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Objective

University Policy Statement 210.000, *Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures*, states: “Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards shall be consistent with Section IV of [UPS 210.000] and shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. Methods used by the department in evaluating performance shall be clear, objective, and reasonable. Methods used for quantifying any information shall be as uncomplicated as possible” (VI.C.1).

1.0 Appointment

1.1 Tenured and Tenure-Track. This document addresses review processes for (1) tenure-track (provisionary) faculty and (2) tenured faculty seeking promotion (UPS 210.000 I.B). Review of tenured faculty NOT seeking promotion is addressed in UPS 210.020; full-time lecturers are addressed in UPS 210.050; and part-time lecturers are addressed in UPS 210.060.

1.2 Rank. Probationary and tenured faculty members are appointed as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor (UPS 210.000 I.C).

1.3 Service Credit. If a probationary faculty member seeks service credit (maximum two years) at the time of initial appointment, s/he shall include in the Portfolio (section 4.0 below) documentation of accomplishments at the post-secondary education institution during the year/s for which service credit is requested (UPS 210.000 I.D). Requests for one or two year/s of service credit shall be evaluated by the following, in order: Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, College Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and University President.

1.4 Promotion.

1.4.1 Assistant Professor. A probationary faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor is normally considered for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time s/he is considered for tenure, usually during the sixth probationary year, with tenure and promotion effective the beginning of the seventh year. However, an Assistant Professor may request early review for tenure and promotion if his/her Portfolio demonstrates truly outstanding merit that warrants early consideration (UPS 210.000 I.F, I.G). A “Non-Tenured Request for Early Action” form is available from Faculty Affairs and Records, http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/#FAR.

1.4.2 Associate Professor. An Associate Professor shall normally be considered for promotion to Professor during his/her fifth year in rank, with promotion effective the beginning of the sixth year. However, an Associate Professor may request early review for promotion if his/her Portfolio demonstrates truly outstanding merit that warrants early consideration (UPS 210.000 I.F, I.G). A “Tenured Faculty Promotion Request” form is available from Faculty Affairs and Records, http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/#FAR.

2.0 General Requirements

2.1 Three Areas of Review. “Advancement of learning is central to the mission of California State University, Fullerton. We therefore seek to develop and maintain a faculty actively
engaged in furthering learning. A productive faculty member engages in three complementary aspect of professional life (UPS 210.000 IV.B):

- teaching, both in and out of the classroom, that advances student learning;
- scholarly and creative activities that foster peer-discipline learning; and
- service-professional work that supports the advancement of the learning community.”

2.2 Expectation. “Each faculty member is expected to make suitable contributions in all three of the above areas to become a contributing citizen in our community of learners. Retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) require that increasing levels of achievement be demonstrated in these three areas of performance” (UPS 210.000 IV.B).

2.3 Ranking. “CSUF recognizes that teaching is the most important activity of its faculty. Therefore, teaching shall be the most important criterion for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. CSUF further recognizes that faculty involvement in scholarly-creative activities is also essential. Therefore, scholarly-creative activities shall be the second most important criterion for retention, tenure, and promotion” (UPS 210.000 IV.B).

2.4 Evaluation criteria. At each level of review, each of the three categories – teaching, scholarly-creative and service – shall be evaluated as either “excellent,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory.” An excellent evaluation indicates truly outstanding performance: the faculty member demonstrates evidence that is among the best in this area, ahead of most others. A satisfactory evaluation indicates performance that meets expectations: s/he demonstrates evidence of acceptable, but not exemplary, accomplishments in this area, on par with most others. An unsatisfactory evaluation indicates performance that fails to meet expectations: s/he demonstrates evidence of low achievement in this area, lagging behind most others.

2.4.1 Retention. To be recommended for RETENTION, the faculty member’s performance during the period of review must demonstrate satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

2.4.2 Normal tenure and/or promotion. To be recommended for NORMAL tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member’s performance must be evaluated as either satisfactory or excellent in EACH category. If his/her performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory in ANY category, the faculty member shall NOT be recommended for normal retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

2.4.3 Early tenure and/or promotion. To be recommended for EARLY tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member’s performance during the period of review must be evaluated as excellent in BOTH teaching and scholarly-creative activities, and at least satisfactory in service. If his/her performance is evaluated as satisfactory in EITHER teaching OR scholarly-creative activities, or if his/her performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory in ANY category, the faculty member shall NOT be recommended for early tenure and/or promotion.

3.0 Developmental Narrative

3.1 Initiation. “During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty shall write prospective development narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities and service, not to exceed 500 words each” (UPS 210.000 II).

3.2 Scope. “These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments s/he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the department standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion” (UPS 210.000 II).
3.3 Review. “These narratives will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the department chair and the dean who will each provide written feedback... prior to May 1 [the first draft is due to the department chair in mid-February]. These narratives shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member’s Portfolio [see item 4.0 below] that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure track position” (UPS 210.000 II).

3.4 Revisions. “During subsequent years, the developmental narratives may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period” (UPS 210.000 II).

4.0 Portfolio

4.1 Purpose and Scope. “The Portfolio is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. It shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be taken. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio” (UPS 210.000 III.A.1).

4.2 Contents. The Portfolio must contain at least all items outlined in UPS 210.000 III.A.3 (5.1-5.6 below). A “Faculty Checklist for Portfolios” and a “Portfolio Table of Contents” are available from Faculty Affairs and Records, http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/#FAR.

