



**Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review – Handbook Change**

**RES 252644**

FAC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recommends revising Sections 305.3.3., 305.5.2., 305.5.3., 305.4.2.10, and Appendix G of the University Handbook to replace outdated guidance regarding WPAF size and content (e.g., the “three-inch binder” limitation) with updated guidelines that reflect electronic file systems and emphasize clarity, organization, and representative evidence aligned with Unit RTP Criteria.
- RESOLVED:** That the revisions to the University Handbook establish clear expectations for the scope and organization of Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) that are aligned with the type of review being conducted, such that developmental reviews (e.g., retention and periodic evaluations) emphasize materials since the most recent WPAF submission, while cumulative reviews (e.g., lecturers seeking three-year appointments, tenure and promotion) appropriately consider a broader body of work over the relevant period.
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate affirms the importance of thorough, clear, and fair evaluation letters by Unit RTP Committees and Deans, as these are essential to providing meaningful feedback, ensuring transparency, and supporting equitable and well-informed personnel decisions.
- RESOLVED:** That any change to the platform used for WPAF submission and review shall be implemented in consultation with the Academic Senate, and that the Office of Faculty Affairs shall develop and communicate clear, consistent, and equitable procedures to support faculty and reviewers in the evaluation process.
- RESOLVED:** That such guidance shall ensure clarity, consistency, and alignment with University RTP policies while taking into account the organizational features of the platform.
- RESOLVED:** That Appendix G of the University Handbook shall be reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect these changes and to ensure that WPAF organization guidelines remain current, accessible, and appropriate for the platform in use.

**RESOLVED:** The Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the organization of the WPAF. Deletions are in ~~strike through~~ and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

### Handbook Changes

#### 305.3.3 Promotion of Tenured Faculty

Promotion of tenured faculty shall ordinarily occur at the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current rank or classification. **Accordingly, WPAF materials submitted for promotion shall generally reflect approximately five years of accomplishments, typically beginning with the faculty member's final WPAF submission as a probationary faculty member (i.e., the beginning of the final year as a probationary assistant professor or equivalent).**

**WPAF materials submitted for promotion shall be consistent with University Handbook guidance regarding scope of materials, with emphasis on accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor and demonstrating sustained achievement, impact, and continued professional growth.**

Promotion of tenured faculty occurs within the following guidelines and restrictions.

- a. Tenured faculty wishing to undergo review for promotion shall notify the Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) in writing by November 1 of their intention to undergo performance review for the purpose of promotion during the Fall review. Tenured faculty who do not notify the Office of the P&VPAA by that date will be ineligible to undergo review for promotion that year. **Tenured faculty wishing to undergo review for promotion shall notify the Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) in writing during the academic year prior to the review cycle, in accordance with timelines established by the Office of the P&VPAA. Faculty who do not provide notice by the established deadline will be ineligible to undergo review for promotion during that review cycle.**
- b. The performance review for promotion purposes occurs in the Fall review during the **following** academic year in which the tenured faculty requests the review for promotion.

### 305.5.2 Contents and Organization of the RTP File

**The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF, sometimes informally referred to as the RTP, PTR, or PEF file) shall be organized to provide a clear, structured, and representative record of the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. Materials should be arranged to support a narrative explanation of performance in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. The WPAF should be thorough yet concise, providing representative rather than exhaustive documentation sufficient for effective review. Faculty shall not be expected to include all artifacts or materials associated with their professional activities; rather, materials should be selected to demonstrate quality, impact, and alignment with Unit RTP Criteria.**

(See Appendix G for a detailed description of the required and optional contents of the RTP file and instructions on organizing the RTP file.)

