigable;
3. Put all files into PDF format to ensure it displays as intended;

4. Insert PDF versions of PowerPoints or Prezis with several slides on each page of the PDF;
5. Label every file with a descriptive title rather than simply a numerical one (Example Item 1: Syllabi, Item 2: Graded assignments, etc.);
6. Be selective - having a digital file is not an excuse to exceed 30 items by putting several items in one digital file;
7. Avoid creating one giant file or folder; instead use multiple folders and sub-folders to clearly organize the file
8. Each folder should have only related items; do not use a folder for just one item.

The Faculty Center offers a template container in Community; please email facctr@csusm.edu if you would like access.

Constructing the Very First WPAF

Basic rules for "size" of the WPAF

Reflective statements shall not exceed **15 pages** in combined length. You decide how many pages to devote to statements in each area: (1) statement of up to 15 pages or three (3) separate statements totaling 15 pages.

Evidence of success in **Teaching**, **Research/Creative Activity**, and **Service** is limited to **30 items** total. Types of items may vary; you decide how to distribute the items among the three categories; however, each category must contain evidence. Remember the WPAF is meant to be representative – not comprehensive– of the faculty member's work.

When a faculty member is faced with the task of constructing their first Working Personnel Action File, they should first examine several WPAF samples:

- Ask close colleagues in your unit if they will let you see their previous WPAF
- Consult the samples available in the Faculty Center

Reflect on the samples you have seen and think about how they respond to the requirements of the University RTP Document. Your task is to create a file that addresses the requirements and accurately presents your work, achievements, and goals. Many faculty share a draft of their first WPAF with a close colleague[1] and benefit greatly from the peer consultation. This is a time intensive process, so allow plenty of time to develop the file. Please note that the Faculty Center offers RTP Workshops each semester, with the intention that faculty attend them the semester before their file is due. The Faculty Center does not offer RTP Workshops immediately before deadlines.

Keep your audience in mind as you construct the WPAF:

[1] Note, that faculty under review cannot ask colleagues serving on their PRC for peer consultation once a review period has begun. See this guidance from FAC for more details.

- Not everyone who reviews your file will come from your disciplinary background - avoid jargon and acronyms and be explicit how your work contributes to your field
- Be kind to your reviewers! Strong files are concise and explicit

Choose items (documents, texts, artifacts) that are the most significant and representative examples of your work

- Any item you choose to present should be discussed in the reflective statement
- Statements such as "Documentation available on request" may be used. Please consult with close colleagues about this. At any rate, the items you do include should be sufficient to make a clear case.

Revising and Updating the WPAF for Subsequent Reviews

Best practice is to create a backup electronic copy of each WPAF that you submit, either through a file folder on your computer (or the cloud), or in a "sandbox" Community Moodle shell. The CV, reflective statement, and index will have been removed from the WPAF and placed in your permanent personnel file (PAF).

- Develop a filing system to preserve a copy of each WPAF. It is especially important to keep a copy of the first WPAF. This WPAF shows the beginning of your tenure-track career and will be useful for you to examine when the time comes for later stages of review.
- Keep the complete file accessible to share with junior colleagues in the future and consider sharing a copy with the Faculty Center.

Assume that you will substantially revise the reflective statement from the previous review.

- Some parts of the reflective statement will still be useful, but you should start fresh and make sure that you are "telling the story" of the period under review in the best possible way
- New items will need to be added to the file, and some may need to be removed

As you embark on updating your WPAF, set aside time to:

- Carefully review and consider all feedback from the most recent review and all earlier reviews; the review letters and your file are a conversation – there will be instances that merit your direct response to feedback from the PRC, Dean, or Provost.
- In the reflective statement, address both your reflection on the feedback you have received and any action you have chosen to take in response to the feedback

Constructing your WPAF for Tenure or Full Professor

- Solicited letters in WPAFs: It is not uncommon for candidates for tenure and promotion to solicit letters from colleagues to document their contributions in teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. Indeed, the use of such letters is an effective way in

which faculty can round out the picture of their work that they are presenting in the file. However, letters should NOT argue a candidate's "case" for tenure or promotion without any familiarity with the actual WPAF. The promotion and tenure process that the CBA and the University RTP document provide mechanisms for external review of a candidate's file. Soliciting colleagues (or students) to provide letters of support for tenure and promotion is not appropriate.

