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I. INTRODUCTION.

The procedures adopted by the Department of Biological Science of the College of Natural Science and Mathematics for evaluating and recommending faculty for retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) decisions and other personnel matters conform with policies outlined in the CSU-CFA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and University Policy Statements (UPS) 210.000. Each faculty member shall meet the requirements detailed in this document, the MOU and UPS 210.000. Thus, each new faculty member shall be presented with copies of each document by the Department Chair upon joining the faculty. Faculty members shall be responsible for examining the current version of the MOU and UPS 210.000 as they prepare documentation for RTP decisions or periodic reviews. Throughout this document the word “shall” indicates mandatory action; the words “may” or “should” indicate permissive action, but “should” includes an element of expected action.

I.A. Goals.

I.A.1. Program Excellence. The Department of Biological Science is committed to the goal of establishing and maintaining an academic program of the highest quality for the purpose of providing the students of the University with an excellent education in biological science. The Department recognizes that the key to a quality program is faculty excellence and, thus, expects a high level of competency in both Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. The purpose of this Departmental Personnel Document is to ensure the excellence of the biology faculty by setting forth guidelines for faculty hiring and subsequent evaluation of faculty performance.

I.A.2. Nature of the Evaluation Process. Evaluation of faculty is an arduous, but necessary process. The diverse facets of professionalism that comprise excellence in a faculty member are entwined so tightly that for purposes of evaluation separation is difficult if not impossible. Thus, the categories developed in this document create artificial separations of the collection of attributes and activities expected of each faculty member. Nevertheless, the Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) must use these categories to make judgments about the level of performance of each faculty member as a whole. The Department expects the DPC to (1) exercise fairness, wisdom, and compassion in making judgments, (2) develop constructive evaluations and reports that recognize accomplishments, (3) contribute to the development of improvement plans as necessary, and (4) safeguard the future excellence of the Department by ensuring excellence in its faculty members.

I.A.3. Positive Role of Review. The Department believes that the best way to foster a superior program is to support and assist its faculty in becoming excellent teacher/scholars. For this reason, the document and its policies should be viewed as supportive and constructive, having the goal of maintaining or raising the quality of the Department and its programs. The review process provides an opportunity for the recognition of areas of strength and achievement of a faculty member as well as the recommendation of areas for potential improvement. Both processes will benefit the faculty and students of the Department.
I.B. Hiring.

I.B.1 Teacher/Scholars. The Department of Biological Science seeks to hire the best teacher/scholars available. It is expected that the individuals selected on the basis of information gathered during the hiring process will have the potential to earn tenure and promotion, and contribute to the Department in furthering its goal of improving the quality of its educational program. The successful candidates shall be counseled during the initial interview with the Chair, and subsequently upon joining the faculty, concerning the policies of this document, the MOU and UPS 210.000.

I.B.2 Prior Experience. In consultation with the Chair of the Search Committee, the Chair of the Department shall recommend to the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (who then recommends to the Vice President for Academic Affairs) that new faculty having prior experience be appointed at a step commensurate with that experience. As appropriate, the Department Chair may also recommend that prior service credit be granted.

I.C. Retention, Tenure and Promotion.

I.C.1. Importance. The granting of tenure and the promotion to Professor are the most important personnel decisions that the Department can make. The granting of tenure recognizes significant achievement and the strong potential for continued contribution to the goals of the Department. The promotion to Professor recognizes the development of leadership roles in the discipline. As detailed in UPS 210.000, normally written requests by the faculty member shall determine whether tenure and promotion considerations shall be initiated; however, tenure consideration is automatic during the sixth probationary year review.

I.C.2. Retention. The Department recognizes that retention of high-quality faculty is the primary way to achieve its objectives of establishing and maintaining program excellence. The personnel evaluation process is a means to maximize the likelihood of a faculty member successfully meeting this goal.

I.C.3. Evaluation. In making recommendations for personnel decisions, three categories are evaluated: (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and (3) Professional, University, and Community Service. Primary consideration shall be given to Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, which together constitute about 80% of the importance of the evaluation; Professional, University and Community Service shall be given secondary consideration and make up the remaining 20% of importance. These percentages represent relative weights to be assigned qualitatively by the DPC and shall not be directly quantified.

I.C.4. Portfolio (formerly the Working Personnel Action File or WPAF). The Portfolio shall be constructed as specified in UPS 210.000. It shall include an up-to-date and complete curriculum vitae, evidence of performance in the categories defined in Section I.C.3, for all of the years of review (including prior years of service if those were granted at the time of original appointment), and other elements as specified in UPS 210.000 Section
III. The specific material that constitutes evidence of performance is detailed elsewhere in this document under the appropriate sections.

I.C.5. **Mentors and Developmental Narrative for Probationary Faculty.** First year probationary faculty will be assigned one or more Mentors before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester. The Mentor(s) will provide guidance, advice and support to the probationary faculty member during preparation of a Developmental Narrative during the first year as outlined in UPS 210.000 Section II.

Probationary faculty hired prior to August 17, 2001, who have approved Development Plans, will include the Development Plans in their Portfolio in place of a Developmental Narrative. For faculty with approved Development Plans, progress towards retention, tenure, and promotion will be measured against expectations in UPS 210.000 and the Department Standards. All further mention of the Developmental Narrative throughout this Document includes this proviso for probationary faculty hired prior to August 17, 2001 with approved Development Plans.

I.C.6. **Time-table.** Retention, tenure and promotion decisions shall occur according to the time-table established in UPS 210.000, the MOU and announced by the University President. In the case of exceptional performance, as determined by criteria described in Section VIII. **Evaluation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion,** the Department may recommend early promotion or early tenure for a faculty member who has requested such action in writing as detailed in UPS 210.000 Sections IV.G.III and IV.H.2. Post-tenure review for Associate Professors and Professors shall occur as described in Section I.C.7. Professional Reviews, Section IX. **Evaluation of Tenured Associate Professors** and Section X. Evaluation of Professors.

I.C.7. **Professional Reviews.** Reviews shall be conducted according to guidelines set forth in UPS 210.000, the MOU and this document. Faculty shall be informed of the dates for submission by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records or the DPC as appropriate.

I.C.7.a. **Probationary Faculty** shall be evaluated for retention or tenure as described in Section V. **Evaluation for Retention** or Section VI. **Evaluation for Tenure.**

I.C.7.b. **Tenured Associate Professors** shall normally be considered for promotion after they have met the conditions described in UPS 210. If promotion is not being requested, the Portfolio shall be submitted by the third Friday of the spring semester and follow criteria set forth in Section IX. **Evaluation of Tenured Associate Professors.** If promotion to Professor is being requested, Portfolio submission and evaluation shall occur as set forth in Section VII. Evaluation for Promotion.

I.C.7.c. **Tenured Professors** shall be evaluated every five years according to a randomized schedule developed by the Department and dependent upon year of promotion to Professor. The Portfolio shall be submitted by the third Friday of the spring semester and follow criteria set forth in Section X. **Evaluation of Professors.**
I.C.7.d. **Full-time and Part-time Temporary Faculty (Lecturers)** shall be evaluated by the DPC according to the Department of Biological Science Policy for Evaluation of Temporary Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty (Lecturers).

II. **TEACHING PERFORMANCE.**

II.A. **Department Responsibility.**

The Department of Biological Science offers courses at the undergraduate and graduate level. Graduate level studies principally include advanced specialty courses, seminars and faculty-mentored graduate research. At the undergraduate level, courses are offered to majors and non-majors. Courses offered to biology majors include: (1) lower-division core courses required of all majors, (2) upper-division gateway or foundation courses required for specific concentrations, (3) advanced courses offered as upper-division electives to majors (some with laboratory or field components included), and (4) faculty-supervised undergraduate research. Courses offered for majors may also be required by other science programs, e.g., biochemistry, environmental studies, and those seeking biology teaching credentials. Courses for non-majors include: (1) Elements of Biology as the lower-division general education life science requirement for most undergraduates, (2) several other lower- and upper-division courses fulfilling science requirements in the general education program, and (3) lower- and upper-division courses required for other majors and programs such as child development, nursing, and gerontology.

Because of the diversity of course offerings, the Department divides courses into four categories for instructor evaluation, each assessed with a distinct Student Rating of Instruction (SRI) form: (1) lecture courses, (2) lecture/laboratory/field courses (when lab is taught by the lecture instructor), (3) laboratory/field courses or laboratory/field components of courses (if the lab is taught by a different instructor), and (4) seminar and seminar-like courses.

II.B. **Teaching Performance.**

It is the intention of the Department to have each faculty member strive for excellence in Teaching Performance. Thus, the Department seeks continuous improvement in Teaching Performance among faculty at all levels. Each faculty member should provide evidence of high academic standards in her or his classroom and currency in the subjects being taught. In addition, all faculty should have clearly articulated goals and objectives for teaching and learning. These goals should reflect the faculty member's efforts to deal with new developments in biology, the educational process in general, and advancements in classroom-presentation tools. The goals should also be sensitive to student retention and the changing patterns of the student body with respect to preparation, background, gender, culture, and ethnicity. The Department expects that the faculty member's success in addressing these goals and objectives will be assessed as described below.