All RTP files shall include the following sections in sequence. **(See Appendix G for a detailed description of the required and optional contents of the RTP file and instructions on organizing the RTP file.)**

- a. Log sheet – lists each document placed in the file **WPAF**, date of insertion, original source, person or authority responsible for inserting the document.
- b. Access sheet – lists each person having access to the file, reason for access, and date of access.
- c. Master index – lists each document in the file arranged chronologically within each area of review—teaching/performance, scholarly/creative activity/ professional growth, and professionally related service.
- d. Assignments – list all courses taught, semester-by-semester (faculty) and all major responsibilities and professional activities (librarians and counselors).
- e. Current ~~vita~~ **curriculum vitae**
- f. Applicable unit RTP criteria.
- g. Previous RTP evaluations and recommendations (all levels).
- h. Personal statement (optional)—~~concisely describes personal perspective regarding performance in the three areas of review for the current RTP cycle:~~
  - a. **Provides a clear and organized narrative describing the faculty member's performance in each area of review for the current RTP cycle, addressing the applicable Unit RTP Criteria, highlighting accomplishments, and responding to prior evaluations where appropriate**
- i. Documentation of Teaching or Performance

- a. **All peer observations of teaching conducted during the period under review shall be included and clearly labeled for reviewers. For promotion reviews, faculty shall include all peer observations conducted during the period in rank.**
- j. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth
- k. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and the Community
- l. Miscellaneous Section

### 305.5.3 **Completeness of the WPAF for periodic and performance review**

**A complete WPAF includes all required materials as specified in the Unit RTP Criteria and University Handbook and should present those materials in a clear, organized, and representative manner. Completeness refers to the inclusion of required materials and does not imply that the WPAF must include all possible documentation of professional activities.**

The unit periodic and performance review committees and the faculty undergoing review shall be responsible for ensuring that the **WPAF** Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) (sometimes informally referred to as the RTP, PTR, or PEF file) is complete and accurate before the start of the review process. No level of review may require that additional materials be included in the file other than those specified in the Unit RTP, PTR, or PEF criteria document(s) or University Handbook. Further, if any level of review believes additional material needs to be included for a full evaluation, that request must go through appropriate campus processes: modification of unit criteria or the University Handbook.

Files are expected to be complete by the posted and announced deadline. The unit committee chair or committee member designee shall inspect the file during the unit review period to determine if any required materials are missing from the file.

If the unit committee determines that the WPAF includes all required materials and is complete, review continues as indicated within the University Handbook.

If the unit committee determines that required materials are missing and the WPAF is incomplete, the committee chair may inform the faculty member of any missing required items. The faculty under review may submit missing requested material to the committee chair to be inserted into the file. Insertion of required missing items by the unit committee shall be recorded on the WPAF Log sheet, following procedures specified in the University Handbook for the insertion of materials.

If the unit committee does not receive requested required materials and/or the WPAF is not received by the deadline, the unit review shall proceed based on materials that were received

and those available in the **Personnel Action File (PAF)**. Failure to submit a complete WPAF may result in the unit committee being unable to return a review of 'satisfactory' performance.

Once the relevant unit periodic or performance review committee has determined that the WPAF contains all required elements, any materials to be added to the WPAF must be approved by the University Review Committee (URC) and shall be limited to items that became available only after the date of completion of the file. Only evaluations and recommendations completed by each level of review, any minority reports, and any responses to the evaluations and recommendations may be added to the WPAF without prior approval by the URC. A copy of all added materials shall be provided to the faculty. ~~Reviewing authorities may disregard any added material that could have been included in the original file at the beginning of the review process.~~

If the URC approves the addition of newly available materials to the WPAF, the file shall be returned to the unit review committee for reconsideration of its initial evaluation and recommendation before subsequent levels of review begin their respective evaluations.

During the review process, no material shall be removed from the WPAF.

#### **305.4.2.10 The RTP File**

~~Each faculty member subject to performance review shall prepare a file containing a representative sample of materials from the period under review. Unit RTP criteria may require additional materials. (Added 05-30-2023) The file should be prepared with attention to the demands on reviewers. For example, the file, excluding SOCI's should be no longer than could be held in one three-inch binder. For electronic files, the documents in the electronic file should be capable of being held in one three-inch binder if they were printed. SOCI's may be contained in a separate file.~~

~~The second-year review shall contain documentation from the period under review and shall also contain all materials from the first-year review. This enables the University Review Committee and higher levels who did not participate in the first-year review process to consider the entire first year of probationary faculty.~~