- Explaining Departmental Practices: Candidates are advised to explain departmental practices that might not be shared by all units or disciplines across campus. E.g., what work is involved in organizing a colloquium, serving as graduate coordinator, or serving as leader for a course.
- "On time" promotion to Full: The CBA specifies that promotions to Full Professor/Librarian/SSPAR III are considered "on time" if they take effect at the start of the sixth year. That is, a WPAF turned in during the fifth year in rank as an Associate is "on time" (CBA 14.3). WPAFs turned in prior to the fifth year as an Associate are "early" (CBA, 14.4, Univ RTP II.C). This contrasts with requests for P&T to Associate, which are on "on time" in the sixth year and become effective at the start of the seventh year of service.
- Note: Many Associate Professors decide to wait for six, seven, or more years before they apply for promotion. This is perfectly understandable.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to submit a complete WPAF by the deadline announced in the RTP Timetable. Once the faculty member submits the WPAF, all reviewing parties shall review the file for "completeness" within seven (7) days of its due date and shall request additional material via a memo to the Custodian of the File (Associate Vice President of Faculty Affairs). See the University RTP Document for detailed information.

Guidance on Reflective Statements

The University RTP Document requires that the WPAF contain "a reflective statement for each section: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service." The reflective statement(s) "may not exceed 15 pages in combined length."

The following is an attempt to provide guidance to faculty as they craft and revise their reflective statements throughout the tenure process. For faculty undergoing retention review, the WPAF and reflective statement address one's accomplishments since the last retention review. For faculty undergoing review for tenure/promotion, the WPAF and reflective statement address one's accomplishments since hiring or most recent promotion. If service credit was awarded and has not been considered in a prior CSUSM review for tenure/promotion, you should include evidence of accomplishments from the other institution(s) for the most recent years of employment. Please consult the Faculty Center or a close colleague if you have service credit and would like assistance on the time inclusive of your WPAF.

Since the procedure calls for a "portfolio" approach to the WPAF (and not an "archive" approach), the reflective statement need not present a chronological narration. The CV

submitted in the WPAF, however, should provide a full, chronological listing of all relevant accomplishments, including classes taught, by semester. The reflective statements provide the narrative of your professional development: you tell the story of your continued growth as a faculty member. The reflective statements also explain the meaning of the items that you have chosen to present. This narrative should explain your philosophy, goals, assessment, and reflection.

The University RTP Document does not contain standards per se but instead provides guidance and procedures for the process. Each faculty member must familiarize themselves with their college/equivalent RTP document, and departmental/school standards, where applicable. It is paramount that the reflective statement explains how the faculty member's work in the three areas (teaching, research/creative activity, and service) addresses the applicable standards.

Here are some general suggestions about writing a strong reflective statement. What follows are some more specific suggestions about the three areas that need to be covered.

Explain your work in its disciplinary context. Every faculty member has a distinct academic profile, depending on training, experience, and interests. It is your responsibility to explain to the reader how your work and accomplishments fit into disciplinary or interdisciplinary contexts. It is up to you to explain how your work contributes to your field. The members of the PRC will likely include colleagues who are familiar with your work and the discipline, but other readers may come from different academic disciplines. You should present your work and the significance of it clearly to all readers of your dossier. Avoid using jargon because while your PRC members may understand it, the Dean, members of the University P & T committee, or the Provost, may not.

Target the audiences that will read the file, depending on where you are in the review cycle. The WPAF will be read by a different sequence of committees/administrators in periodic evaluations (usually years 1, 3, and 5) and performance/retention reviews (usually years 2, 4, and 6).