4.3 Adding Material. “Material may be added to the Portfolio until the date it is due to be submitted, at which time the Portfolio shall be declared complete... by the department chair” (UPS 210.000 III.A.4). After that, material may be added only according to the provisions of UPS 210.000 III.A.4 and III.A.5. The “RTP Timeline” for submitting the Portfolio for the Retention-Tenure-Promotion process is available from Faculty Affairs and Records, http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/#FAR.

4.4 Review. The following items, 5-6-7, include the criteria for review of the Portfolio items in the three areas of teaching, scholarship-creativity, and service.

5.0 Narrative Summary: Teaching Performance

“Each faculty member shall establish an environment where learning is central” (UPS 210.000 IV.C.1). To that end, each faculty member shall write a narrative summary of teaching performance: a self-assessment of goals and accomplishments regarding the relevance and significance of instructional activities during the period of review, limited to 1000 words. To assist in evaluating the narrative, the faculty member should outline the teaching narrative according to UPS 210.000 IV.C.1:

- **Pedagogical Approach and Methods**: outline approach to help students learn; discuss teaching assignments (5.1 below), relevant points of course syllabi (5.5) that document pedagogy, assessment of student learning, and any relevant additional indicators (5.7) included in appropriate Appendix (e.g., teaching materials, innovative approaches).
- **Student Response to Instruction**: discuss student ratings of instruction, or SRIs (5.2), statistical summaries of student opinions (5.3)—including overall mean for period of review relevant to overall department mean for same period, student comments on originals of SRI forms (5.6), and any relevant additional indicators (5.7) included in appropriate Appendix (e.g., unsolicited letters)
- **Expectations Regarding Student Achievement**: outline expectations; discuss statistical summaries of grade distributions (5.4)—including overall mean for period of review
relevant to overall department mean for same period, justification for any course GPA that deviates from departmental guidelines for grade ranges, relevant points of course syllabi (5.5) that document expectations, and any relevant additional indicators (5.7) included in Appendix (e.g., advising, mentoring).

- **Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**: discuss self-assessment of teaching objectives and methods stated in developmental narrative (3.0), plus any indicators included in Portfolio and/or Appendix (e.g., curriculum development, seminars, workshops and/or research on teaching). Scholarly and creative activities might be further discussed in section 6.0, if appropriate.

- **Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline**: discuss self-assessment of professional development stated in developmental narrative (3.0), plus any indicators included in Portfolio and/or Appendix (e.g., curriculum development, conferences, interaction with colleagues, collaborative efforts, creative undertakings). Professional activities might be further discussed in section 7.0, if appropriate.

Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate an ongoing program to improve his/her teaching effectiveness and maintain currency in the discipline (UPS 210.000 IV.C.1). Evidence of teaching performance must include at least the PRIMARY items listed in 5.1 through 5.6 below. Item 5.7 lists some optional SECONDARY indicators. Items 5.1-5.4 must be placed in the Portfolio. Items 5.6-5.7 go into the Appendix.

5.1 **List of Teaching Assignments**: A table of each class taught for each term during the entire period of review, including supervision courses (496, 499). List classes by year and semester and include: course number, title, schedule, units, enrollment, class GPA, and indicate if a new preparation. Also note any assigned time activities in the case of a term where the faculty member did not teach a normal load (12 teaching units) of classes.

5.2 **Sample Form: Student Opinion of Teaching**: A copy of the blank Student Rating of Instruction (SRI) form used by the department.

5.3 **Statistical Summaries: Student Opinions**: Original, computer-generated, summary sheets of SRI forms, by class, for all courses taught during the period under review.

5.4 **Statistical Summaries: Grade Distributions**: Original, computer-generated, grade summary sheets, by course, for all courses taught during the period under review, including supervision courses (496, 499).

5.5 **Original Student Opinion Forms**: In the Appendix to the Portfolio, the original SRI forms for each course taught during the period of review. These must be chronologically arranged and neatly presented in a banker's box (three-hole punched and/or in Manila envelopes).

5.6 **Course Syllabi**: A syllabus for the most recent section of each course taught during the period of review.

5.7 **Additional Indicators**: Other, optional, SECONDARY items of evidence regarding teaching performance may be noted in the Portfolio. Each item must have corresponding documentation in the Appendix. This additional evidence should be considered, but given less weight than the previous six items (5.1-5.6), when evaluating teaching performance. Additional items may include, but are not limited to:

- teaching materials: course packets, assessment tools, handouts, lecture outlines or notes, exams, projects, exercises, other supplemental teaching aids
- innovative approaches: new or adapted pedagogical approaches with evidence of successful student learning
- unsolicited letters: from students and peers
• advising above and beyond normal expectations: unusual student load, noted successes
• mentoring: unusual student load, noted successes
• undergraduate projects: descriptions of noteworthy student research or creative activities
• graduate students: theses, projects, independent studies
• classroom visitations: written reports by peers (UPS 210.000 III.B.3)
• curriculum development: new courses, program improvements, collaboration
• seminars: organizing and/or participating in workshops on teaching
• research: related to teaching effectiveness

5.8 Evaluation Criteria. The overall evaluation criteria for the teaching category are outlined in UPS 210.000 IV.C.1. In assessing this category, reviewers shall consider the quality of teaching, in addition to the quantitative indicators (e.g., SRI summaries). Using the guidelines below, each reviewer shall rate the faculty member’s teaching performance as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

• For NORMAL tenure and/or promotion, a rating of either satisfactory or excellent is necessary in teaching. For normal retention, if few semesters are under review and result in less than satisfactory, the committee may consider the potential for improvement by the time of review for tenure and/or promotion.