**Each faculty member subject to performance review shall prepare a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) that provides a clear, organized, and representative record of accomplishments relevant to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria.**

**The WPAF shall include materials sufficient to allow reviewers to evaluate the quality, significance, and impact of the faculty member's work in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. Faculty are expected to address each relevant criterion identified in the Unit RTP Criteria and provide appropriate narrative explanation supported by representative documentation.**

**All prior evaluation letters shall be included in the WPAF. These evaluations provide context for the current review and allow reviewers to assess the faculty member's responsiveness to prior recommendations. Accordingly, faculty are not required to re-submit previously reviewed materials unless necessary to demonstrate improvement, continuity, or impact.**

**WPAF materials should be thorough yet concise. Faculty shall exercise professional judgment to ensure that the file is focused, well-organized, and avoids unnecessary or duplicative documentation. The WPAF is intended to provide representative evidence supporting the faculty member's narrative and is not intended to function as a comprehensive archive of all professional activities.**

**Because Unit RTP Criteria vary across disciplines in their structure and specificity, the length and organization of WPAF materials may reasonably differ across units. As a general guideline, narrative sections often correspond to the scope and number of criteria identified in the applicable Unit RTP Criteria.**

**The scope of materials included in the WPAF shall align with the type of review being conducted. These shall be interpreted to be minimum requirements; faculty undergoing review may judiciously include additional material to demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving the Unit RTP Criteria.**

**a. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty (i.e., lecturers)**

- 1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's work since the most recent WPAF submission, or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted. Materials should emphasize teaching effectiveness and any assigned duties, and should demonstrate performance in relation to assigned responsibilities and applicable evaluation criteria.**
- 2. Lecturers seeking an initial three-year appointment shall include materials representing their overall body of work since initial appointment at California State University, Bakersfield, with emphasis on recent accomplishments, consistent with the comprehensive nature of such reviews.**

3. Lecturers seeking a subsequent (renewed) three-year appointment shall include materials representing their work since the most recent WPAF submission, while also providing sufficient context to demonstrate sustained performance, development, and responsiveness to prior evaluations.
4. All SOCIs shall be included in a separate folder and shall align with the scope of the review:
  - i. For periodic evaluations without consideration of three-year appointment: SOCIs since the most recent review (or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted)
  - ii. For initial three-year appointment: all SOCIs since initial appointment
  - iii. For subsequent three-year appointments: SOCIs since the most recent WPAF submission

**b. Retention of Probationary Faculty**

1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's work since the most recent WPAF submission, or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted, with emphasis on progress toward meeting the applicable Unit RTP Criteria in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service.
  - i. For the second-year review, the WPAF shall include all materials since initial appointment, including materials from the first-year review, to ensure that all levels of review have access to a complete record of the faculty member's performance to date.
2. All SOCIs collected since the initial appointment shall be included in a separate folder.
3. For multi-year probationary reviews, materials from prior review cycles may be included, and additional materials spanning multiple years may be incorporated as appropriate to demonstrate the faculty member's professional development, progress, and growth, particularly for levels of review that did not participate in earlier evaluations.

**c. Tenure and Promotion of Probationary Faculty**

1. Materials may represent the faculty member's body of work during the probationary period at California State University, Bakersfield, with emphasis on accomplishments during the most recent years and demonstration of sustained development and achievement across all areas of review.

**2. With the exception of SOCI, materials included in the WPAF shall be representative rather than exhaustive. Faculty are expected to exercise professional judgment in selecting materials that best demonstrate their development, achievement, and readiness for tenure and promotion. The absence of individual documents shall not, in itself, be interpreted as a deficiency, provided that sufficient evidence is included to support a comprehensive and fair evaluation.**

**i. All SOCI collected since the initial appointment shall be included in a separate folder.**

**d. Promotion of Tenured Faculty**

**1. Materials may represent the faculty member's overall body of work, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since the final WPAF submission as a probationary faculty member, demonstrating sustained achievement, impact, and continued professional growth.**