Sample Review Schedule

Periodic Review (PRC + Dean)	Year 1 Due Jan. 2023	Year 3 Due Jan. 2025	Year 5 Due Jan. 2027
Performance Review (PRC + Dean + Provost)	Year 2 Due Aug. 2023	Year 4 Due Aug. 2025	
Promotion & Tenure (PRC + Dean + P&T + Provost)			Year 6 Due Aug. 2027

The readers of periodic evaluations include the PRC and the Dean, so the audience is closer to your home discipline. For the periodic evaluation, the faculty member presents their WPAF so that the PRC and the Dean can make suggestions for improvement for the performance review. For the performance reviews, the WPAF will be evaluated once again by the PRC, and the Dean, who will look for reflection and action since the periodic evaluation; and it will also be reviewed by the Provost, who will make a decision about retention. The feedback loop for the WPAF for the periodic evaluation is smaller but it is crucial that you do your best with this version of the WPAF and then be prepared to take action (in the three areas of your work and also in the updated version of the dossier) so that the WPAF is as strong as it can be for the performance review.

Demonstrate "dialogue, action, reflection" with the PRC. Faculty members receive feedback on the WPAF from each level of review in the form of a letter. After receiving all of the letters in a review cycle, compare the feedback systematically. Consider how to implement the suggestions about your work in the three areas. If any evaluation letters contained suggestions for improvement, your next WPAF should explicitly address how you handled the advice. Demonstrate that you are actively participating in the peer review process and that you can successfully apply what you learn.

Teaching and Learning in the Reflective Statement

Each faculty member is responsible for continuous improvement in the area of instruction, and reflection on instruction is a major component of the WPAF. The reflective statement must present a cumulative self-analysis of instruction. In the past, "teaching" was discussed in terms of the techniques that faculty members employed in the classroom. More recently, the focus has shifted to address how we as instructors facilitate student learning. A new field of academic research has developed called "Scholarship of Teaching and Learning" wherein faculty use research methods to systematically analyze student learning. However you choose to frame your work in this area, the statement should address your philosophy of teaching and learning, pedagogical approaches and techniques, class assignment (e.g. first-year courses, Upper Division General Education courses, graduate courses), student evaluations, and professional development activities.

Faculty members address instructional topics such as:

- Innovative pedagogy (media/technology; case teaching; problem-based inquiry)
- Culturally inclusive practice; diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom
- Classroom assessments conducted during the term (e.g. mid-semester evaluations; "Foggiest Point/Clearest Point" check-ins)
- Development of new courses, specialization, minor, major developed
- Collaboration within/across department, unit, college

- Professional development activities on pedagogy (workshop, training, or conference)
- Other (teaching award recipient; development of custom instructional materials)

The reflective statement must include reflection/analysis of any teaching/learning documentation you include in the WPAF. Remember that the items you select for inclusion in the WPAF are *representative* of the quality of your work; the complete record of your work in this area is listed in the CV.

Student Evaluations of Teaching in the WPAF

The Collective Bargaining Agreement and campus procedures mandate that "written or electronic student questionnaire evaluations" are required for "all classes taught by each faculty unit employee." [Article 15.15] On this campus, the Office of Institutional Planning and Assessment (IPA) has processed the questionnaires for each class and collects and reports back the data collected on the questionnaires. IPA provides faculty members with a packet for the evaluation of each course, using a questionnaire designed by faculty and approved through the Academic Senate. Soon after the end of the semester, IPA provides each faculty member with a report for each course that was evaluated, including an official summary of the student responses, written comments, and comparisons to relevant courses in the department/unit and college. During academic year 2022-23, student course evaluation administration will migrate back to Academic Affairs.

The course evaluation reports are required but are not counted as items in the WPAF. The reports are provided in the form of PDF files, and the actual questionnaires are not returned to the faculty. The PDF files should be included in complete form in the WPAF and organized in a consistent manner. Faculty members are expected to present analysis of the student course evaluations in a systematic way in the reflective statement.

Faculty members should approach the "reflection" or analysis of these student evaluations—and other relevant data—as a kind of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. As faculty with expertise in specific academic disciplines, faculty members should bring their analytic skills to bear on this required data, but also putting it in the context of their mission as a faculty member. It is not recommended to create quantitative or multi-term summaries of the data from the IPA reports for the WPAF; rather, analysis should be presented about the data as it was reported by IPA (on an individual course basis). Faculty should address the course evaluation data in the context of their teaching philosophy, pedagogical approaches, and multiple strategies for assessing student learning. Emphasizing the formative value of the data, faculty should not be reluctant to address an aspect of the course which did not achieve the desired result. If student evaluation data raised an issue with course design or classroom practice, for example, the faculty member should dissect the issue and then outline plans to address it in the future and thus demonstrate dedication to continuous improvement.