• For EARLY tenure and/or promotion, a rating of excellent is necessary in teaching.

  5.8.1 Excellent. To be evaluated as excellent in teaching performance, the evidence must indicate:
  • an average SRI score across all terms at 3.7 OR ABOVE, out of a possible 4.0; and
  • an average grade distribution across all terms that demonstrates an overall acceptable grade range—NORMALLY MEAN CLASS GPAs BETWEEN 2.0 – 2.9, out of a possible 4.0, with justification for any course GPA that deviates from this range; and
  • original student opinion forms that demonstrate consistently very positive statements about instruction in the written comments; and
  • course syllabi that demonstrate very active, engaged and challenging pedagogy; and
  • additional indicators, if any, that demonstrate meritorious teaching effectiveness, among the university’s best, ahead of most university faculty.

  5.8.2 Satisfactory. To be evaluated as satisfactory in teaching performance, the evidence must indicate:
  • an average SRI score across all terms BETWEEN 3.0 – 3.69, out of a possible 4.0; and
  • an average grade distribution across all terms that demonstrates little deviance from an overall acceptable grade range—NORMALLY MEAN CLASS GPAs BETWEEN 2.0 – 2.9, out of a possible 4.0, with justification for any course GPA that deviates from this range; and
  • original student opinion forms that demonstrate consistently positive statements about instruction in the written comments; and
  • course syllabi that demonstrate active, engaged and challenging pedagogy; and
  • additional indicators, if any, that demonstrate acceptable teaching effectiveness, on par with most university faculty.
5.8.3. Unsatisfactory. To be evaluated as unsatisfactory in teaching performance, the evidence must indicate:

- an average SKI score below 3.0, out of a possible 4.0; or
- an average grade distribution across all terms that demonstrates an unacceptable grade range—NORMALLY MEAN CLASS GPAs BELOW 2.0 OR ABOVE 2.9, out of a possible 4.0, with unsatisfactory justification for all course GPAs that deviate from these guidelines; or
- original student opinion forms that demonstrate recurring negative comments that do not improve over time or are not effectively addressed in the self-assessment narrative; or
- course syllabi that demonstrate inadequate pedagogy; or
- additional indicators, if any, that demonstrate poor teaching effectiveness, below par with most university faculty.

5.9 Evaluation expectations. Each level of review shall result in a written evaluation that addresses both the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the teaching category. Where there are weaknesses, recommendations for improvement should be made. The evaluation should discuss at least the five areas of teaching performance outlined above regarding the narrative, as appropriate to the faculty member’s development narrative (3.0): pedagogical approach and methods, student response to instruction, expectations regarding student achievement, ongoing professional development as a teacher, and ongoing professional development in the discipline (UPS 210.000 IV.C.1). Ultimately, each reviewer shall recommend or not recommend that the faculty member receive retention, tenure, and/or promotion based on the overall rating of the teaching evidence as either excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

6.0 Narrative Summary: Scholarly and Creative Activities

“Each faculty member shall establish a record of scholarly-creative endeavor that generates, integrates and/or disseminates knowledge” (UPS 210.000 IV.C.2). To that end, each faculty member shall write a narrative summary of scholarly and/or creative activities: a self-assessment of goals and accomplishments regarding the relevance and significance of research and/or creative achievements during the period of review, limited to 1000 words. To assist in evaluating the narrative, the faculty member should outline the teaching narrative according to UPS 210.000 IV.C.2:

- **Accomplishments:** discuss and fully cite all COMPLETED scholarly and creative items during the period of review (6.1-6.7)—those that have appeared in print or been exhibited or have at least completed the peer review process (as evidenced by a letter in the absence of an actual print document or exhibition).
- **Ongoing Activities:** discuss and cite to the extent possible all IN-PROGRESS scholarly and creative items during the period of review (6.1-6.7)—those that have not yet completed the peer review process for publication or exhibition (indicate for each item its stage of completion).

In the narrative, the faculty member shall discuss the significance of each scholarly or creative item, as well as the extent of his/her contribution to each work for which multiple authors or creators are cited. A “Scholarly and Creative Activity Coversheet” and a “Co-Authorship Disclosure” form are available from Faculty Affairs and Records, [http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/#FAR](http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/#FAR). Full citations must be given for each published or exhibited work, in the style customary to the discipline. Copies of each cited piece,
in the relevant format (e.g., photocopy, photo, audio- or videotape. CD, DVD), must be included in the Appendix. Letters of acceptance should be placed in the Appendix for works that are in the process of being, but are not yet, published or exhibited. Documentation should also be included in the Appendix for work that is in progress (e.g., manuscripts, abstracts, grant proposals, dailies, rough cuts) (UPS 210.000 III.C.2).

Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate an ongoing program of scholarly and creative productivity (UPS 210.000 IV.C.2). Evidence of scholarly and/or creative accomplishments normally falls into the six JURIED categories listed in items 6.1 - 6.6 below. Some additional, SELECTED indicators are listed in 6.7. For each item the faculty member cites, documentation is required in the Appendix.