**2. With the exception of SOCI, materials included in the WPAF for promotion of tenured faculty shall be representative rather than exhaustive. Faculty are expected to exercise professional judgment in selecting materials that best demonstrate sustained achievement, impact, and continued professional growth. The absence of individual documents shall not, in itself, be interpreted as a deficiency, provided that sufficient evidence is included to support a comprehensive and fair evaluation.**

**i. All SOCI collected in current rank shall be included in a separate folder.**

**e. Post-Tenure Review without Promotion**

**1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's activities and achievements since the most recent WPAF submission, with emphasis on continued engagement in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service, as well as plans for ongoing professional development.**

**2. With the exception of SOCI, materials included in the WPAF shall be representative rather than exhaustive. Faculty are expected to exercise professional judgment in selecting materials that best demonstrate continued engagement, effectiveness, and professional development. The absence of individual documents shall not, in itself, be interpreted as a deficiency, provided that sufficient evidence is included to support a comprehensive and fair evaluation.**

**i. All SOCI collected since the most recent review shall be included in a separate folder.**

## **APPENDIX G: CONTENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE RTP FILE (WPAF)**

In each of the following sections, each document must have a unique identifying code that is also displayed on the Master Index. When a section contains materials from semester-to-semester and/or year-to-year, the materials shall be organized chronologically, preferably “reverse chronology,” with most recent materials toward the front of the respective section.

**The WPAF is intended to provide a structured, organized, and representative record of faculty accomplishments in relation to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. Materials should be selected and organized to support a clear narrative explaining the faculty member’s performance. The WPAF should be thorough yet concise and should include representative rather than exhaustive documentation. Faculty shall not be expected to include all artifacts or materials associated with their professional activities; rather, materials should be selected to demonstrate quality, impact, and alignment with Unit RTP Criteria.**

**Because Unit RTP Criteria vary across disciplines, the length and organization of WPAF materials may reasonably differ across units.**

**The scope of materials included in the WPAF shall align with the type of review being conducted. These shall be interpreted to be minimum requirements; faculty undergoing review may judiciously include additional material to demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving the Unit RTP Criteria.**

### **Standard Organization of the WPAF (Section-Based Structure)**

**To promote consistency, clarity, and ease of review across electronic platforms, WPAF materials shall be organized into clearly defined sections and, where appropriate, subsections, using the organizational features of the platform in use (e.g., sections, tabs, or folders). Because electronic review platforms vary in their organizational features and capabilities, the structure described below represents a conceptual framework rather than a rigid technical format.**

**The WPAF should generally be organized as follows:**

- 1. Log Sheet<sup>1</sup>**
- 2. Access Sheet**

---

**<sup>1</sup> In electronic review systems that provide automated tracking of file access, document history, and case materials, the Log Sheet and Access Sheet requirements may be satisfied by system-generated records and need not be maintained as separate documents.**

3. Master Index<sup>2</sup>
4. Assignments Sheet
5. Current Curriculum Vitae
6. Unit RTP Criteria
7. Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations
8. Personal Statement
9. Teaching (or Performance)
10. Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth
11. Service
12. Miscellaneous (optional)

### Document Naming Conventions

To ensure clarity and consistency across electronic WPAFs, all documents shall follow a standardized naming convention. Below is a recommended approach.

[Section][Year or Term][Item Type] [Brief Descriptor]

For example:

Teaching 2026 Fall SOCI CSUB1001

RSCA 2026 JournalArticle Einstein et al.

#### A. Log Sheet

- 1) All documents placed in the RTP file shall be listed chronologically on the Log Sheet, with date of insertion, original source of each document, and person or authority responsible for inserting the material.
- 2) All documents removed from the RTP file shall be listed chronologically on the Log Sheet, with date of removal and person or authority responsible for removing the material.
- 3) The Log Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the dean or director of the faculty.

#### A. Access Sheet

---

**<sup>2</sup> A Master Index may be included where helpful for clarity; however, in electronic systems that provide structured navigation and document labeling, a separate index is not required. The inclusion of a Master Index or Table of Contents is considered best practice to facilitate the review process.**

- 1) The names of all persons accessing the RTP file shall be recorded on the Access Sheet, with date(s) of access and reason for access.
- 2) Each person accessing the RTP file shall be responsible for recording the necessary information on the Access Sheet.
- 3) The Access Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the dean or director of the faculty.