The student evaluations of teaching provide all faculty with an important base line assessment that can be used to evaluate each course they teach, but will not be the only indicator of teaching effectiveness. Each faculty member should develop a toolbox of additional assessments to measure teaching effectiveness. Faculty members should carefully review all feedback they receive regarding instruction and use their subsequent WPAF to pursue a constructive and detailed conversation about development and achievement in the area of teaching and learning.

As of November 2022, all WPAF reviewers are required to have undergone anti-bias training, to include materials on bias in Student Opinion surveys on Teaching, within the last 36 months. This training is offered by the CSUSM Faculty Center in concert with the Office of Inclusive Exclusive.

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity in the Reflective Statement

Each faculty member is responsible for continuous improvement in the area of research, scholarship, or creative activity. The reflective statement should present a cumulative self-analysis of your scholarship for the period under review. Discuss your work in terms of a plan or agenda: detailed description of your areas of inquiry, methods, timeline, and progress. Due to the varied backgrounds of your reviewers, it is imperative to explain the context of your scholarship within your discipline, including your contribution and impact. The reflection should include completed works, and also that in progress. If applicable, define collaborative projects, such as co-authorship, contributing editorship, and provide evidence of peer-review. If required, give rankings of journals, rejection rates, etc. You may include correspondence from journal editors, publishers, and professional organizations as items of evidence for in-progress work.

Some departments/colleges recommend a chart outlining how you have or will meet the research requirements outlined in the RTP document. Due to the varied nature of each department/college RTP, reach out to a senior faculty member for a sample chart, and advice on how to complete it.

When discussing progress on areas of inquiry, faculty may include the following:

Publications or Works in Progress

- Connection to your research agenda
- Contribution to the discipline
- Refereed
- Rejection rate
- Collaborators and roles
- Status

Conference Activity

- Chair, Panelist, Discussant,
- Refereed
- Rejection rate
- Invited or proposed
- Paper published as Proceedings
- Collaborators and roles

Manuscript Reviewer

- Journal or Book publisher
- Connection to your discipline
- Collaborators and roles

Grant Activity

- Connection to your research agenda
- Contribution to the discipline
- Agency
- Award
- Collaborators and roles

The reflective statement must include reflection/analysis of any research/creative activity documentation you include in the WPAF. Remember that the items you select for inclusion in the WPAF are *representative* of your work; the complete record of your work in this area is listed in the comprehensive CV.

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity in the CV

Whereas the WPAF includes representative and selective evidence, the CV is an exhaustive, comprehensive account of the candidate's professional accomplishments. The CV should show clearly the type and stage of the candidate's research: e.g. peer-reviewed journal article; non-peer-reviewed journal article; book; op-ed; juried exhibition; invitational; art commission; external funded and internal grants (include dollar amount); unfunded grants if appropriate; evidence of outcomes; single-authored; co-authored or multiple authors (including your contribution to the project); submitted; under review, in press, or forthcoming (include documentation); explain order of author "value" in your field.

Contributions to collaborative projects

It is not unusual to collaborate in research activity. However, like other research and scholarship activity, it is important that candidates clearly explain what their contributions are, including what their original research or creative contribution is to the collaborative project; the quality and importance of said contribution; and what their share of the contribution is to the overall research project. As stated above, it is important to explain "author order" as the significance varies between disciplines. As with other areas, candidates should include evidence that substantiates their contributions.

Service in the Reflective Statement

Each faculty member is responsible for sustained high quality achievement in the area of service, and reflection on service is a major component of the WPAF. The reflective statement should present a cumulative self-analysis of your service. A key aspect of service is your participation in the shared governance of the university. All faculty members are expected to take a continuous and active role in service activities that address the needs of the University (e.g. curriculum, assessment, faculty peer review, student services, campus climate, etc.). Over the faculty career cycle, service work will take various forms as faculty gain experience and

develop and apply their professional expertise. Early on, faculty contribute most of their service at the department and college levels. Promotion requires that the faculty member has made significant contributions in the area of service, especially on the university-level. Service may also include service to the academic profession and community beyond the university.