II.C. **Evaluation of Teaching Performance.**

The level of Teaching Performance shall be determined by evaluation of the teaching performance portion of the Portfolio and shall be consistent with the faculty member's Developmental Narrative. This portion of the Portfolio shall include materials for appraisal of **documentable teaching activities** (e.g., course materials, student opinion questionnaires, etc.), various qualitative factors (collectively referred to herein as the
dynamic of teaching), evidence of ongoing professional development as a teacher, and maintenance of currency in the discipline. An individual’s teaching dynamic is dependent upon characteristics like vitality and enthusiasm, communication between teacher and student, teaching sensitivity to various learning styles and cultures, involvement with students and direct participation in their mastery of information, and concern for the learning success as evidenced by self-reflection and outcome assessment. The teaching narrative is expected to provide evidence of characteristics of teaching dynamic, and the DPC shall look for evidence of these attributes as part of the peer-review process.

In order to evaluate teaching activities, teaching dynamic and professional development, the Portfolio shall include: (1) a self evaluation, (2) student evaluations and (3) peer evaluations along with necessary supporting materials as prescribed by this document or selected by the faculty member. A priori, no one of these three components is intended to dominate the overall evaluation. Furthermore, the Department wishes to make it clear that, even though the SRIs are important as a measure of student evaluation, the fact that they are the only quantitative component does not mean that they are more important, and they shall not be given a dominant role based solely on their quantitative nature.

II.C.1. Self Evaluation. The Teaching Performance Narrative is the primary form of self evaluation. During preparation of the narrative the faculty member shall address his/her Developmental Narrative and take time to reflect on successes and failures during the review period and revise goals and objectives for future classes. If a written plan to improve performance had been developed in consultation with the Chair and DPC during the previous review period, the plan and the faculty member’s response shall be discussed here also.

II.C.1.a. Classroom Teaching Performance. The self-evaluation narrative shall consider the following two areas.

(1) Documentable teaching activities. An appraisal of documented teaching activities is an assessment of the degree to which course goals and objectives have been met. Copies of syllabi and exams, Classroom Observation Forms (peer-review), summaries of grade distributions and student opinion questionnaires shall be included in the Teaching Performance portfolio. The use of equipment, library holdings, personnel and facilities that support teaching, and measures of improvement in student cognitive skills, job performance, retention, and similar parameters may also be addressed. The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative: What specific changes have I made that help me meet my goals and objectives? What have I done to improve the clarity and usefulness of the verbal and written materials that students receive? What have I done to encourage the students to become self-directed learners? What innovative teaching and evaluation methods did I try and were they successful? What is my response to comments on the student opinion questionnaires? What are my goals and objectives for the next review period?

(2) Teaching dynamic. The narrative should illustrate the dynamic of teaching as supported by selected comments from students, personal perceptions, and any other information that may help the DPC understand achievements in this important area of teaching. Again, the following questions
reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative: How do I share my excitement for biology with my students? How have I diversified my teaching styles to accommodate diverse learning styles? How have I engaged my students in active learning? What can I do to improve my teaching dynamic?

II.C.1.b. Development of curriculum. Another important area of Teaching Performance is the development of new courses or the extensive modification of existing courses. Experienced faculty should be more involved than new faculty in this type of teaching activity, but both groups, no doubt, will be engaged in curricular development. Teaching Performance Narratives should discuss the pedagogical importance of the new course(s) or course modifications developed during the review period. The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative: How does the course enhance the departmental curriculum? What important aspect of biology does it explore? What innovations will be employed in the course? How do modifications made to existing courses strengthen the goals of the course and Department?

II.C.1.c. Supervision of student research. Research is the process of doing biology, not just learning about it. The skills of hypothesis development and testing, experimental design, laboratory or field techniques, data analysis, and communication of results are essential to a professional biologist. For this reason, an important activity of the biology faculty is the mentoring of student researchers. Many undergraduate and all graduate students engage in independent research in the laboratories of biology faculty members. The close student-faculty association and the passage of laboratory/field expertise is difficult to chronicle, but its importance cannot be overemphasized. The narrative should concisely discuss the role of the faculty member in these activities. The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative. How do I maintain currency in my discipline? How do I approach the process of helping the student become a thinking biologist? In what ways do I help my students learn the process of experimental design? What are the objectives of the student research project? How does the student’s study fit in with the appropriate body of knowledge? Have I encouraged and provided opportunities for the student to communicate her/his findings to the scientific community? Contributions to graduate research are also made via faculty involvement on thesis committees and assistance with student use of instruments or techniques. These contributions should be documented as well.

II.C.1.d. Advising and mentoring activities. Molding the career of a biology student requires close interaction between faculty and students. The Department considers advising and mentoring of students to be an important aspect of Teaching Performance. This process may take three forms: (1) academic and
career advising, (2) mentoring and role modeling, and (3) supervising student research. Discussion of these advising and mentoring activities shall be included in the Teaching Performance Narrative.

II.C.1.e. Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher and in the Discipline. To be effective educators, faculty members must strive to improve their classroom performance. In addition, they must maintain currency in the biological sciences, particularly in those areas that reflect their primary teaching responsibilities. Participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, attendance at scientific conferences, and interactions with colleagues in the discipline are evidence of such professional development.

II.C.2. Student Opinion of Teaching Performance. The primary mechanisms for student evaluation of Teaching Performance are the SRIs and the statistical summaries of SRIs. The SRIs shall have objective and subjective components. Each shall consist of questions deemed relevant to the different types of classes. Additional input from students in the form of written, signed letters shall be considered if included in the Portfolio appendix. It shall be noted whether these were solicited or unsolicited letters.

II.C.2.a. Types of SRIs. Four types of SRIs are used by the Department—one for lecture courses, one for lecture/laboratory/field courses (when lab is taught by the lecture instructor), another for laboratory/field courses or laboratory/field components of courses (if the lab is taught by a different instructor), and another for seminar and seminar-like courses.

II.C.2.b. Levels of Performance. In the objective portion of the SRIs, students shall react to statements about the instructor with “A” = Outstanding to “E” = Unacceptable. The DPC shall determine ratings for both the objective and subjective components (see Section II.C.4. Determination of Level of Teaching Performance).

II.C.2.c. Lecture SRIs. SRIs used in lecture courses shall have two components: (1) an objective component where students will evaluate teaching performance and (2) a subjective component where students will answer open-ended questions about the course and the instructor. Questions shall be relevant to lecture courses.

II.C.2.d. Laboratory SRIs. SRIs used in laboratory/field courses shall have an objective and a subjective component also. However, the questions asked shall reflect the specific objectives of a laboratory/field course.

II.C.2.e. Seminar SRIs. SRIs used in seminars and similar courses where objectives differ from both lecture and laboratory/field courses, shall reflect the specific objectives of that type of course.

II.C.3. Peer Evaluation. One of the best ways to evaluate Teaching Performance by faculty is through review by other biologists. Such peer review is a critical part of the Teaching Performance evaluation process and should be aimed at determining the overall quality of a faculty member’s Teaching Performance. DPC members shall participate as peers in evaluating the teaching effectiveness and the academic standards and expectations of department faculty members by: (1) visiting classes, completing Classroom Observation Forms, and evaluating in-class Teaching Performance, (2) evaluating course materials,
(3) examining grade distributions and (4) reading and evaluating the Teaching Performance Narrative.

II.C.3.a. **Class visitation.** Classroom or laboratory visitation is the best way for each DPC member to develop first-hand knowledge of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. For untenured, probationary faculty, such visitations shall be performed by each member of the DPC at least once during the academic year prior to each review (unless prohibited by class schedule conflicts), preferably during the fall semester. For tenured faculty under review, visitations shall be performed by a subcommittee of the DPC during the spring semester.

During class visitations, DPC members shall observe and assess the learning environment within the classroom (both the instructor and the classroom environment). These visits are also a mechanism to provide constructive feedback to the instructor.

Based on all Classroom Observation Forms in the portfolio, the DPC shall evaluate Teaching Performance with respect to the quality of documentable teaching activities and teaching dynamic, as described in Section II.C.

II.C.3.b. **Quality of course materials.** The course materials submitted are expected to reflect the nature of the course itself. The list of items appropriate for this section can be found in Section VI.B. (Evaluation for Tenure) Teaching Performance. The DPC shall evaluate these materials with a primary focus on how they represent the quality of the course. The Department expects courses to be presented at the highest level of quality with rigor appropriate for the level of the students.

II.C.3.c. **Grade distributions.** In accordance with UPS 210.00, grade distributions shall also be examined.