B. Master Index

- 1) All documents in the RTP file arranged chronologically within each section of the file shall be so listed on the Master Index, i.e., the Master Index shall be organized by section.
- 2) ~~Each document shall have a unique identifying code, which is also displayed on the Master Index.~~  
**Each document shall be clearly labeled using consistent file naming conventions and listed in the Master Index. Unique identifying codes may be used but are not required if file naming conventions provide sufficient clarity.**
- 3) The Master Index shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

A. Assignments Sheet

- 1) Faculty shall list all courses taught, semester-to-semester, since the last RTP review on the Assignments Sheet. In addition, faculty shall list all assigned time (including number of units for each reassigned activity), semester-to-semester, since the last RTP review.
- 2) Librarians and counselors shall list all assigned responsibilities since the last RTP review.
- 3) The Assignments Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

B. Current ~~Vita~~ **Curriculum Vitae**

- 1) A current ~~vita~~ **curriculum vitae** should contain, **at minimum**, the following information:
  - a. formal education, including dates of attendance and degrees awarded;
  - b. employment history, including position titles and dates;
  - c. prior teaching and/or professional experiences;
  - d. instructionally related activities, including, but not limited to, major advising responsibilities, supervising major tutorial programs, curriculum or program development;
  - e. scholarly or creative accomplishments or professional growth accomplishments, including, but not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, and presentations of peer reviewed papers at professional meetings;
  - f. funded grants and contracts, including consulting activities;
  - g. professionally related services to university and/or community, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership on university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, and other activities contributing to the enlightenment and enrichment of the community;
  - h. major honors and awards, including special leaves or sabbaticals for professional development; and

- i. other areas of assigned responsibilities.
- 2) The vita shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

F. Current Unit RTP Criteria [Subject to revision based on RES 252632]

G. Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations

- 1) At each level of review, evaluations and recommendations pertaining to retention, the award of tenure, and promotion shall be placed in the RTP file, as well as entered into the Log Sheet.
- 2) The faculty shall receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation from each level of review before the RTP file is forwarded to the next level of review.
- 3) The faculty shall have ~~seven (7)~~ **ten (10)** days from the receipt of the evaluation and recommendation to file a written rebuttal or response.
- 4) ~~All rebuttals or responses shall be placed in the RTP file and entered into the Log Sheet.~~ **All rebuttals or responses shall be included in the WPAF, entered into the Log Sheet, and maintained as part of the complete record of prior and current evaluations.**

H. Personal Statement (~~Optional~~)

- 1) Faculty ~~are encouraged to~~ **shall** prepare a Personal Statement summarizing their perspective of their performance in each of the three areas for the current RTP cycle, highlighting their accomplishments, and addressing any criticisms, concerns, or suggestions for improvement made during previous RTP reviews or by students on the SOCI for the current review.
- 2) **Faculty narratives shall address each relevant criterion identified in the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. As a general guideline, narrative length may correspond to the number and complexity of criteria, often averaging approximately one to two pages per major criterion.**

I. Documentation of Teaching or Performance

- 1) Teaching
  - a. Careful documentation of teaching performance is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly for faculty, teaching success is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion.
  - b. ~~Student evaluations of teaching (SOCI) for all courses taught during the probationary period must be included.~~ **Student Opinion of Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) data shall be included in the WPAF in a dedicated folder and organized chronologically. The scope of SOCIs included shall align with the type of review being conducted (see section 305.4.2.10 of this Handbook).**
  - c. **Classroom observations, as required by the University Handbook (section 305.4.2.7) and the Unit RTP Criteria, shall be included. Teaching materials shall include a clearly labeled**

**subfolder for Classroom Observations, which shall include all required peer observations conducted during the period under review (or period in rank for promotion reviews).**