As a matter of practice, solicited letters from committee chairs "documenting" committee membership and meeting attendance are not useful for the evaluation process. The best practice is for the faculty member to explain the significance of their work on the committee. The service should be clearly listed and labeled on the comprehensive CV. In the reflective statement, the faculty members should explain the contribution they made to the committee and how that contribution fits as part of their interests and skills in service. For example, if one has contributed to writing a significant document, then it could be included as an item.

The reflective statement must include reflection/analysis of any service activity documentation you include in the WPAF. Remember that the items you select for inclusion in the WPAF are *representative* of the quality of your work; the complete record of your work in this area is listed in the CV.

Guidance on "What is an Item?"

Please see the document, "What is an Item: Supplemental Guidance on Evidence to Include in the WPAF", approved by the Academic Senate in 2017.

Department/College RTP documents

It is important that candidates and evaluators only use approved department and/or college RTP documents and note the version of the document in their memo.

- Faculty Evaluation, RTP Documents

General Guidance on the Evaluation of the WPAF

Your WPAF, the information in it, and the entire evaluation process are to be handled with confidentiality by all participants in the review cycle. But the evaluation process is open to you. You have a right to see everything that is in your file. After each review step, you have the right and opportunity to respond within ten days of receiving the written evaluation. Any party to the review process -- including you -- may request an external review. Appendix C of the University RTP document describes how to initiate and conduct an external review for tenure or promotion. If you are not satisfied with the outcome of an evaluation you are entitled to work with the California Faculty Association even if you are not a CFA member. Consult the University RTP Document and Collection Bargaining Agreement for detailed information.

Appendix

1. Sample WPAF Checklist
2. Sample Memo #1
3. Sample Memo #2
4. Sample WPAF Title Page
5. Sample Index

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) Required Items Checklist

Please visit the Faculty Affairs website to download a clean copy for your WPAF.

California State University SAN MARCOS

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) Required Items Checklist

FACULTY INITIALS	REQUIRED ITEM
	Completed WPAF Checklist (initialed, signed, and dated by review candidate).
	Memorandum stating action the Candidate is requesting (1st, 3rd, 5th year Periodic, 2nd or 4th year Retention, Tenure and/or Promotion Review).
	Index (Table of Contents).
	Curriculum Vitae (with current academic year listed).
	All personnel review letters since hire – or since last time promotion and/or tenure was granted. All rebuttals and/or responses to reviews.
	Reflective statement for each section: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.
	Student evaluations, in compliance with the CBA and college/library policies.
	Evidence of teaching success (for all faculty unit members who teach) and equivalent professional performance based on primary duties assigned in the job description (for non-teaching faculty).
	Evidence of success in research and creative activity (for teaching faculty and librarians) and continuing education/professional development (for SSP-ARs).
	Evidence of success in service representing service to the campus, system, community, discipline, and/or profession.
	Evidence consists of no more than 30 items in total.
	University and Area standards for retention, tenure, and promotion (if they exist). **Area being the College, Library, Department, or Unit as appropriate and in existence for the job classification.*
	Materials placed by administrators since your last personnel action or as required by the CBA (i.e., letters of commendation or reprimand).
	For faculty with a joint appointment, the Memorandum of Understanding (including all previous versions of the MOU).
	For faculty exempting themselves from new or substantially revised department/college standards, Exemption Form – Applicability of Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP Standards (if applicable).
	Faculty Evaluation and Process Memo dated 03/25/2020 re: Probation Extensions, Student Evaluation, Student Evaluations and RTP Guidance (if applicable).