II.C.3.d. **Reading and evaluating the Teaching Performance Narrative.** The DPC shall read and evaluate the Teaching Performance Narrative discussed in Section II.C.1. Self Evaluation.

II.C.3.e. **Additional material.** Additional forms of peer review may be included as deemed appropriate by the faculty member in consultation with the Chairs of the Department and the DPC. Comments and evaluations by peers outside the Department may be included.

II.C.4. **Determination of Level of Teaching Performance.** The Level of Teaching Performance shall be determined by ratings received from the three methods of evaluation discussed in Section II.C. 1-3 above, i.e., (1) Peer Evaluation of the Teaching Narrative, (2) Student Evaluation by SRIs, and (3) Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching and Course Materials. Each of these forms of evaluation shall be of equal importance in determining the Level of Teaching Performance.

II.C.4.a. **Level of Teaching Performance.** The Level of Teaching Performance shall be used for purposes of action (see Sections V.F., VI.F., VII.C.3., IX.B.5., and X.B.5. Action), which depends upon the determination of the Combined Evaluation of Teaching Performance (see below). The Combined Evaluation of Teaching Performance shall be considered in the context of the cumulative nature of the Portfolio and, as appropriate, improvement in teaching performance over the review period shall be used to modify the Combined
Evaluation of Teaching Performance to obtain the Level of Teaching Performance. If improvements are considered, teaching performance over the last year of the review period must fall within the guidelines for the level of performance assigned. The Level of Teaching Performance shall be entered on the Action Matrix (see Sections V.F., VI.F., VII.C.3., IX.B.5., and XB.5. Action) as the DPC’s final rating of teaching performance and shall be used for recommendation of action.

II.C.4.b. **Combined Evaluation of Teaching Performance.** A Combined Evaluation of Teaching Performance is based on the Individual Evaluation of Teaching Performances made by each DPC member.

To obtain an Individual Evaluation of Teaching Performance for the review period, each DPC member shall average their Individual Evaluation of Teaching Narrative, Individual Evaluation of Student Opinion, and Individual Peer Evaluation of Teaching and assign a rating of “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair” or “Unacceptable”. The rating and supporting comments shall be entered by each DPC member on their “Faculty Evaluation Form”. Below are the components that compose the Individual Evaluation of Teaching Performance rating:

1. **Individual Evaluation of Teaching Narrative.** To obtain an Individual Evaluation of Teaching Narrative, each DPC member shall read and evaluate the Teaching Narrative (the self evaluation component of the Portfolio) as defined above in Section II.C.1. Self Evaluation. Based on criteria such as the thoroughness of the narrative, the quality of self-evaluation, the responsiveness to peer and student comments, efforts to continue improvement as needed, and evidence of the characteristics of teaching dynamic, each member shall rate the Teaching Narrative as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable” depending on its overall quality.

2. **Individual Evaluation of Student Opinion.** This evaluation shall be based on SRIs and other sources of student opinion. SRIs have two components—subjective and objective as defined above in Section II.C.2 Student Opinion of Teaching Performance. Each component shall be given equal weight in determination of an Overall SRI Rating. Other written comments submitted in the Portfolio (e.g., solicited or unsolicited signed letters) shall be considered with the Overall SRI Rating in determining the Individual Evaluation of Student Opinion.
   a. **Subjective Components.** To obtain a Single-Course Subjective SRI Rating, each member of the DPC shall read the written comments on each SRI for each class taught during the review period and rate the written comments as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable”, depending on the overall nature of the comments.
   b. **Objective Components.** To obtain a Single-Course Objective SRI Rating, each DPC member shall determine a rating for each class based on the objective questions of the SRIs using the average of all questions. The following scale shall act as a guide. Average objective SRI scores must fall within the ranges: “Outstanding” (3.60-4.00); “Very Good” (3.20-3.59); “Good” (2.80-3.19); “Fair” (2.40-2.79); “Unacceptable” (below 2.4).
(c) **Overall SRI Rating.** The Overall SRI Rating is the average of Single-Course Objective SRI Ratings and Single-Course Subjective SRI Ratings made by each DPC member.

(3) **Individual Peer Evaluation of Teaching.** This evaluation shall be based on peer evaluation of classroom teaching based on the Classroom Observation Forms and course materials. Each DPC member shall perform class visitations as appropriate, evaluate “Classroom Observation Forms”, and read materials submitted as defined above in **Section II.C.3. Peer Evaluation** for each class. These materials shall be used to rate teaching performance as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable.”

III. **SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY.**

III.A. **Department Responsibility.**

At the university level, excellence in scholarship is the foundation for excellence in Teaching Performance. This is particularly true in a broad discipline like biology where knowledge grows more rapidly than textbooks can be published and where productivity in field- or laboratory-based activities are the essence of scholarship. The Department encourages undergraduate and requires graduate student participation in scholarly and creative activity. Faculty are required to establish and maintain productive programs of scholarship that accommodate both undergraduate and graduate students.

III.B. **Definition of Scholarly and Creative Activities in Biology.**

No matter whether studies are directed at developing a fundamental understanding of biological processes or at creating innovative ways to help students learn about them, *original research is the basis for scholarship* in the discipline. As a result of original research, faculty members become experts in a sub-discipline of biology. It is this expertise that qualifies them to offer courses in the Department’s curriculum and to mentor students doing research in their laboratories. The products of scholarship, whose roots are firmly planted in original research, include the following: (1) Primary research, i.e., the generation of new information that advances knowledge in a particular sub-discipline of biology; (2) Research which is synthetic in nature, i.e., the compilation and organization of material to make it more accessible to other researchers and students in the field and that, for example, offers new perspectives or defines gaps in our knowledge; and, (3) Work of a more applied, contractual nature undertaken with specific objectives specified by a particular sponsor.

III.C. **Performance in Scholarly and Creative Activities.**

Because biology is a broad discipline, research encompasses activities ranging from the study of whole organisms and their interactions with each other and the environment to investigations of molecular interactions and the control of cellular processes. Thus, the Department recognizes that, whether a study is field-oriented or laboratory-based, the time from project initiation to completion may be measured in years. For example, field studies may be subject to seasonal and environmental (and sometimes political) factors out of the control of the investigator. By the same token, laboratory studies may require considerable time to complete because of the use of intricate, labor-intensive techniques that involve manipulation of a large number of variables. Consequently, a biologist may experience a long period when an ongoing, active research program does not produce any publications. Yet, several papers may be submitted at the end of this period. For this reason, the
Department does not rely solely on the number of publications or their even spacing over a review period, but instead places strong emphasis on the maintenance of an active research program and on the quality and significance of the resulting scholarly publications. Productivity and progress in scholarship and creative accomplishments may be measured in each of the ways outlined below.

**III.C.1. Importance of Publication.** Publication is an important step in any scientific investigation, and, ultimately, is the basis upon which the lasting value of the work shall be judged. Generally, manuscripts that receive rigorous peer evaluation prior to publication will be of greater value to the advancement of knowledge in the discipline. Therefore, the DPC shall give greater importance to publications receiving rigorous peer review. Nevertheless, the DPC recognizes that rigorous peer review may vary from multi-reader evaluation to inspection by a single editor, and that publications receiving little or no peer review may be important contributions. However, the latter will require careful evaluation by the DPC to determine their importance.

Unpublished research, which may range from a near-complete manuscript to a mere collection of partially analyzed data, constitutes evidence of on-going activity. However, unpublished research is much less important than published work.

**III.C.2. Importance of Grant/Contract Writing.** Funding of research activities through the receipt of contracts and grants is fundamental to the research success of a faculty member as well as the overall academic success of the Department. Although the Department recognizes that successful acquisition of funds from intramural sources is valuable, the pursuit of extramural funding is more important, and competitive grant and contract applications funded by extramural sources are of greatest value. Faculty are expected to seek funding for research and instrumentation from established extramural funding agencies through competitive grants reviewed by peers. In the highly competitive grant-seeking environment, submission of proposals is seen as an essential research activity. The quality of proposals should be determined by the review panel comments as well as funding status. The scholarly value of contracts not competitively reviewed is variable; therefore, sufficient documentation for evaluation of their merit by the DPC should be provided.

**III.C.3. Importance of Presentations.** Presentation of papers and seminars to learned bodies is an important way to communicate research findings and is a natural outcome of the research process. Presentations are particularly important for communicating work in progress and for receiving feedback from other workers in the field. Also, presentations are seen as a vehicle by which a faculty member can establish herself/himself as an expert in the field.

**III.C.4. Importance of Supervision of Student Research.** The continuity of biology as a discipline is built on the foundation of well-trained students who become productive biologists, i.e., people who do biology. Faculty are expected to involve graduate and undergraduate students in their research programs with the goal of developing the cognitive and manual skills required to investigate biological processes. These include: critical thinking skills required for developing research questions, building hypotheses, and designing sound experimental protocols; technical prowess necessary for performing experiments, making observations and gathering data; analytical skills required for
analysis of the data; and communication skills necessary to inform the scientific community of research findings. Such mentoring is fundamental to the academic success of individual students and to the achievement of departmental goals.

