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I. Preamble

The Department of Counseling (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service to the Department, College, University, and Community. Adequate communication, especially regarding personnel policies, is of utmost importance to the maintenance and enhancement of a high quality faculty and, thus, a viable University. With this objective, the Department shall institute the following procedures for assessing Portfolios for the purposes of retention, tenure and promotion. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and reviewing bodies may be aided in their respective roles by having available to them as clear and as objective a statement as is reasonably possible of the Department’s expectations. Furthermore, the Department faculty specifically affirms their position that the best interests of the University, the College, the Department, and their many students are served when the faculty represent a wide diversity of interests and activities.

II. Philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development

We believe that knowledge is evolving and socially constructed and that learning is produced through an interaction of different perspectives that enable students to connect their education to their own experience. Thus, in our educational practice, we aim:
1. To create classroom communities where learning is interactive and dynamic.
2. To engage in reflective teaching and learning that draws attention to the process through which knowledge is produced and content learned.
3. To encourage all students to voice their perspectives and experiences.
4. To model various approaches to knowledge construction and learning for our students.
5. To enable students to understand the implications for their practice of differences and similarities related to culture, ethnicity, race, gender, age, ableness, and economic status.
6. To expand learning beyond the classroom to the broader societal and institutional contexts where students will engage in their practice.
7. To empower students to shape communities that are more humane.

III. Department Structure

The Department is coordinated by a Department Chair, selected according to UPS 211.100. The Department Chair has the responsibility of communicating the standards and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion to all Department faculty members (see UPS 210.000, V.C.).

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called "the Committee") shall make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to members of the Department as specified in UPS 210.000.

B. Committee structure

1. The Committee shall consist of at least three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. All shall at least hold a rank higher than that of any person being evaluated that year. At least three-fourths of the Committee shall be members of the De-
partment when this is possible. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he or she is the subject of the personnel review process.

2. The alternate member shall participate on the Committee in those deliberations in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete the term. Should a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty. When possible, the new alternate shall be from the same Department as the regular Committee member who was unable to complete the term.

3. Committee members shall serve a one-year term. The term shall begin early in the Fall Semester, following the election of members.

C. Election of committee members

1. The Department Chair (or a designee) shall conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the Fall Semester each year. The election shall be by written secret ballot.

2. All eligible members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B.1 above, are automatically on the slate of nominees for the Committee, except the following: a) the Department Chair; and b) those who are being considered for a personnel action during that year. Service in the personnel evaluation process is part of the normal and reasonable duties of tenured faculty. In cases where the Department has no tenured faculty members to serve on the Committee, any faculty member in the Department may make a nomination to represent that Department. All qualified nominees who agree in writing to serve if elected will be included on the slate. Nominees shall be presented to the faculty for election in the following manner and order: a) listed by Department affiliation; b) listed by rank and seniority within the Department; and c) alphabetized by last name, thereafter. A person nominated from outside the Department shall have his or her Department listed in parentheses next to the name. No person shall appear on the slate for more than one Department.

3. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote for as many of the official nominees as shall have been determined to be the membership number for the Committee for that year, and not more than that number. The top three (3) persons receiving the largest number of votes in each Department slate shall be elected "regular" members of the Committee. In addition, the person with the next highest number of votes shall be the alternate. In the case of a tie, the last regular member and the alternate shall be decided by the flip of a coin.

4. The Committee shall select its Chair for the one-year term of the Committee. The Chair shall be selected by written, secret ballot among the Committee members. The prior Committee Chair shall conduct the election, if possible; where this is not feasible, the Department Chair (or a designee) shall conduct the election.

D. Committee procedures

1. The Committee shall review and evaluate in writing (i.e., typed) the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure or promotion. In this evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications under each category of the criteria listed in Section VI of this document. (Here and throughout, see UPS 210.000 for further requirements and information.)

2. The Committee's evaluation for each area is to be based on the Portfolio according to the professional judgment of the committee members. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for describing the faculty member under review as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" with respect to each area of performance.

3. The Committee shall receive the evaluation of the Department Chair after completing their evaluation and recommendation.
4. The Committee shall formulate a recommendation that shall state in writing the reason for the recommendation. The recommendation and evaluation report shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.

5. Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.

6. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

V. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments expected 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. 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 on a timetable to be determined by the College, but prior to May 1st. These narratives shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member’s Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure track position.

During subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

B. Portfolio preparation and submission

It is the responsibility of each faculty member being considered for personnel action to prepare the required information and documentation for her/his Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the appropriate Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. The Department shall follow procedures outlined in UPS 210.000 with regard to the Prospectus.