I verify that all items are included in the file: _____ _____

Candidate Signature **Date**

Revised 08/19/2021

Sample Memo #1--Periodic Evaluation

Note: WPAFs for Periodic Evaluation are submitted to the Dean's Office of your College. These reviews typically take place in your 1st, 3rd, and 5th years.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: <*DATE*>

TO: <*NAME*>, DEAN, <*COLLEGE OF _____/UNIVERSITY LIBRARY*>

FROM: <*YOUR NAME, RANK*>

SUBJECT: Periodic Evaluation

I am submitting my Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). I hereby request that I be considered for my <*first/third/fifth*> year Periodic Evaluation. I am currently in my <*which*?> year as <*Rank*> Professor of <*Department/Program/College*> at CSUSM. <*I have been granted <<how many?>> years of service credit toward tenure*.>

cc: <*Name*> <*Chair/Director*>, <*Department/Program*>

Michelle Hunt, Associate Vice President Faculty Affairs

Sample Memo #2--Performance Review

Note: WPAFs for Performance Review (and Promotion) are submitted to the Provost's Office – these reviews typically take place in your 2nd, 4th, and 6th year

MEMORANDUM

DATE: <*Date*>

TO: Carl Kemnitz, Provost

FROM: <*Your Name, Rank*>

SUBJECT: <*Performance/Tenure/Promotion*> Review

I am submitting my Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). I hereby request that I be considered for my <*second/fourth year Performance OR Tenure and Promotion OR Promotion*> Review. I am currently in my <*which*?> year as <*Rank*> Professor of <*Department/Program/College*> at CSUSM. <*I have been granted <<how many?>> years of service credit toward tenure*.>

cc: <*Name*> <*Chair/Director*>, <*Department/Program*>

Michelle Hunt, Associate Vice President Faculty Affairs

Sample Index

The WPAF Checklist provides a helpful starting point for your Index

WPAF Index: Shirley Goodfellow

1. WPAF Checklist
2. Memo Requesting Review
3. Curriculum Vitae
4. Personnel Review Letters
5. Student Evaluations of Teaching for Period Under Review (Complete IPA Reports)
    a. Course #, Sem/Yr: Title
    b. Course #, Sem/Yr: Title
    c. Course #, Sem/Yr: Title, etc.
6. Evidence of Teaching Success
    a. Syllabus Course #: Title
    b. Course # Sample Classroom Assessment Techniques
    c. Course # Evidence of Student Learning
        i. Student Paper with Comments
        ii. Thesis Draft with Written Comments
    d. Course # Artifact of Student Performance
    e. Peer Evaluation of Teaching
    f. Teaching Award
7. Evidence of Research & Creative Activity Success
    g. Publication/Offprint
    h. Publication "in press" or under review (with documentation)
    i. Funded grant proposal (with documentation from funding agency)
    j. Presentation at Professional Meeting
    k. Invited Presentation
    l. Honor or Award
    m. Creative performance/display/item
    n. Musical Score/Choreographic Score/Photographs
    o. Performance text
    p. Installation
8. Evidence of Service
    q. Academic Senate Committee Annual Report (authored, co-author, contributor)
    r. Documentation of Leadership in Student Mentoring or Student Club/Group
    s. Statewide Academic Senate Document (authored, co-author, contributor)
    t. Presentation at/Organization of CSU System-wide Meeting
    u. Disciplinary/Professional Association Work (e.g., governance role, section coordination) (Discipline/Professional Service)
9. Standards for Retention, Tenure & Promotion
    a. University RTP
    b. College/Library RTP
    c. Department RTP

Sample Curriculum Vitae

Over the years, the Faculty Center has been in communication with faculty on the Faculty Affairs Committee, Deans, and administrators in the Office of the Provost. The following recommended CV format has evolved on this campus with input from all of these groups. The intention is that this comprehensive CV provides a complete record of the faculty member's work in all three areas that are evaluated. Whereas the limit of 30 items and 15 pages of reflection requires faculty to present only representative examples, the CV should be a complete list of your work. It is also different from the normal professional CV because it contains a list of the courses (with relevant information) by semester. This format is strongly recommended for the WPAF, but it is not required. We encourage talking with departmental colleagues about preferred formats as well. Here is some general advice about the CV that is included in the WPAF.

The headings are suggestions; you should customize them to represent your work in a way that is accurate and appropriate.

"Publication" means a complete manuscript that is actually published or is in press.

Clarify the status of a project that is not actually published.

Use chronological or reverse chronological sequence, as you prefer, but be consistent. Specify if there is a difference between a calendar-year or academic-year period.