Points for each item are measures of quality for evaluators to use as guidelines in assessing productivity. As a baseline for reference, one (1) point is considered the equivalent of a significant creative position on a competitively-selected short film-video in an acclaimed exhibition venue, or sole-author of a research article selected for publication in a respected academic journal. Other activities may be more, the same, or less, depending on the relative amount and sophistication of the work, as well as the rigor of the peer-review process (e.g., a co-authored article might be less, a film that the faculty member wrote, produced, and directed might be more). The points are guidelines only and are not intended to be absolute.

6.1 Juried exhibitions, performances, productions, scripts, and creative achievements (up to 2 points each). May include, but are not limited to: producer, director, writer, shooter, designer (e.g., sound, lights, set), editor, or other creative positions for films, videos, audio projects, websites, CDs, DVDs, interactive and other media, recognized as deserving merit by an appropriate peer-review process, such as selection for or placement in a festival or competition or the marketplace—published, optioned, produced, sold, distributed, and the like. Documentation must be provided that indicates the significance of each work. When possible, the faculty member must provide the ratio of acceptance for entries in a juried competition. Normally, a significant creative position on an accepted short film or video shall receive about 1 point. However, reviewers may assign a higher value for a longer work, a work for which the faculty member held multiple creative positions, or a work in a highly respected venue with national scope and importance. Works that appear in venues having regional importance or impact shall normally be rated lower than shall national exhibitions. To assist in assessing the significance of creative activities, Appendices A and B provide statements of evaluating creative work from the University Film and Video Association and the Broadcast Education Association.

6.2 Refereed articles (up to 1 point each). Published articles in peer-reviewed journals, with either single or multiple authors. Journals may be either hard copy or electronic (e.g., CD, DVD, online) or both. Also, papers accepted for presentation and/or awarded placement or recognition in juried competitions, such as conference competitions (not invited panel presentations, which are secondary—see below). Normally, an accepted refereed journal article shall receive about 1 point. However, reviewers may assign a higher value for a work in a highly respected publication—with the highest for those with an acceptance rate of below 20 percent—and/or documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.3 Books and monographs (up to 2 points each). Books and monographs published by peer- and/or editor-reviewed publishers, either single or multiple author/s or editor/s. Normally, a single-author accepted scholarly book or monograph shall receive about 1.5 points. However, reviewers may assign a higher value for a significant work based upon it being a first-edition,
particularly strong reputations of its reviewers, and/or documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.4 Book chapters (up to 1 point each). Published chapters in books authored or edited by others and published by peer- and/or editor-reviewed publishers, either single or multiple author/s. Normally, an accepted refereed book chapter shall receive about 0.5 points. However, reviewers may assign a higher value for a work in a highly respected publication, high reputation of the reviewers, and documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.5 External funding (up to 1 point each). Successful procurement of extramural funds from peer-reviewed awarding agencies (e.g., grants, scholarships, foundation awards) outside Cal State Fullerton or the CSU system, including past grants or contracts that are continuing or renewed for part or all of the period of review. Normally, an accepted grant proposal shall receive about 0.5 points. However, reviewers may assign a higher value for being the principal investigator on an external grant with a monetary amount of $100,000 or more and documented importance in the field.

6.6 Refereed Conference Presentations (up to 1 point each). Peer-reviewed scholarly papers or creative works accepted for or attending in conference competitions. Normally, an accepted conference presentation shall receive about 0.5 points. However, reviewers may assign a higher value for a work in a highly respected conference—with the highest for those with an acceptance rate of below 20 percent—and documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.7 Additional indicators (up to 0.5 points each). Other, SELECTED, scholarly and creative activities may be noted in the Portfolio. Each item must have corresponding documentation in the Appendix. This additional evidence shall be considered, but given less weight than the previous six items (6.1-6.6), when evaluating scholarly and creative activities. Additional items may include, but are not limited to (UPS 210.000 III.C.5, IV.C.2):

- non-refereed, but invited, scripts, productions, exhibitions, and performances (normally up to 0.5 points each)
- external grant procurement from non-peer-reviewed agencies (e.g., donations) (normally up to .25 points each)
- internal grant procurement from intramural sources within Cal State Fullerton or the CSU (normally up to .25 points each)
- self-published books, monographs, and/or articles (normally up to 0.5 points each)
- chapters in self-published books, monographs, and/or articles (normally up to .25 points each)
- non-refereed, but invited, papers and panel presentations (normally up to .25 points each)
- invited commentaries, replies, interviews, and the like that recognize expertise in the field (normally up to .25 points each)
- book reviews (normally up to .25 points each)
- citations or quotations in other works that recognize expertise in the field (normally up to 0.1 points each)

6.8 Evaluation Criteria. The overall evaluation criteria for the scholarly and creative category are outlined in UPS 210.000 IV.C.2. In assessing this category, reviewers shall consider the quality of the items cited, in addition to their quantity. Equal consideration shall be given to: (A) scholarly activities only; or (B) creative activities only; or (C) a combination in any proportion of
both scholarly and creative activities. Using the guidelines below, each reviewer shall rate the faculty member’s scholarly and/or creative activities as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

- For NORMAL tenure and/or promotion, a rating of either satisfactory or excellent is necessary in scholarly-creative activities. For normal retention, if few semesters are under review and result in less than satisfactory, the committee may consider the potential for improvement by the time of review for tenure and/or promotion.