- d. Other evidence illustrating teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - i. representative syllabi, course materials and handouts, quizzes and exams;
    - ii. peer evaluations of teaching, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
    - iii. signed letters from current students or alumni;
    - iv. professional development activities for the improvement of teaching performance, including those conducted by the Faculty TLC;
    - v. curriculum development—new courses and/or new pedagogy; and/or
    - vi. significant advising of students in a major/program.
  - e. The use of information or other technologies and involvement in TLC and assessment activities, by themselves, will carry little, if any, weight in the judgment of teaching effectiveness. Reviewers should justify their evaluations regarding such activities and student learning.
  - f. Additional teaching through Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach, including SOCI, must be included in this section.
  - g. Except for the SOCI, no anonymous materials, including letters, notes, e-mails, etc., shall be included in the RTP file.
- 2) Performance (librarians and counselors)
- a. For librarians and counselors, performance is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. Therefore, careful documentation of performance on all assignments during the probationary period is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly.
  - b. Evidence illustrating high levels of performance may include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - i. assignments requiring significant leadership skills, analytical and organizational skills, and/or problem solving skills
    - ii. peer evaluations of performance, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
    - iii. signed letters from faculty, staff, current students, or alumni; and
    - iv. program development.
  - c. The information should be in sufficient detail to substantiate the role of the faculty and his/her contributions.
- 3) Specific Suggestions for Organizing Teaching Materials
- a. Materials for each course (SOCI, syllabus, handouts, quizzes and exams, peer reviews, etc.) should be included in a single “course file.” All course files should be organized in identical fashion.

- b. All course files for a given semester should be grouped together and labeled/coded in some fashion so that reviewers can easily discern semester-to-semester teaching. **Teaching materials should be organized by term and course using a consistent folder structure (e.g., Term → Course → Materials), allowing reviewers to easily navigate teaching activities across semesters and years.**
  - ~~c. All course files for a given academic year should be grouped together and labeled/coded in some fashion so that reviewers can easily discern year-by-year teaching.~~
  - c. Other evidence supporting teaching effectiveness (signed letters from students, professional development activities, curriculum development, advising, etc.) should be placed in a separate file distinct from course files.
  - d. Because of the volume of materials that will accumulate during the probationary period, it is absolutely essential that all materials regarding teaching be organized in the RTP file in chronological order, preferably “reverse chronology,” with the most recent materials (current review cycle) being in front. **Because WPAFs may contain substantial documentation, careful organization and selection of representative materials is essential.**
- J. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth
- 1) This section must show how the faculty is growing and developing through scholarly/creative activities within the discipline (teaching faculty or librarians) or through professional growth activities within the field (counselors).
  - 2) **Faculty who are earlier in their career progression (e.g., probationary faculty), may emphasize ongoing scholarly or creative activities, without outputs, as an indication of their potential for future success and impact. However, peer-reviewed outputs (e.g., publications, presentations, exhibitions, creative outputs, as articulated in the Unit RTP Criteria), are expected for tenure and promotion of probationary faculty, and promotion of tenured faculty.**
  - 3) Faculty should include evidence for scholarly/creative activities in accord with their unit RTP criteria, which may include, but is not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, papers presented at professional conferences, etc.
    - a. **Faculty shall include all peer-reviewed outputs that are relevant to their current review type (e.g., retention of probationary faculty, promotion of probationary faculty, post-tenure review).**
  - 4) Faculty are responsible for obtaining outside reviews of unpublished scholarly manuscripts in a timely manner so that they can be included in the RTP file before the RTP review cycle begins.
  - ~~5) Scholarly/creative materials that have been neither published nor reviewed by peers in the discipline will carry little, if any, weight in the review process.~~
  - 6) When listing papers presented at a scholarly conference, the faculty must provide information as to whether the paper was selected through a refereed process. **When listing papers presented at a scholarly conference, faculty shall provide information regarding the nature of the review process (e.g., refereed, invited, or other selection process), as this provides important context for evaluating the work.**