III.D. Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activity.

Consistent with the Developmental Narrative and performance in Scholarly and Creative Activity, faculty members shall be evaluated by analysis of (1) self-evaluations and (2) peer evaluations.

III.D.1. Self Evaluation. The Scholarly and Creative Activity narrative is the primary tool for self-evaluation of performance in this area. The narrative should consist of a concise discussion of the Research and other scholarly and creative activity that has transpired during the review period. The faculty member should attempt to put the work into perspective with other work in the field and to emphasize the most important aspects of her/his research findings with attention to contributions made by undergraduate and graduate students. All research products should be listed in standard reference format and documented where necessary as described in the research section under the relevant type of review. If, during the previous review period, a written plan to improve performance had been developed in consultation with the Chair and DPC, the plan and the faculty member’s response shall be discussed here also.

III.D.2. Peer Evaluation. Peer evaluation shall consist of DPC review of the research narrative and the body of material submitted as evidence of ongoing research, research productivity, and other scholarly and creative activity. Evaluations by external reviewers and colleagues in the field is not required but shall also be considered when available.

IV. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

Faculty members are expected to participate in activities that benefit professional societies and organizations and the University and Community. All faculty members are expected to make consistent, productive contributions to faculty governance, particularly as members of Departmental committees. Other Professional, University and Community Service activities should reflect an individual’s interests and capitalize on special expertise or abilities. Involvement in activities that promote and support a particular scientific or educational area is important in establishing a faculty member as part of a larger community of professional scientists and educators. All faculty members are expected to participate in these activities. However, for untenured faculty members, participation in these activities are of secondary importance to establishing proficiency in teaching and to developing a productive research program. Service plays an increasingly important role in evaluating faculty members who are being reviewed for promotion to Professor.

V. EVALUATION FOR RETENTION.

The retention decision determines whether a probationary faculty member shall be reappointed at probationary status for another year, terminated, or be granted a terminal year as set forth in UPS 210.00 Section V.L. Timing of Review Cycles: Types of Recommendations. The initial probationary appointment is for a two-year period, without a review in the first year. Probationary faculty are subject to reviews before they are reappointed to third, fourth, fifth or sixth probationary years or granted tenure (UPS
210.000.1.B.1). The second and fourth probationary year reviews are full Performance Reviews that may result in a recommendation of retention or termination (second probationary review) or granting of a terminal year (fourth and sixth probationary reviews). The third and fifth probationary year reviews are normally Periodic Reviews; reappointment for another probationary year is automatic and evaluations are advisory. The “Review File” submitted for Periodic Review is much less extensive than for a full Performance Review as discussed in UPS 210.000 Section V.L. Timing of Review Cycles: Types of Recommendations. For the “Review File,” Biology faculty shall submit completed Classroom Observation Forms, in addition to an updated curriculum vitae that clearly indicates all activities to be evaluated as specified in the DPD, by academic year, and statistical summaries of student ratings of instruction.

When faculty are hired with service credit (or receive credit before 15 September of their first academic year at CSUF), those faculty shall be informally reviewed by the DPC and Chair who may recommend reappointment for the next probationary year. If the DPC and Chair do not agree on such an action, the faculty member shall prepare a Portfolio according to the President’s timetable. Determination of probationary-year status (including service year credit) is set forth in UPS 210.000 Section I.D. Service Credit.

The purpose of the probationary years is to develop skills and achieve goals required to earn tenure. Furthermore, as stated in UPS 210.000, the Portfolio is a cumulative record. Thus, evidence of growth and progress toward tenure should increase with advancing years of service.

V.A. Eligibility.

Probationary faculty are eligible for retention (i.e., reappointment to probationary status) for up to six years (service credit years are counted as part of the probationary period). After six probationary years, if tenure is not granted, appointment to a seventh terminal year shall occur. Appointment to a terminal year can occur as a consequence of an earlier review if such action is deemed appropriate in the evaluation of the DPC and higher reviewing bodies. Evaluations shall be performed according to the timetable submitted by the President as required by the MOU.

V.B. Teaching Performance.

One of the most important concerns for first and second year probationary faculty is to develop the basic skills required for effective communication in the classroom and laboratory. Teaching assignments are made by the Chair based on departmental needs. DPC expectations for teaching performance may vary with different teaching assignments. For example, instructors in large, lower division or non-major lectures do not have the opportunity for personal contact with each student that small, upper division, major seminar-type classes would have, and SRIs may reflect the differential. Also, the teaching process is much different in these two settings and peer evaluations may reflect that difference. These variations notwithstanding, ultimately, it is expected that the faculty member will develop a Teaching Performance that will meet or exceed the departmental standard for tenure.

During each probationary year full performance review, the DPC shall evaluate the Teaching Performance as discussed in Section II. Teaching Performance. The material that shall be submitted for self evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation is the same as that listed under Section VI.B. (Evaluation for Tenure) Teaching Performance. Faculty members with service credit shall include data and materials generated during that time.
Each DPC member shall determine a Level of the Teaching Performance of a probationary faculty member as defined in Section II.C.4. Determination of Level of Teaching Performance.

V.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity.

The Department’s expectation of probationary faculty increases with the increasing years of experience. In addition to Teaching Performance, the most important concern for the first and second probationary years is the construction of the Developmental Narrative (UPS 210.000 Section III), the establishment of a functional research laboratory, and recruitment of research students. Expectations will vary with teaching assignment because it is clear that this commitment determines the amount of time available for research. During subsequent years, a higher level of productivity will be expected. Ultimately, it is expected that the faculty member will develop and maintain a CSUF-based research program that will meet or exceed the departmental standard for tenure.

The Department’s view of research is presented in Section III.B. Definition of Scholarly and Creative Activities in Biology and Section III.C. Performance of Research and Scholarly and Creative Activities. Information that can be submitted in support of research and other scholarly and creative activity is that listed for evaluation of tenure in Section VII.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. Faculty members with service credit shall include data and materials generated during that time.

During the second probationary year review, each member of the DPC shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activities of faculty being considered for retention in categories as defined below.

- **Outstanding** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the establishment of a working laboratory showing student involvement in research; (2) a peer-reviewed paper submitted or a significant extramural grant submitted; (3) a contribution from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and, (4) other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8 (see Section VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity).

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the establishment of a working laboratory showing strong potential for student involvement in research; and, (2) evidence of significant contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-8 (see Section VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity).

- **Fair** - The establishment of a working laboratory with the potential for student involvement in research, but evidence of little other significant activity shall be evaluated as “Fair”.

- **Unacceptable** - Failure to meet the criteria for “Fair” shall be deemed “Unacceptable”.

During the third and fifth probationary year reviews (which are Periodic Reviews), each member of the DPC shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity of faculty being considered for retention in categories as defined below. Although
these reviews are for single years, they occur after several years of activity and, therefore, the DPC will look for evidence of growth and progress toward tenure.

- **Outstanding** - The maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students and that yields an accepted or published peer-reviewed paper or a significant extramural grant funded; a contribution from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8 (see **Section VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity**).

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - The maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students and that yields high-quality, but unpublished data; and, evidence of other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-8 (see **Section VII.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity**).

- **Fair** - The maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students but that has so far resulted only in the collection of high-quality, but unpublished, data.

- **Unacceptable** - Failure to meet the criteria for “Fair” shall be deemed “Unacceptable”.

During the **fourth** probationary year review (which is a full Performance Review covering three years of activity), each member of the DPC shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity of faculty being considered for retention in categories as defined below. Because this review covers three years, the DPC expects to see strong evidence of growth and progress toward tenure.

- **Outstanding** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students; (2) an accepted or published peer-reviewed paper or a significant extramural grant funded; (3) a paper submitted for peer-review or an extramural grant submitted; (4) a paper or grant in development; (5) three contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and (6) other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8 (see **Section VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity**).

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students; (2) a paper submitted for peer-reviewed publication; (3) a paper in preparation; (4) a significant extramural grant proposal submitted; (5) one or two contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and (6) other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8 (see **Section VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity**).

- **Fair** - The maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students and that yields high-quality, but unpublished data; and, evidence of other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative
Activity Areas 1-8 (see Section VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity).

- Unacceptable - Failure to meet the criteria for “Fair” shall be deemed “Unacceptable”.

V.D. Professional, University, and Community Service

While Professional, University, and Community Service are important to the growth of the faculty member and to the reputation of the University, this area plays a relatively minor role in the granting of tenure. Modest, but high-quality and on-going, activity in this area is sufficient.

V.D.1. Professional, University, and Community Service. See Section VI.D. (Evaluation for Tenure) Professional, University, and Community Service for a list of appropriate activities.