- For EARLY tenure and/or promotion, a rating of excellent is necessary in scholarly-creative activities.

  6.8.1 Excellent. To be evaluated as **excellent** in scholarly and/or creative activities, the evidence must indicate a score of 3.5 OR ABOVE, with at least two items in any of the first four **juried** category(ies) (6.1- 6.4).

  6.8.2 Satisfactory. To be evaluated as **satisfactory** in scholarly and/or creative activities, the evidence must indicate a score of BETWEEN 2.5-3.49, with at least two items in any of the first four **juried** category(ies) (6.1- 6.4).

  6.8.3 Unsatisfactory. To be evaluated as **unsatisfactory** in scholarly and/or creative activities, the evidence must indicate a score of 2.49 OR BELOW, and/or one or no item in any of the first four **juried** category (6.1- 6.4).

6.9 Evaluation expectations. Each level of review shall result in a written evaluation that addresses both the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the scholarly-creative category. Where there are weaknesses, recommendations for improvement should be made. The evaluation should discuss both accomplishments and ongoing activities in scholarly and/or creative achievements (UPS 210.000 IV.C.2), as appropriate to the faculty member’s developmental narrative (3.0). Ultimately, each reviewer shall recommend or not recommend that the faculty member receive retention, tenure, and/or promotion based on the rating of the scholarly-creative evidence as either excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

7.0 Narrative Summary: Professional, University, and Community Service

“Each faculty member shall contribute to the profession, to the University, and to the community through appropriate professional and service activities” (UPS 210.000 IV.C.3). To that end, each faculty member shall write a narrative summary of service to the profession, university, and community: a self-assessment of goals and accomplishments regarding the relevance and significance of service activities during the period of review, limited to 1000 words. To assist in evaluating the narrative, the faculty member should outline the teaching narrative according to UPS 210.000 IV.C.3:

- **Professional**: list and discuss professional service (7.1).
- **University**: list and discuss university service (7.2).
- **Community**: list and discuss community service (7.3).

“All faculty shall contribute to faculty governance and participate in professional or academic organizations” (UPS 210.000 III.D.4). Each faculty member, then, is expected to be active in at least some department, college, university, or CSU-system committees or similar activities, as well as at least one professional or similar organization appropriate to the field. Evidence of service contributions to the profession, university, and community normally falls into the three stated categories. Each item must have corresponding documentation in the Appendix.

7.1 Professional service. May include, but is not limited to: membership in professional or similar organizations; elected offices held in such organizations; organizing, speaking,
presenting, or moderating at professional activities; participation in professional events; receiving honors or awards from professional organizations; being interviewed or quoted in recognition of professional service; promoting the profession; consulting professionally.

7.2 University service. May include, but is not limited to: faculty advisor to a club or organization; service on committees or similar activities in the department, college, university, or CSU system; chairing such committees; organizing, speaking, presenting, or moderating at university functions; participating in university events; receiving honors or awards from university offices; being interviewed or quoted in recognition of university service; promoting the university; consulting with university offices or personnel.

7.3 Community service. May include, but is not limited to: membership in community or civic-sponsored organizations; elected offices held in such organizations; organizing, speaking, presenting, or moderating at civic gatherings; participation in community events; receiving honors or awards from community organizations or municipalities; being interviewed or quoted in recognition of community service; promoting community organizations or municipalities; consulting with community organizations or municipalities.

7.4 Evaluation criteria. The overall evaluation criteria for the service category are outlined in UPS 210.000 IV.C.3. In assessing this category, reviewers shall consider the quality of the items cited, in addition to their quantity. Using the guidelines below, each reviewer shall rate the faculty member’s service contributions as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

- For NORMAL tenure and/or promotion, a rating of either satisfactory or excellent is necessary in service. For normal retention, if few semesters are under review and result in less than satisfactory, the committee may consider the potential for improvement by the time of review for tenure and/or promotion.

- For EARLY tenure and/or promotion, a rating of either satisfactory or excellent is necessary in service.

7.4.1 Excellent. To be evaluated as excellent in service, the evidence must indicate EXTRAORDINARY and CONTINUOUS involvement in at least professional and university service, with at least some community service, more than most others in the field and university.

7.4.2 Satisfactory. To be evaluated as satisfactory in service, the evidence must indicate CONTINUOUS and PRODUCTIVE involvement in at least professional and university service, on par with most others in the field and university.

7.4.3 Unsatisfactory. To be evaluated as unsatisfactory in service, the evidence must indicate UNPRODUCTIVE and LITTLE service involvement, including items in only one service area and/or very limited contributions in professional and university service, below par with most others in the field and university.