- 7) When listing co-authored books, articles, research projects, and grant proposals, the faculty must clearly indicate the extent of his/her contribution to the joint effort. **When listing co-authored books, articles, research projects, creative projects, and grant proposals, faculty shall provide a clear description of the nature and extent of their contributions to the collaborative work.**
- 8) In general, grant/contract proposals that have been funded carry more weight than those that have not been funded. Grant/contract proposals that have been submitted for review but have not yet been evaluated carry little weight in the review process. **Grant and contract activity should be evaluated in terms of both engagement in the scholarly process and resulting outcomes. Funded proposals provide evidence of successful external validation and support, while submitted proposals and those under review may demonstrate ongoing scholarly engagement, development of research agendas, and efforts to secure external funding.**
- 9) Consulting work (paid or unpaid) in of itself carries little, if any, weight in the review process. Consultant reports, if they have received outside peer review, may carry some weight. **Consulting work (paid or unpaid) may provide evidence of professional engagement, applied expertise, and contributions to practice. Consultant reports or products that have undergone external review or dissemination may also provide evidence of scholarly or professional impact.**
- 10) Reviews of book manuscripts, journal articles, papers being considered for presentation at professional meetings, etc., may carry some weight if there is documentation of the faculty's contributions. **Service to the profession, such as reviewing book manuscripts, journal articles, or conference submissions, may provide evidence of scholarly engagement and recognition within the discipline, particularly when accompanied by documentation of the faculty member's contributions and role.**
- 11) Under ordinary circumstances, work on accreditation applications and reports should be considered under the category of service to the department and university rather than as scholarly activity. However, in those instances where the products of the accreditation process can be worked into a larger research strategy or design that can lead to or result in the production of an article or monograph published in a peer-reviewed journal, such activities can be considered scholarship.
- 12) Activities currently "in process" or being "planned for the future" may be listed, but such activities carry some weight only in the early stages of the faculty's probationary period. If these activities are listed in this section, then the faculty is obligated to inform all reviewers regarding the outcome of these "in process" or "planned" activities in subsequent review cycles.
- 13) Specific suggestions for organizing materials in this section
  - a. Materials must be organized in chronological order, preferably "reverse chronology," with the most recent materials (current RTP review cycle) in front; and
  - b. Versions or revisions of published papers or articles must be carefully cross-referenced in the RTP file (including Log Sheet and Master Index). Earlier versions should be purged from the file to keep physical size manageable. **When multiple versions or stages of a scholarly work are**

**included (e.g., draft, submitted, accepted, published), these should be clearly labeled and, where appropriate, cross-referenced to illustrate the progression of the work.**

- K. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and to the Community
- 1) This section must show the type and extent of professionally related services the faculty provides to the **profession, university, college, department, students, and/or community** ~~campus and/or to the community~~.
  - 2) Faculty should include evidence for professionally related services to the university and to the community in accord with their unit RTP criteria, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership of university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, presentations to community groups, involvement in community projects, etc. Supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the faculty's level of performance should be included in this section.
  - 3) The professionally related services listed in this section should be related to the faculty's teaching area, field of scholarship/creative activities, or professional assignments.
  - 4) Teaching for additional pay through Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (and other similar academic arrangements) shall not be listed in this section.
  - 5) Consulting activities for which the faculty was paid shall not be listed in this section.
  - 6) Activities for which special assigned time arrangements have been made shall be counted in this section only to the extent that the faculty's performance was exemplary, or ~~his/her~~ **their** efforts significantly exceeded the amount of assigned time. In either case, supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the assigned time arrangements should be included in this section.
- L. Miscellaneous Section (optional)
- 1) An additional section may be appended to the RTP file to include such materials as:
    - a. large, bulky items, e.g., audio or video tapes, CDs, award plaques, photographs, paintings, and creative "artifacts;"
    - b. unpublished or unreviewed manuscripts;
    - c. unreviewed grant/contract proposals;
    - d. letters/articles published by the local media;
    - e. information on professional conferences, meetings, workshops attended (as opposed to those where a paper was presented); and
    - f. signed thank you notes and cards from other faculty, staff, students, alumni, or individuals from the community.
  - 2) Since these materials are usually not considered as significant evidence of the faculty's performance, good judgment must be exercised in creating this additional section.