V.D.2. Evaluation of Professional, University and Community Service. Evaluation of Service shall be made by the faculty member and by the DPC.

V.D.2.a. Self-evaluation. The faculty member should include in a concise narrative, contributions made to the profession and to the Department, the College, the University, and the Community.

V.D.2.b. Peer Evaluation. The DPC shall review the body of material submitted as evidence of service activities and shall deem these contributions as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, and “Unacceptable”.

V.E. Action.

Faculty hired with service credit (or who receive credit before 15 September of their first academic year at CSUF) shall be informally reviewed by the DPC and Chair and may be recommended for reappointment for the next probationary year. If the DPC and Chair do not agree on such an action, they shall review a formal Portfolio and recommend for another probationary year or termination at the end of the first academic year at CSUF.

The second and fourth probationary year reviews are full reviews. Based on the evaluation process as outlined above, the DPC shall vote on a recommendation for retention.

During the first probationary year, the Developmental Narrative is completed and included in the Portfolio submitted during the second probationary year review. During subsequent years, the Developmental Narrative may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

Because, the fourth probationary year covers three years of activity, it should show growth and progress toward tenure; thus, many of the expectations for tenure should have been met by this time. An overall DPC evaluation of “Unacceptable” in either Teaching Performance or Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity should result in a recommendation for termination (second probationary year review) or a terminal year (fourth probationary year review).

The third and fifth probationary year reviews are periodic, reappointment for another probationary year is automatic and evaluations are advisory. Nevertheless, performance should be on track for tenure.
During each probationary year review, the DPC evaluation of the Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity performance shall note the progress made toward the eventual granting of tenure. Specific reference about satisfactory progress toward this goal shall be included in a letter from the DPC to the faculty member. If deficiencies are found, the Chair in consultation with the DPC and the faculty member shall develop a written plan to aid the faculty member in attaining the level of performance expected. In such a case, periodic assessment outside the usual review process could be part of this plan if desired by the faculty member. Statement of the plan and discussion of the faculty member’s response to it shall be included in the narrative section of the subsequent Portfolio.

VI. EVALUATION FOR TENURE.

The granting of tenure, which is normally accompanied by promotion to Associate Professor, is an important long-term commitment by the Department and University. It is a statement of the value of a faculty member’s contribution to the academic goals and objectives of the Department and the University. Therefore, this evaluation process is extensive and the Portfolio is to be cumulative. A high level of success shall have been attained by the end of the probationary period with strong evidence of continued improvement and on-going activity.

VI.A. Eligibility.

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure during their sixth probationary year, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed. The granting of tenure before the sixth year shall be considered “early tenure” and is discussed in Section VI. Evaluation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion.

VI.B. Teaching Performance.

For the granting of tenure, the Department expects the faculty member to have developed into a well-rounded teacher who exhibits proficiency at several levels of classroom instruction and who uses a variety of teaching techniques with skill. The DPC must determine that the faculty member has demonstrated an ability to contribute to the teaching goals and objectives of the Department and shows evidence of an ongoing program of professional development as a teacher and in the discipline.

Each member of the DPC shall evaluate Teaching Performance as outlined in Section II. Teaching Performance based on:

- **Self-evaluation materials** - The Teaching Performance Narrative is the primary vehicle for self-evaluation. As appropriate, it should include treatment of classroom teaching, development of curriculum, participation in activities to develop pedagogical skills and maintain currency in the discipline, supervision of research students and advising activities for the review period. The narrative should be cumulative and not necessarily treat each semester separately. If the same course has been taught several times, a discussion of the progressive development of that course should be included.

- **Materials taken from all courses taught during the review period** shall be submitted in the Portfolio appendix in support of the Teaching Performance Narrative. For courses taught several times, multiple samples may be submitted to demonstrate the progressive development of the course, but otherwise materials should be limited to a single representative sample.
1. Copies of syllabi provided to students that include a fairly detailed list of topics discussed.
2. Representative assignments.
3. Representative copies of examinations and other types of evaluative devices, along with an explanation of how these were administered (i.e., in-class, take-home, open-book, etc.).
4. Representative handouts provided to the students in support of the course.
5. Grade distributions.

- The following items may be submitted as deemed useful by the faculty member:
  1. Samples of lecture notes and/or videotapes of lectures.
  2. Samples of original audio-visual materials.
  3. Samples of original study aids.
  5. Evidence of attending workshops, symposia, etc. designed to help faculty improve teaching performance.
  6. Evidence of attending conferences and/or other interactions with colleagues designed to maintain currency in the discipline.
  7. Evaluation of textbooks used and changes made.
  8. Evidence of student performance such as exam averages.
  9. Samples of student learning assessments.
  10. Evidence of efforts to teach an increasingly diverse student population.
  11. Other evidence as deemed appropriate by faculty member.

- **Student evaluation materials** - SRIs and summaries of SRIs shall be submitted for each semester during the review period. If signed letters from students are available they may be included in the appendix and shall be marked as solicited or unsolicited. Other forms of student evaluation may be submitted as deemed appropriate by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Chair and the DPC Chair.

- **Peer evaluation materials** - The Classroom Observation Forms for each semester of the review period shall be submitted. Other types of peer evaluation may be included as described in Section II.C.3. Peer Evaluation.

Each DPC member shall determine a Level of the Teaching Performance of a faculty member being considered for tenure as defined in Section II.C.4. Determination of Level of Teaching Performance.

**VI.C. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity.**

For the granting of tenure, the Department expects the faculty member to have developed a well-rounded CSUF-based research program that encourages and provides for student involvement consistent with the Developmental Narrative. Each faculty member is required to contribute to the knowledge in his or her area of specialization and, thus, to the discipline in general. Contributions shall be in accordance with areas discussed in Section III.B. Definition of Scholarly and Creative Activity in Biology and Section III.C. Performance of Research and Scholarly and Creative Activity, and specifically indicated below. The quality of the contributions is most important, but the DPC shall also consider the quantity, and it is expected that several papers will have been published during the tenure-review
period. As stated previously, the timing of publication is not critical, but evidence of an on-going research program must be presented.

Below is a list of the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas in which contributions may be submitted. These are listed in descending order of importance.

1. **Primary research papers:** Citations (authors, date, title, journal, volume, pages) from peer-reviewed publications that represent original contributions to knowledge in biology. Co-authored citations should indicate the contributions of the faculty member to the product. The greater the involvement of the faculty member, the more important the contribution.

2. **Contributions of a synthetic nature:** Citations (authors, date, title, journal or book title, volume, pages) of review papers, book chapters, books, symposium proceedings and the like that primarily compile, organize and analyze large quantities of material in the field. Co-authored citations should indicate the contributions of the faculty member to the product.

3. **Grants:** Citations of funded grants in support of original research (whether for instrumentation, personnel, or operating expenses) and unfunded grant proposals in support of original research submitted to established funding agencies for competitive evaluation by peers; size and longevity of successful grants shall be considered. Co-PIs should indicate the relative contribution they made to the proposal. Funded proposals shall be weighted more heavily than unfunded proposals. Funded and unfunded intramural proposals shall be considered, but given lower value.

4. **Textbooks, courseware and software:** Citations of textbooks. Courseware and software developed for innovative instruction or specialized research uses should also be submitted. These contributions shall be evaluated based on originality, creativity and value to the discipline. (Contributions in this area are not encouraged until after tenure has been achieved.)

5. **Technical reports:** Citations (authors, date, title, agency, document or journal, pages) of technical reports presented in completion of contracts that have a substantial scholarly value and are not simply a professional exercise. (Contributions in this area are not encouraged until after tenure has been achieved.)

6. **Evidence of presentations at professional meetings:** Citations of published or unpublished abstracts from papers or posters presented at regional, national or international meetings, conferences, or symposia.

7. **Other publications:** Citations of published reviews of books on biology; other publications in the discipline.

8. **Unpublished materials:** Manuscripts in preparation; grant proposals in preparation; graduate and undergraduate student reports; compiled and analyzed research data; and the like.

Each member of the DPC shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity of faculty being considered for tenure in categories as defined below.

- **Outstanding** - Important, high-quality contributions from a CSUF-based research program are expected from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-6 as follows. There shall be: (1) at least three peer-reviewed contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 or 2, two of which should contain significant primary research; (2) at least
one significant extramural grant shall have been funded (Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 3); (3) at least an average of one contribution each year from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6 is expected; and (4) contributions in other Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas commensurate with this level of performance.

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good”, shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - Valuable contributions from a CSUF-based research program shall have been made from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1, 2, 3 and 6 as follows. There shall be: (1) at least two peer-reviewed contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 (contributions in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 2 may substitute for one of these, but should contain some primary research); (2) at least one substantive, good quality extramural grant proposal (Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 3) shall have been submitted and two intramural grants shall have been funded if no extramural grant was awarded; (3) an average of one contribution every other year from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6 shall have been made; and, (4) contributions in other Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas commensurate with this level of performance.