Spell out your contribution to a collaborative project in a concise annotation, clarifying the disciplinary protocol if necessary.

Curriculum Vita

Shirley Goodfellow

Position: Year(s) - Title – Department, California State University San Marcos

EDUCATION

University, degree, year received, emphases, dissertation title, 3-5 sentence abstract

University, degree, year received, thesis title, 3-5 sentence abstract

Instruction

Courses taught at CSUSM (list all in reverse chronological order)

Term	Year	Course #	# of Students	Other Info
Fall	2021	Course 353	42	New prep, live & online modality
Fall	2021	Course 101	38	Asynchronous online
Spring	2021	Course 101	40	Synchronous online
Spring	2021	Course 201	40	Synchronous online
Fall	2020	Course 101	33	Synchronous online
Fall	2020	Course 201	34	Synchronous online
Spring	2020	Course 101	35	Moved online due to Covid
Spring	2020	Course 201	32	Moved online mid-semester due to Covid
Fall	2019	Course 101	25	New prep
Fall	2019	Course 201	40	New prep

Other Teaching Activities

Advising Undergraduate advising (number of students)

Independent study supervision (number of students)

Masters thesis supervision (number of students)

Service on thesis committees (number of committees)

Other teaching-related activities

Guest lectures

Advisory committees

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

*Refereed Publications***

Journals

Year - author(s) - title - Journal - Vol. *X,* No. *Y* - pages

Book Chapters

Year - author(s) - title - book author - Book - Chapter # - Publisher info - pages

Books

Year - author(s) - Book - Publisher info

Non-refereed Publications

Journals

Year - author(s) - title - Journal - Vol. *X,* No. *Y* - pages

It is acceptable to include a concise annotation here to explain important details which might not be self-evident to a person outside your field.

Book Chapters

Year - author(s) - title - book author - Book - Chapter # - Publisher info - pages

Grants--External

Title - date - source - amount - co-principal investigators

Grants--Internal

Title - date - source – amount- co-principal investigators

Conference & Workshop Presentations

Year - Conference/Workshop - place - date

Manuscripts reviewed

Year - author(s) - title - Journal

Work in Progress (manuscript is not yet complete; note if contracted for publication, if this is a re-submission, etc.)

Creative Activity (e.g., exhibits, performances, recordings, etc.)

Title - date - location - collaborators - short description

SERVICE

Department
Year - Committee - Position (Member/Chair) - Accomplishments

College
Year - Committee - Position (Member/Chair) - Accomplishments

University
Year - Committee - Position (Member/Chair) - Accomplishments

Community
Year - Committee - Position (Member/Chair) - Accomplishments

Professional membership and service
Year - Organization - Position (Member/Chair/Secretary)

HONORS, AWARDS, FELLOWSHIPS

Year - Title of honor - University

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

(Professional positions you held before you came to Cal State San Marcos)

Dates - place - title/position - short description

Selected References

The Faculty Center maintains a small library of resources about faculty development and higher education. Faculty may use the Faculty Center Library reading room during the time when the Faculty Center is open. Any library user may borrow the items, which are being incorporated into the university's library catalog. Items will be bar-coded and checked out using the Library's regular circulation system.

Angelo, Thomas A. and K. Patricia Cross, *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*, Second Edition (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993).

Bain, Ken, *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Cambridge, Mass: Havard University Press, 2004).

Bean, John C., *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2001)

Boyer, Ernest L., *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate-A Special Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990).

Diamond, Robert M. and Bronwyn E. Adam (eds.), *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty* (Washington, DC: The American Association of Higher Education, 1995).

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, Gene I. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate-An Ernest L. Boyer Project of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997).

Henry, Ronald, *New Directions for Higher Education: Transitions Between Faculty and Administrative Careers* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2006)

Hutchings, Pat, *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review* (Washington, DC: The American Association of Higher Education, 1996).

Moody, JoAnn, *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions* (New York and London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004)

O'Neil, Carol and Alan Wright, *Recording Teaching Accomplishment: A Dalhousie Guide to the Teaching Dossier*, 5th Edition (Halifax, Nova Scotia: Office of instructional Development and Technology, Dalhousie University, 1995).