7.5 Evaluation expectations. Each level of review shall result in a written evaluation that addresses both the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the “service” category. Where there are weaknesses, recommendations for improvement should be made. The evaluation should discuss accomplishments in all three areas of service—professional, university, community (UPS 210.000 IV.C.3), as appropriate to the faculty member’s developmental narrative (3.0). Ultimately, each reviewer shall recommend or not recommend that the faculty member receive retention, tenure, and/or promotion based on the rating of the service evidence as either excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

8.0 Department Personnel Committee
1.1 Members. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of three, full-time, tenured faculty members (faculty in the FERP program who can be available for both fall and spring semesters are eligible), not to include the department chair, elected annually by all full-time members of the faculty (UPS 210.000 VI.B). A fourth, alternate member is also elected to serve in the absence of one of the three regular members if a regular member is deemed to be disqualified for service by the department chair due to illness, conflict of interest, or other compelling reasons, or if a member is self-disqualified due to a conflict of interest. Normally, the following year’s committee is elected at the last regular faculty meeting in May. If the department “does not have at least four tenured faculty other than the chair, it may select one or more tenured faculty for its personnel committee from related disciplines” (UPS 210.000 VI.B.3).

1.2 Responsibilities. The DPC conducts all items in UPS 210.000 V.D, including evaluations of Portfolios and recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP).

Appendix A

Statement to the Academic Community

The Evaluation of Faculty in Creative Specialties for Promotion and Tenure

Consideration for academic promotion and tenure traditionally involves an evaluation of a faculty member's contribution in each of three areas: teaching, research/creative activity, and service. Since procedures and standards for evaluation of teaching and service are generally well-established at most institutions, the focus of this statement is on the procedures and standards for evaluation of research/creative activity.

Introduction
Creative work should be fully accepted as part of the faculty evaluation process when such work is appropriate to both faculty specialization and teaching load. Just as the primary professional contributions of a faculty member teaching media history should be expected to be in the form of published scholarship, so the primary professional contributions of a faculty member specializing in a creative area should be expected to be in one or more of the areas of creative production.

The fine arts have clearly established a precedent for the consideration of creative work as a part of the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. Exhibitions of paintings, drawings, sculptures, photographs, etc. are accepted as evidence of professional contributions in the visual arts. Musical compositions and reviews of recitals and solo performances are accepted in the field of music. Creative writing, direction and design of plays, choreography, and dance performances are likewise accepted as evidence of faculty contributions in other creative fields. The same should be true of creative work by a film or video faculty member.

Comparison between Criteria for Evaluating Creative Work and Criteria for Evaluating Traditional Scholarship
In order for traditional scholarship to be acceptable evidence in support of promotion and tenure, that scholarship must be disseminated and evaluated by experts in the field. The same is true of creative work in film and video.

Dissemination and evaluation of traditional scholarship is usually accomplished by means of publication. Over the years a fairly clear set of criteria have evolved for the evaluation of publications, which are ordinarily books or articles. The value and importance of a particular book can be determined by the prestige of the publisher, the prepublication comments of peer reviewers, and postpublication reviews in scholarly journals.

Articles are often judged on the basis of the reputation of the journal in which they appear. Articles in refereed journals are given more weight than articles in nonrefereed journals. Journals, refereed or not, are rated on the basis of their reputations, the reputations of their editors and peer evaluators, and their refusal rate. Invitations to a faculty member to write particular pieces for a journal can be viewed as recognition of that faculty member's status within a specialization.

Creative work in film and video can be disseminated and evaluated in a similar way, although the process of dissemination and evaluation is less well-developed and less well-understood by some within the academic community.
Review of Film and Video: Initial Considerations
Dissemination of scholarly work typically is accomplished by means of publication in articles, books, and, less frequently, monographs. Completed creative work in film and video consists of products whose forms have a greater variety in length than is found in printed materials. A faculty member might be involved in the production of feature-length dramatic film, a half-hour documentary, and three-minute animated work, or a work of some other type and length: many possibilities exist. The length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of the effort required to complete it. A short experimental video piece or a multimedia production might require even more time and effort to create than a relatively straightforward hour-long documentary. When peers evaluate a film or video work, it is important that they determine the probable difficulty of particular projects. Their task is analogous to that of judging the importance of a multi-year horizontal study in the social sciences: such a study might require many years of effort, yet result in an article of only modest length.

Instances of joint authorship occur in traditional scholarship. In such cases it is necessary to establish the contribution made by each author, if the work is included in a promotion or tenure dossier. Film and video works are frequently, although not always, collaborative endeavors. Thus, it is extremely important to know what role a faculty member played on a particular production. In many cases, the faculty member will have had total responsibility for the production. In other cases, his/her role might have been that of writer, editor, etc. It is appropriate to give varying levels of credit for varying levels of responsibility. In cases of shared responsibility, it is best to rely on experts in the field to determine the relative importance of each individual's contribution.

Dissemination of Film and Video Works
Public showings of a film and video work to informed audiences should be considered dissemination of the work, equivalent of that of scholarly publication. This is similar to the traditional acceptance of a music recital performed for a knowledgeable audience as the equivalent of publication.

Certain forms of film and video can be adjudicated in festival competitions. Many festivals have rigorous selection procedures for inclusion of films and tapes within their programs. Selection of a faculty member's creative work for showing at a festival that has a good reputation can be considered indicative of the quality of the work. Festivals can be of either local, regional, national, or international importance. Because the reputation of festivals is not static, it is important for the current reputation of a pertinent festival to be specified in any promotion and tenure dossier.

The quality of a film or video work may be partially indicated by any festival awards or prizes which have been bestowed upon it. Festival awards and prizes are evidence of a positive competitive judgment about the quality of the work. In evaluating the importance of a festival award or prize, it is important to consider the current reputation of the festival at which it was received.