- **Fair** - The presence of on-campus research activity that includes contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 or 2, 3, and 6 meeting some, but not all, of the minimum criteria for “Good”; and including contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 7 and 8 may be rated as “Fair”.

- **Unacceptable** - Research contributions that do not meet the criteria for “Fair” shall be rated “Unacceptable”.

**VI.D. Professional, University, and Community Service.**

While Service, as discussed in Section IV. Professional, University, and Community Service, is important to the growth of the faculty member and furthers communication within the University and to the Community, it plays a relatively minor role in the granting of tenure. Modest, but high-quality, on-going activity in this area is sufficient.

**VI.D.1. Types of evidence in support of Professional Service.**

Documentation should include dates and titles of the activities described below. This is a list of possible activities, which may not be complete and does not denote any order of importance or value.

**VI.D.1.a Service at meetings of professional societies or organizations.** This category includes involvement in organizing or chairing meetings, symposia or contributed paper sessions. Participation as a presenter of original research as defined in Section III.B. Definition of Scholarly and Creative Activity should be included under Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity.

**VI.D.1.b Service in an official capacity for professional organizations.** This includes activity as an officer, committee chair or committee member in professional societies or organizations.
VI.D.1.c. **Awards and honors from professional societies or organizations.** Awards or honors presented by professional societies or organizations should be entered as evidence of professional service.

VI.D.1.d. **Service as an editor or member of an editorial board for professional publications.**

VI.D.1.e. **Service as a reviewer for professional publications or extramural granting agencies.** Included is service as a reviewer of papers for scientific journals and textbooks, and as a reviewer of extramural grant applications for organizations such as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other granting agencies.

VI.D.1.f. **Presentation of seminars or lectures at other institutions.**

VI.D.1.g. **Service as a consultant for public or private agencies.**

VI.D.2. **Types of evidence in support of Service to the University and Community.** The following list indicates the types of activities considered by the DPC as evidence of Service to the University and Community consistent with the Developmental Narrative. This list may not be complete and does not denote any order of importance or value.

VI.D.2.a. **Service in governance of the Department, College, and University.** Service on standing or ad hoc committees or offices involved in the governance of these units.

VI.D.2.b. **Service in organizing or conducting Department, College, University, or Community functions and activities.** Service on committees or offices involved in planning various functions (e.g., social functions for the Department, Day in Science for the College), mentoring activities sponsored by the College and University, and reviewing proficiency examinations for the University (e.g., the English Writing Proficiency examinations).

VI.D.2.c. **Participation in department meetings, seminars, and other activities.** Attendance at departmental meetings, seminars, workshops, and other activities.

VI.D.2.d. **Service as a sponsor or advisor to student organizations.** This category includes activities such as serving as a reviewer of grants for the Associated Students and mentoring high school students in science participation programs organized by groups outside of the University.

VI.D.2.e. **Presentations of lectures delivered to community groups or organizations.** The dates, titles and locations of such lectures should be included for these activities.

VI.D.2.f. **Service to community groups.** This may include participation in local and state science fairs, activity on local boards or in community groups, and participation in community functions such as local sports or art groups.

VI.D.2.g. **Other service activities deemed appropriate by the DPC.**

VI.D.3. **Evaluation of Professional, University, and Community Service.** Evaluation of Service shall be made by the faculty member and by the DPC.

VI.D.3.a. **Self-evaluation.** In a concise narrative, the faculty member should review the contributions made in the areas of Professional Service and Service to the University and Community during the period under consideration.
VI.D.3.b. **Peer Evaluation.** The DPC shall review the body of material submitted as evidence of Professional, University and Community Service, and evaluate these contributions as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable”. The Department considers the two areas of Professional Service and Service to the University and Community to be of equal importance. A "Good" rating requires evidence of activity in both areas. "Very Good" and "Outstanding" ratings require greater and more varied activities in both areas.

**VI.E. Action**

Following the evaluation process as outlined above, the DPC shall vote on recommendation of tenure based on the overall summary DPC evaluation. The Department’s expectation for the granting of tenure is a minimum of a combined rating of “Very Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and ratings of at least “Good” in Service. Combined ratings of less than “Good” in Teaching Performance, Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service should result in a recommendation of a terminal year. Under unusual circumstances that are documented in the Portfolio, the DPC may recommend tenure for a faculty member with combined ratings of “Outstanding” and “Fair” or “Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity and a rating of at least “Good” in Service. However, under such conditions the DPC shall provide a thorough explanation in support of its decision.

The Action Matrix shown below shall guide the DPC in making its recommendation for tenure (given summary DPC evaluations of “Good” or better for Service). (See **Section VIII. Evaluation for Early Tenure, and Early Promotion** for information on early tenure.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Early Tenure is possible
Recommendation for Tenure
Recommendation for Tenure is possible
Recommendation for Terminal Year

Explicit explanation of the recommendation shall be included in a letter from the DPC to the faculty member. If deficiencies are found, if time remains in the faculty member’s probationary period for another tenure review, and if it is deemed feasible and desirable by the DPC and Department Chair, they, in consultation with the faculty member, shall develop a written plan to aid the faculty member in attaining the level of performance expected. Statement of the plan and discussion of the faculty member’s response to it shall be included in the narrative section of the subsequent Portfolio.
VII. EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION

VII.A. Eligibility for Promotion to Associate Professor.
Promotion to Associate Professor occurs with the granting of tenure. Therefore, the criteria described in Section VI. Evaluation for Tenure shall be applied. Early tenure and early promotion shall be recommended when requested by the faculty member in writing and warranted by the faculty member’s overall accomplishments. Such decisions require that an individual exceed the requirements for tenure or promotion in a period shorter than the usual time frame. Early tenure and early promotion decisions shall be made in accordance with criteria in UPS 210.00.IV.G.3 and H.2 and as described in Section VIII. Evaluation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion.

VII.B. Eligibility for Promotion to Professor.
Promotion of a tenured faculty member shall normally be considered if he/she has met the conditions described in UPS 210.000. Promotion to Professor must be requested in writing by the faculty member. A faculty member may request in writing that he/she not be considered for promotion, in which case evaluation shall continue according to guidelines in Section IX. Evaluation of Tenured Associate Professors.

The Department considers promotion to Professor to be a significant step, recognizing contributions to the discipline, to the Department, and to the University. Thus, the Department expects that faculty members being considered for promotion to Professor should perform at or above the level expected for Recommendation for Tenure in the areas of Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and perform above the level expected for Recommendation for Tenure in the area of Professional, University and Community Service. For a tenured faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor, the time period of review shall be the time since the last full review that resulted in a recommendation for tenure or the previous five years, whichever is less.

VII.C. Promotion to Professor.

VII.C.1. Teaching Performance. For promotion to Professor, the Department encourages the faculty member to develop a leadership role in Teaching Performance, and expects the faculty member to have maintained at least an overall “Good” to “Very Good” Teaching Performance according to the criteria discussed in Section VI. Evaluation for Tenure. For the rare situation where a faculty member is requesting simultaneous promotion to Professor and the granting of tenure, all conditions for tenure and promotion to Professor apply. And in this situation, activities at CSUF shall be weighted most heavily and evidence of continued high-level performance is expected.

In addition, individuals being considered for promotion to Professor shall have contributed to the Department objectives in other teaching-related activities as indicated below.

The DPC shall evaluate Teaching Performance as outlined in Section II. Teaching Performance and Section VI. Evaluation for Tenure based on the following material:

VII.C.1.a. Self evaluation materials. As described in Section VI.B. (Evaluation for Tenure) Teaching Performance.

VII.C.1.b. Student evaluation materials. As described in Section VI.B.
(Evaluation for Tenure) Teaching Performance.

VII.C.1.c. Peer evaluation materials. As described in Section VI.B. (Evaluation for Tenure) Teaching Performance.

VII.C.1.d Teaching-related activities. Documentation of productive contributions in other teaching-related areas is required. This is a list of possible teaching-related activities, which may not be complete and does not denote any order of importance or value:

1. Original curricular development (e.g., departmental approval of a new course, implementation of new courses or components of courses).
2. Incorporation and assessment of innovative teaching techniques or strategies in lectures or laboratories.
3. Completion of textbooks, laboratory manuals, etc.
4. Funding of an extramural grant for teaching equipment, development of teaching materials, creation of fellowships or institutes at CSUF or of educational interactions with other institutions, or other similar activities.
5. Organization of symposia in support of the teaching objectives of the Department.
6. Productive contributions in activities such as core laboratory/field course coordinator, seminar coordinator, departmental graduate advisor, or similar activities.

Each DPC member shall determine a Level of Teaching Performance of a faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor as defined in Section II.C.4.