## **RATIONALE:**

The current University Handbook language governing the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) reflects an earlier paper-based model that relies on physical constraints (e.g., the “three-inch binder” guideline) and does not adequately account for the realities of electronic submission and review systems. In addition, existing language does not consistently differentiate expectations across types of faculty reviews, including retention, tenure and promotion, promotion of tenured faculty, post-tenure review, and lecturer evaluations. As noted in Referral #31, there is a need to clarify both the expected scope of WPAF materials and the timelines associated with faculty reviews. This resolution modernizes Handbook language by replacing outdated size-based limitations with guidance emphasizing clarity, organization, and the use of representative evidence aligned with Unit RTP Criteria.

The proposed revisions establish a more coherent and equitable framework by aligning WPAF expectations with the purpose and scope of each type of review. Developmental reviews (e.g., retention and periodic evaluations) emphasize work since the most recent WPAF submission, while cumulative reviews (e.g., tenure and promotion) appropriately consider the broader body of work over a defined period, such as the probationary period or time in rank. Importantly, the revisions clarify the timeline and scope of materials included in the WPAF, explicitly indicating that materials should generally reflect accomplishments since the most recent WPAF submission. This resolves a common source of confusion in which activities occurring after the most recent WPAF submission—but prior to a change in rank or effective date of promotion—may otherwise be omitted. By clarifying that such activities shall be included, the policy ensures that faculty work is fully represented and that no period of professional activity is inadvertently excluded from evaluation.

The revisions also clarify expectations regarding the inclusion of Student Opinion of Curriculum and Instruction (SOI) data, teaching observations, and prior evaluation letters, ensuring that reviewers have access to a complete record of performance while reducing unnecessary duplication of materials. By emphasizing representative evidence rather than exhaustive documentation, the revised policy improves both faculty preparation of WPAFs and the efficiency and effectiveness of the review process. Finally, the resolution introduces guidance for consistent organization and naming conventions in electronic WPAFs and affirms that future changes to submission platforms will be implemented in consultation with the Academic Senate. Collectively, these updates promote transparency, consistency, and flexibility across disciplines, while supporting meaningful and equitable evaluation of faculty performance.

The revisions further strengthen the policy by clarifying that WPAF materials are intended to be representative rather than exhaustive, reinforcing the expectation that faculty exercise professional

judgment in selecting evidence that best demonstrates the quality, impact, and significance of their work. This approach recognizes that, particularly in multi-year and cumulative reviews, it is neither necessary nor desirable to include every possible document. Instead, the focus is on providing sufficient, well-organized evidence to support a fair and comprehensive evaluation. By explicitly indicating that minor omissions of individual documents should not be interpreted as deficiencies, the revisions promote a more holistic and equitable approach to evaluating completeness. In some cases, such omissions may reflect inconsistencies in communication, training, or clarity of expectations rather than deficiencies in performance, and the policy is intended to mitigate overly rigid or punitive interpretations.

In addition, the revisions provide greater clarity regarding the evaluation of scholarly, creative, and professional growth activities by distinguishing between engagement in scholarly processes and the production of scholarly outputs. This is consistent with the principles of Resolutions 252632 and, to a greater extent, 252633. This distinction is particularly important in developmental and post-tenure review contexts, where sustained engagement, trajectory, and professional growth are central considerations alongside traditional measures of dissemination and impact. By framing a broader range of activities as meaningful evidence of engagement, the policy supports a more nuanced and context-sensitive evaluation of faculty work while still recognizing and prioritizing the importance of peer-reviewed and publicly disseminated outputs. These distinctions should be discussed and articulated as units revise their Unit RTP criteria. Collectively, these refinements further align WPAF expectations with the varied purposes of faculty review and promote a fair, developmental, and forward-looking evaluation process.

**Distribution List:**

- President
- Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
- AVP for Faculty Affairs
- College Deans
- Dean of the Library
- College Associate Deans
- General Faculty

---

Approved by the Academic Senate: April 30, 2026  
Sent to the President: May 8, 2026  
President Approved: June 16, 2026