Some academic associations schedule screenings based on a preconvention evaluation of submitted works. Selection for screening can be considered an indicator of quality, provided the current reputation and procedures of the association are known.

The merit of a film or video work may be indicated its having been televised. It might be shown on commercial and/or public television, and might be aired on cable systems. Greater weight is often given to works selected for network presentation than to those
carried only locally. In all cases, it is important to consider the level at which the work has had public exposure. It must be acknowledged that television showings are not equally accessible to all types of work.

Sometimes museums, media art centers, and universities schedule invited presentations, often including oral presentations by the filmmakers or videomakers. The prestige of such invitational showings varies, of course, depending upon the importance of the institution and the rigor of the selection process.

It should be noted that multiple showings of the same film are not the equivalent of reprints of a scholarly work. In the case of reprints of books or articles, the original printing is often still available through libraries. Reprinting of an article is primarily for the convenience of the readers of a particular periodical. There is generally no such easy access to media works: thus, in most circumstances each showing of a media work makes the production available to a new, previously inaccessible audience.

Film and video works may be disseminated through distribution agencies and companies, although this system is considerably less comprehensive than the equivalent dissemination of published scholarly works. Some distributors are highly selective, and the inclusion of a faculty member's work within their inventories can be considered an indication of quality. However, most film and video distributors are commercial, and the exclusion of a faculty member's work from such distribution is not necessarily an indication that it has little or no artistic or social value. It must be remembered that faculty works must compete for distribution with works produced by individuals whose careers are exclusively dedicated to creative film and video production.

Sources of Written Evaluations of Film and Video Works
Meaningful reviews of faculty creative work appear in scholarly and professional publications, library media publications, and even, in some cases, newspapers. In evaluating such reviews, the status of the reviewer and the reputation of the periodical are important.

Some professional associations, including the University Film and Video Association, regularly provide written evaluations of works selected for showing at their conventions. The judges of some festivals will provide written critiques, if requested.

Letters evaluating a faculty member's work can be requested from responsible individuals at museums, media centers, colleges and universities, and other institutions at which the work has been shown. As in the case of scholarly reviews, it is important to consider the reputation of the individual or institution contributing the evaluation.

Additional Considerations
Media production is inherently expensive. Thus it is not infrequent for a faculty member to be involved in seeking grants in support of creative work. This can be a time-consuming process, which requires clear written articulation of creative goals and methods. Credit should be given in the promotion and tenure process for the seeking of grants as well as for any grants received.

When a faculty member's creative work is presented at a university, a festival, or an association conference, it is usual for the faculty member to introduce the work and to respond to any subsequent questions, comments, and criticisms. Although such a presentation is difficult to document, it should be considered the equivalent of the presentation of scholarly papers for peer critique in academic settings.
It must be noted that there are certain types of creative works for which appropriate means of dissemination and evaluation have not yet been devised. Scripts, multi-image pieces, and some types of experimental work fall into this category. In such cases, it is necessary to rely on peer evaluations to establish the value and importance of faculty creative work.

**Peer Evaluations**
It is fairly usual for faculty members within a department to evaluate the creative output of their colleagues as part of the promotion and tenure process. It is increasingly common, and indeed essential in a relatively new field such as film and video, for a panel of outside evaluators to be established for the purpose of examining creative work. It is important that the evaluators should be knowledgeable about, and sympathetic toward the type of creative work completed by the faculty member who is being considered for promotion or tenure. For instance, an evaluator whose sole interest is narrative film should not be asked to evaluate an experimental video work. In some cases an institution might wish to include professionals from the media industry on an outside evaluation panel. It must be remembered, however, that media professionals may not be attuned to the requirements of the promotion and tenure process.

The University Film and Video Association stands ready to assist institutions or individuals in the selection of outside evaluators, through the office of its President.

*Compiled by Peter J. Bukalski from material submitted by Richard M. Blumenberg, Raymond E. Fielding, Ben Levin, Calvin Pryluck, Mimi White, and Donald J. Zirpola.*

Appendix B

Broadcast Education Association
Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for Electronic Media Faculty Involved in Creative Work

Statement of Purpose
The Broadcast Education Association affirms that creative work that meets established criteria, is reviewed by recognized peers, and is disseminated to others both within and outside the academy is important to the development of the field of electronic media and should be recognized as equal to scholarly publication in promotion and tenure review for faculty in the creative areas of the discipline.

Intellectual Foundations of Creative Work
A major function of traditional research is to add to the field through discovery of new information or insight. Creative endeavors often involve traditional research methods of information gathering, literature reviews, synthesis of information, and analysis. However, one of the major differences between media productions and traditional research is that the unknown that is being explored may also be form - the medium. Far from simply recording what occurs before the camera or within range of the microphone, creative faculty through their choices of form reveal a pattern and context to the material that goes beyond mere recording. Thus, the intellectual function of discovery is the foundation of creative work, just as it is with traditional scholarship.

A second intellectual function that is central to both traditional research and creative work is integration. Not only must creative faculty integrate research from a variety of disciplines, but they also must integrate aural and visual strategies with the content to illuminate the conclusions of the research.

Further, the functions of discovery and integration are enhanced through creative application and teaching. Reading an instruction manual for a piece of equipment or type of software will never provide the insights into its full artistic and communicative possibilities as will applying those principles of instruction in a production. New understandings, both for the creator and the students who participate in the production, arise from working through production challenges.