Determination of Level of Teaching Performance. In this determination, each DPC member shall include an individual evaluation of other Teaching Related activities as described below:

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Related Activities. This evaluation shall be based on peer evaluation of activities as outlined above (VII.C.1.d). Each DPC member shall examine documentation to determine the quality and level of productivity associated with other teaching-related activities. Rating of teaching-related activity performance as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable” depends on the nature of these activities.

VII.C.2. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. After receiving tenure, the Department encourages the faculty member to develop a leadership role in research, and expects the continuation of an active research program of the type described under Section VI.C. (Tenure) Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity that makes valuable contributions to biology. Contributions should be from areas discussed in Section III.B. Definition of Scholarly and Creative Activities in Biology and Section III.C. Performance in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activities, and the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas specifically listed in Section VI.C. (Tenure) Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. The quality of the contributions is most important, but the DPC shall also consider the quantity, and it is expected that several papers will have been published during the promotion review period (the time since the
last full review that resulted in a recommendation for tenure or the previous five years, whichever is less). As stated previously, the timing of publication is not critical, but evidence of an on-going research program must be presented.

Each member of the DPC shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity of faculty being considered for promotion to Professor in categories as defined below.

- **Outstanding** - It is expected that important, high-quality contributions will have been made from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-5. There shall be at least three contributions in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 or 2, at least two of which shall be primary research papers. A contribution in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 4 may be considered in substitution for a contribution in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 2. One extramural grant (Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 3) shall have been funded or 3 well-reviewed extramural proposals shall have been submitted. There shall be at least an average of one contribution per year from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6. Contributions in other Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas shall be considered.

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - Valuable contributions shall have been made in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 or 2, and 3 and 6. At least two contributions in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 1 or 2, of which one shall be a primary research paper. A contribution in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 4 may be considered in substitution for one contribution in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 2. One high-quality proposal (Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 3) shall have been submitted to an extramural agency, and two intramural proposals shall have been funded if no extramural grant was awarded. An average of at least one contribution each other year from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6 shall have been made. Contributions in other Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas shall be considered.

- **Fair** - The presence of research activity that includes contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 through 6 meeting some, but not all of the criteria for “Good”, and including contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 7 and 8 may be rated as “Fair”.

- **Unacceptable** - Research contributions that fail to meet any of the criteria for “Good” shall be rated “Unacceptable”.

**VII.C.3. Professional, University, and Community Service.** Service is an important consideration in the promotion to Professor. The Department expects tenured Associate Professors to actively engage in professional affairs, play important roles in professional organizations in their fields, and contribute service to the Department, University and Community at a level above that expected for untenured faculty members. To be
recommended for promotion to Professor, consistent, productive contributions to
Departmental, College, or University governance are required, contributions to the
profession are expected, and the extent and significance of other service contributions will
be considered in the DPC evaluation. Contributions include serving as chair of
departmental committees, participation in College- or University-wide committees, as well
as those discussed in Section VI.D. Professional, University, and Community Service.

The DPC shall evaluate Service as outlined in Section IV. Professional, University,
and Community Service and Section VI.D. Evaluation for Tenure. Professional, University,
and Community Service.

VII.C.4. Action. Following the evaluation process as outlined above, the DPC shall vote
on recommendation for promotion to Professor based on the overall summary DPC
evaluation. The Department’s expectation for promotion to Professor is a combined rating
of “Very Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly
and Creative Activity, and a rating of “Very Good” in Professional, University and
Community Service. Under unusual circumstances, the DPC may recommend promotion
for a faculty member with combined ratings of “Outstanding” and “Fair” or “Good” and
“Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity.
However, under such conditions the DPC shall provide thorough explanation in support of
its decision. Otherwise, combined ratings below expectations shall result in
recommendation to hold at Associate Professor.

The Action Matrices shown below shall guide the DPC in making its
recommendation. (See Section VIII. Evaluation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion for
information on early tenure and early promotion.)
Explicit explanation of the recommendation shall be included in a letter from the DPC to the faculty member. If deficiencies are found, the Chair in consultation with the DPC and the faculty member shall develop a written plan to aid the faculty member in attaining the level of performance expected. Statement of the plan and discussion of the faculty member's response to it shall be included in the narrative section of the subsequent Portfolio.

VIII. EVALUATION FOR EARLY TENURE AND EARLY PROMOTION

VIII.A. Eligibility

VIII. A. 1. Early Tenure. Faculty members shall normally be considered for Tenure during their sixth probationary year, irrespective of their appointed rank. Conditions for early tenure are outlined in UPS 210.000. Consideration for Early Tenure may be requested by a faculty member after having completed at least two years of probationary service and before completing the fifth probationary year. Requests for an Early Tenure decision must be submitted in writing to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records by the deadline indicated in UPS 210.000.

VIII. A. 2. Early Promotion. The promotion of a probationary faculty member shall not normally occur during the probationary period. Conditions for early promotion are outlined in UPS 210.000. A faculty member may, however, apply for Early Promotion after completing at least one year of service at his or her appointed rank. As per UPS 210.000, a probationary faculty member shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate Professor and shall normally be considered for promotion and tenure simultaneously.

To be considered for Early Promotion, a faculty member must apply in writing to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records by the deadline indicated in UPS 210.000.
VIII.B. Criteria for Early Tenure

The granting of Early Tenure requires performance in all areas of evaluation consistent with a normal tenure recommendation PLUS evidence of superior accomplishments in Teaching Performance OR in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, OR performance in both Teaching Performance and Research and Scholarly and Creative Activity judged to exceed the requirements for a normal tenure decision.

To obtain a DPC recommendation for Early Tenure, a faculty member must at least be judged as meeting the requirements for tenure as specified in **Section IV. Professional, University and Community Service, AND**

1. Receive a majority of “Outstanding” DPC evaluations in either Teaching Performance or Research and Scholarly and Creative Activity with the other evaluations in the category being at least “Very Good”, OR

2. Receive an Overall Summary DPC evaluation that substantiates a performance in both Teaching Performance and Research and Scholarly and Creative Activity that exceeds the requirements for a normal tenure decision as set forth in **Section VI. Evaluation for Tenure.**

VIII.C. Criteria for Early Promotion.

The granting of Early Promotion requires performance in all areas of evaluation consistent with a normal promotion recommendation PLUS evidence of superior accomplishments in Teaching Performance, OR in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, OR in both Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity judged to exceed the requirements for a normal promotion decision as set forth in **Section XII. Evaluation for Promotion.**

For Probationary faculty, consideration for Early Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will normally be coupled with a simultaneous consideration for tenure.

Greater emphasis on performance in the category of scholarly and creative activity shall be given during consideration of applications for Early Promotion to Professor since Promotion to that rank requires evidence of continuing scholarly and creative activity. For a probationary faculty member, Early Promotion to the rank of Professor requires simultaneous consideration for tenure.

To obtain a DPC recommendation for Early Promotion, a faculty member must at least be judged as meeting the requirements for promotion to the indicated rank as specified in **Section VII. Evaluation for Promotion, AND**

1. Receive a majority of “Outstanding” DPC evaluations in either Teaching Performance or Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity with the other evaluations in the category being at least “Very Good”, OR

2. Receive an Overall Summary DPC evaluation that substantiates a performance in both Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity that exceeds the requirements for a normal promotion decision as set forth in **Section VII. Evaluation for Promotion.**
IX. EVALUATION OF TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

IX.A. Responsibility of Faculty
Tenured Associate Professors shall be expected to demonstrate continued activity in all three areas of evaluation with the expectation that they will meet the requirements for promotion to Professor.

IX.B. Evaluation Process
Tenured Associate Professors shall undergo performance review according to the time table set forth in the MOU and announced by the President. The process as set forth in this section applies only to peer-review of tenured Associate Professors who are not applying for promotion to Professor. In those cases, the Portfolio shall include an up-to-date curriculum vitae, and, for all courses taught since the last review period, student opinion summaries and grade distributions. A self evaluation shall be included that summarizes performance in the three areas of faculty activity.

IX.B.1. Teaching Performance. The Department expects tenured Associate Professors to strive for excellence and prepare for promotion according to the criteria in Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. In preparation for promotion, these faculty members are also expected to contribute to Department objectives in other teaching-related activities. The DPC shall evaluate Teaching Performance as outlined in Section II. Teaching Performance and Section VII. Promotion. The DPC shall rate tenured Associate Professors in the same categories as used for cases of promotion to Professor (see Section VII.C.1. (Promotion to Professor) Teaching Performance).

IX.B.2. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. The Department expects tenured Associate Professors to strive for excellence and prepare for promotion according to the criteria in Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. These faculty are also expected to continue the active and productive research programs that earned them promotion to Associate Professor. The DPC shall evaluate research as outlined in Section III. Scholarly and Creative Activity and Section VII. Evaluation for Promotion. The DPC shall rate tenured Associate Professors in the same categories as used for cases of promotion to Professor (see Section VII.C.2. (Promotion to Professor) Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity).

IX.B.3. Professional, University, and Community Service. The Department expects tenured Associate Professors to be actively engaged in the professional affairs and organizations of their fields and to participate actively in service to the Department, College, University and Community in preparation for promotion according to the criteria in Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. The DPC shall evaluate Service as outlined in Section IV. Professional, University, and Community Service and Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor.

IX.B.4. Action. Following the evaluation process as outlined above, the DPC shall review progress toward promotion to Professor based on the overall summary DPC evaluation. The Department's expectation for the progress toward promotion to Professor is a combined rating of "Very Good" and "Good" in Teaching Performance and Research
and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and a minimal rating of “Good” in Professional, University, and Community Service. Under unusual circumstances, the DPC may recognize satisfactory progress toward promotion for a faculty member with combined ratings of “Outstanding” and “Fair” or “Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. However, under such conditions the DPC shall provide thorough explanation in support of its decision. Otherwise, combined ratings below expectations shall result in admonition that the present level of performance is unlikely to result in promotion.

Explicit explanation of the evaluation of progress toward promotion shall be included in a letter from the DPC to the faculty member. If deficiencies are found, the Chair in consultation with the DPC and the faculty member shall develop a plan to aid the faculty member in attaining the level of performance expected. Periodic assessment outside the usual review process should be part of this plan. Statement of the plan and discussion of the faculty member’s response to it shall be included in the narrative section of the subsequent Portfolio.

X. EVALUATION OF PROFESSORS

X.A. Responsibility of Faculty.
Professors shall be expected to demonstrate continued growth and productivity in all three areas of performance. They should serve as role models for less experienced faculty in the Department, and their productivity should include leadership in (1) Teaching Performance or Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and (2) Professional, University, and Community Service.

X.B. Evaluation Process
Professors shall undergo performance review every five years according to a schedule established by the Department and shall submit a Portfolio by the third Friday of the spring semester of the academic year. The Portfolio shall include an up-to-date curriculum vitae, and, for all courses taught in the five-year period, student opinion summaries and grade distributions. A self evaluation shall be included that summarizes performance in the three areas of faculty activity.

X.B.1. Teaching Performance. The Department expects Professors to strive for excellence, that is, to achieve an overall “Very Good” to “Outstanding” Teaching Performance according to the criteria in Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. These faculty members are also expected to continue to contribute to departmental objectives in other teaching-related activities (see Section VII.C.1.d). The DPC shall evaluate Teaching Performance as outlined in Section II. Teaching Performance and Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. The DPC shall rate Professors in the same categories as used for cases of promotion to Professor (see Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor).

X.B.2. Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. The Department expects tenured Professors to strive for excellence, that is, to achieve an overall “Very Good” to “Outstanding” performance in scholarly and creative activity according to the criteria in Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. These faculty members are expected to maintain the
active and productive research programs that earned them promotion to Professor. The DPC shall evaluate research as outlined in Section III. Scholarly and Creative Activity and Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. The DPC shall rate Professors in the same categories as used for cases of promotion to Professor (see Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor).

X.B.3. Professional, University, and Community Service. The Department expects Professors to engage in an exemplary fashion in the professional affairs and organizations of their fields and to participate in the activities of the Department, College, University and Community according to the criteria in Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor. The DPC shall evaluate Service as outlined in Section IV. Professional, University, and Community Service and Section VII.C. Promotion to Professor.

X.B.4. Action. Following the evaluation process as outlined above, the DPC shall review contributions to the Department’s goals and objectives for Professors based on the overall summary DPC evaluation. The Department’s expectation for Professors is a combined rating of “Very Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and a rating of “Very Good” in Professional, University, and Community Service. Under unusual circumstances, the DPC may recognize “satisfactory performance with the expectation for improvement” for a faculty member having combined ratings of “Outstanding” and “Fair” or “Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity. However, under such conditions the DPC shall provide thorough explanation in support of its decision. Otherwise, combined ratings below expectations shall result in an unfavorable review.

The Action Matrices shown below shall guide the DPC in making its recommendation.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research</th>
<th></th>
<th>Professional Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Highly Favorable Review is expected
Favorable Review is expected
Improvement during the next review period is expected
Highly Unfavorable Review is expected

Explicit explanation of the evaluation shall be included in a letter from the DPC to the faculty member. If deficiencies are found, the Chair in consultation with the DPC and the faculty member shall develop a written plan to aid the faculty member in attaining the level of performance expected. Statement of the plan and discussion of the faculty member’s response to it shall be included in the narrative section of the subsequent Portfolio.
XI. THE DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

XI.A. Composition

XI.A.1. Number. The DPC shall consist of five voting members and one alternate. At least three Professors shall be members of the DPC.

XI.A.2. Terms. All five voting members shall have two-year terms staggered so that two are elected every other year and three in alternating years. One alternate having a one-year term of office shall be elected each year. The alternate shall become a voting member of the DPC only when the number of participating voting members is fewer than three, or when he or she has replaced a DPC member who has resigned.

XI.B. Elections

XI.B.1. Timing. Election of the voting members of the DPC and the alternate shall occur in the spring semester.

XI.B.2. Announcement. The election shall be announced two weeks in advance.

XI.C. Eligibility

XI.C.1. Faculty. All tenured faculty.

XI.C.2. Exception 1. A faculty member who is subject to a personnel review may serve on the DPC, but cannot participate in the review of his or her own Portfolio.

XI.C.3. Exception 2. Faculty members who are involved in an official recommendation at a level beyond the Department.

XI.C.4. Exception 3. Faculty members who are on leave during any part of their potential term.

XI.C.5. Exception 4. A person may serve consecutive terms only if no eligible faculty are available. Alternates who did not participate in personnel decisions shall be considered as not having served and are therefore eligible for election.

XI.C.6. Exception 5. Former Department Chairs are not eligible to serve until one year after her/his last year as Chair.

XI.C.7. Exception 6. Given that three members must be Professors, eligibility may differ between ballots as a DPC election proceeds.
XI.D. Resignations

Should a resignation be necessary for reasons such as illness or leave-of-absence, the alternate DPC member shall fill the vacated position for the remainder of the term. If required, another alternate shall be elected by special ballot.

XI.E. Balloting Process

XI.E.1. Nominations. The names of all eligible faculty shall be placed in nomination for each position being filled. Positions that must be filled by Professors shall be filled first.

XI.E.2. Votes Required. Election of voting members shall require a majority of the votes cast (not including abstaining votes).

XI.E.3. Separate Ballots. Separate balloting shall be conducted for each vacant seat. The two-year seats shall be filled first, then any one-year seats resulting from a DPC member’s resignation, retirement, or leave, then the alternate seat.

XI.E.4. Ballot 1. If a winner is not determined on the first ballot, the top three vote-receivers shall remain on the second ballot, excluding anyone with zero or one vote.

XI.E.5. Ballot 2. If a winner is not determined on the second ballot, the top two vote-receivers shall remain on the third ballot.

XI.E.6. Ballots 3, 4 and Tie Votes. In the event of a tie after the third ballot, a fourth ballot shall be taken. If a tie remains the following shall determine the appointment to the DPC:

XI.E.6.a. If the balloting is for one of the two-year terms, each individual shall be awarded a two-year term.

XI.E.6.b. If the balloting is for a one-year term, one individual shall be awarded the one-year term and the other the alternate term as determined by a coin toss, with the person whose name is lowest in the alphabet being appointed to the one-year term if the toss is heads.

XI.E.6.c. If the balloting is for the alternate position, the appointee shall be determined by a coin toss with the person whose name is lowest in the alphabet being appointed as alternate if the toss is heads.

XI.F. Responsibilities of DPC

XI.F.1. Evaluation of Portfolios. Evaluate Portfolios submitted during each cycle of review as specified in Section I.C. Retention, Tenure and Promotion and Sections V. Evaluation for Retention, VI. Evaluation for Tenure, VII. Evaluation for Promotion, VIII. Evaluation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion, IX. Evaluation of Tenured Associate Professors, and X. Evaluation of Professors. At least three DPC members shall review each of these portfolios; in promotion considerations, the three DPC reviewers shall have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Evaluate Portfolios submitted by Full-Time Temporary Faculty and Part-Time Temporary Faculty in accordance with the appropriate university and departmental policies, procedures and timelines.
XI.F.2. Classroom Visitation. Conduct classroom visitation and submit “Classroom Observation Forms” for faculty members submitting Portfolios during the next review cycle as specified in Section II.C.3.a. (Peer Evaluation) Class Visitation.

XI.F.3. Student Opinion Questionnaires. Oversee the administration of SRIs for full-time faculty at the conclusion of each semester, intersession and summer session.

XI.F.4. Edit Departmental Personnel Document. Review, revise and submit for approval changes to this document as becomes necessary to keep it in compliance with UPS 210.00, the MOU and departmental goals and objectives.

XI.F.5. Other Personnel Business. Conduct other personnel business as requested by the Department Chair or as deemed appropriate by the DPC.