Creative work is intellectually demanding in similar ways to that of traditional research, including the collection, analysis, and synthesis of content. The creative process also involves discovery in the development of effective aural and visual forms and provides integration as these forms are united with content to create the final work.

Evaluation of Creative Work
As with traditional research, acceptance of creative work as an important intellectual activity involves review and evaluation by peers. Contests and festivals provide one avenue for review, because they normally employ panels of expert judges to select the work that will be honored or screened. Because those outside the communication field may not understand the reputation of these events, information about the contest or festival would be important for the dossier. The information to include would be the year the festival or contest was established, the number of entries in the event (if known), the number of works selected to receive recognition or prizes, the venues in which the selection was screened, etc. If available, a copy of the evaluation criteria would also be helpful to reviewers both inside and outside the field. In addition, subsequent reviews of the work that might appear in either scholarly or popular publications could provide insight into the value of the work and should be included in the dossier.

Another indication of the value of the work is the decision to televise a creative work to the community outside the university through established commercial or public media channels. In the realm of traditional scholarship, this is akin to the selection for anthologies and is recognition of excellence. These selections are generally made by a number of very knowledgeable professionals at various levels, who are experienced in evaluating creative work and can readily recognize excellence, discovery, and innovation in the use of media form and the value of content for the society at large.

Evaluation Considerations
While published research articles tend to be standard in length, the same cannot be said of creative work. The medium for which the production is created has strengths and challenges, and the length of the
final work and its structure may vary greatly from one work to the next. Assessment should take into account the scope and length of the production and the challenges posed by the medium.

Second, while published research tends to follow a traditional form, aesthetic conventions vary for each medium and are constantly changing. Assessment of the work should address the appropriateness and integration of the aesthetic conventions and the content. In addition, originality and innovation in the use of aesthetic or technical processes should be noted.

Third, since few media projects are completed by one person working in isolation, evaluators should expect the participation of others (including students). For example, the role of executive producer is often analogous to a researcher in traditional scholarship who leads a team of assistants in a project. The faculty member's input into the work under evaluation should be addressed.

Finally, while having a great deal of creative latitude, faculty often must work under budgetary and equipment limitations. The ability to use limited resources innovatively to address creative problems should be given consideration in an evaluation.

Dissemination
While the hallmark of intellectual activity within the academy is review and evaluation by one's peers, it is through dissemination that traditional research becomes of value to others in and outside the academy. One means of dissemination for creative works is through winning and subsequent screening at competitions. Another is through invited screenings at recognized festivals. In the past, a work that was presented to a contest or festival audience was not as readily available or as permanent as a publication that could remain on the shelf for years. However, many festivals and contests are beginning to offer anthologies of their winning entries for later distribution. The increase in digital storage capacity makes it possible for large files of images and sounds to be stored on disks or disseminated by other means, such as the Internet. Another avenue of dissemination is through established television, radio, or cable outlets at the national, regional, or local level. While not permanent, this form of dissemination makes the work available to a sizable and diverse audience. A fourth type of dissemination is through an invited presentation at a recognized, prestigious event - scholarly convention, museum program, etc. Thus, the audience for works presented via established festivals/contests, the Internet, media outlets, and recognized events is often large. Even when ephemeral, the work may make a significant contribution to the field and/or the society.

Evaluators
Blind peer review is important in the judgment of the quality of traditional research, and it is equally important for the creative candidate to note which contests or festivals are judged blind. Also, unsolicited reviews, after the work is disseminated, should be included in the dossier. However, it may be necessary to identify qualified outside reviewers to provide additional competent evaluations. Depending upon the requirements of the university, these evaluators may be academic or professional. Academic reviewers, particularly those who have been involved with contests or festivals, will be able to place the work in context with other work in the field, will know the reputations of the contests and festivals, and will be more sensitive to traditional academic tenure and promotion requirements. However, the ability to identify innovative content and techniques is not limited to academics. While industry professionals may or may not be aware of traditional academic criteria, they are experts in the use of media and can readily recognize excellence, discovery, and innovation in its use. Thus, qualified professionals, who are well established, also may be able to provide important evaluative feedback. A list of the judges on the Review Board for the BEA Festival of Film, Video and Media Arts will be provided to BEA members if additional, outside reviewers are needed.

Candidate's Promotion and Tenure Dossier
Although the candidate for promotion and tenure should develop his/her portfolio or dossier under the guidelines established by the university, to make the strongest case possible the candidate may want to include information that will illuminate some of the functions cited above.

Important elements of the dossier include:

1. Formative material that will illuminate creative and innovative choices in content, links to other disciplines, patterns established, or choices of media techniques.
2. Information about festivals, contests, and other dissemination opportunities, including the reputation of the organization making the selection and/or dissemination, the criteria for selection, the number of entries in the event or the contest (if known), and the number selected to receive recognition, prizes and or dissemination.

3. Written evaluations from contest or festival judges, if available.

4. Reviews of the work that subsequently appear in both scholarly and popular publications.

5. Creator's input into the creation of the work and the elements of the work that the creator believes to be central to advancing knowledge in the field.

6. Budget and equipment availability for the creative process.

Written by: Suzanne Williams-Rautiola with the assistance of the Creative Activities Task Force and Festival Committee

Approved by: Board of Directors, Broadcast Education Association on October 27, 2001