C. Portfolio organization and documentation

The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the standard table of contents as specified by UPS 210.000. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. A Portfolio Vita, using APA style wherever appropriate, including date and page numbers, shall be used.

D. Categories for personnel action

The three major categories of faculty performance are as follows: teaching; scholarly and creative accomplishments; and Professional, University, and Community service. In promotion, retention, and tenure decisions, performance in the categories of teaching and scholarly and creative accomplishments shall be given primary emphasis. Secondary consideration will be given to Professional, University, and Community service.

E. Faculty responsibilities

As full-time employees of CSUF, Department faculty are expected to meet faculty responsibilities as they apply to each of the above evaluation categories. In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include, for example, meeting classes, holding assigned office hours at assigned times and places, and participating in Department academic advising procedures. In the area of scholarly and creative activities these responsibilities include, for example, presenting refereed, blind reviewed presentations or posters, publishing books, book chapters, and/or refereed journal
articles. In the area of service these responsibilities include, for example, attendance at Department meetings and completing committee and other Department duties as assigned by the appropriate Department Chair. Evaluators shall take into consideration, in evaluating a faculty member's performance, the extent to which the faculty member has met her/his faculty responsibilities.

VI. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty: Criteria and Weighting

A. Teaching performance
Retention during the probationary years will be predicated upon the individual's self-assessment and progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. Procedures concerning service credit and the Prospectus shall be implemented in accordance with the provisions of UPS 210.000. The philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development (HHD) and Department mission statement guides the primary responsibility of Department faculty, which is teaching. Each faculty member shall establish a teaching environment where student learning is central, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content, and review of the curricula and the counseling degree; and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills necessary to contribute to society. A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in one's discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn both within and outside the classroom.

1. Evaluating teaching performance
Evaluation of teaching performance shall include peer evaluation of the following: a) pedagogical approach and methods; b) student response to instruction; and c) ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher. Faculty members are encouraged to solicit other reviews of teaching performance to be included in the Portfolio at the time of submission. For example, classroom observations by Department colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Classroom observations by departmental colleagues require a written report. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessments by external evaluators by faculty from other departments or other universities may also be included.

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating teaching performance:

a. Mandatory Indicators

1) Comprehensive Self-assessment
The comprehensive self-assessment shall include a reflective review of the faculty member's teaching pedagogical approach, philosophy and performance as well as methods, goals and direction of her/his future teaching. It shall address the faculty member's teaching with respect to the Department's mission, the HHD Philosophy, and to goals one and five of the University Mission and Goals (i.e., "Ensure the preeminence of learning" and "Create an environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed"). In addition, the faculty member is encouraged to discuss her/his contributions to student learning in the comprehensive self-assessment.

2) List of courses taught
A semester by semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, and the unit value. If release time was received, the weighted teaching unit value shall be
listed along with an explanation of the activities for which it was granted. Mean SOQ ratings shall be included for each course with the rating of Excellent (89.5% A’s and B’s or higher), Good (74.5% to 89.4% A’s and B’s), Fair (59.5% to 74.4% A’s and B’s), or Poor (less than 59.4% A’s and B’s).

3) Course syllabi and materials
The file shall include a representative selection of course syllabi and supplementary materials such as tests and study aids prepared by the faculty member to promote student learning.

4) Statistical summaries of student opinion forms
The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses during the period of review must be included. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by an appropriate administrator.) Statistical summaries of student opinion data for all of the years for which service credit is given should be included, if available.

5) Student opinion of teaching forms
The printed Student Opinion Questionnaire shall be included for each course taught at CSUF for academic credit during the period of review. Copies of the Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQs) shall also be included for years prior to SOQ development. Student opinion data for all the years for which service credit is given shall be included. If such data are not available or if the data is incorrect, a letter from the Department Chair shall attest to the unavailability or errors included.

6) Statistical summaries of grade distributions
The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester of the period of review must be provided.

b. Additional Indicators
The faculty member may submit other evidence that demonstrates teaching effectiveness and contributions to student learning, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Peer review of teaching following classroom visitations, lectures, or seminars.
2. Documentation and evaluation of teaching activities in colleagues' classes.
3. Documentation of fieldwork coordination, academic advisement, or mentoring activities.
4. Development of new course proposals which have been approved for inclusion in the curriculum.
5. Development of instructional technology strategies to enhance student learning.
6. Development of portfolio and case study assignments.
8. Publications about teaching that do not qualify for inclusion in section VI.B.1.b.
9. Evidence of additional training in teaching.
10. Evidence of collaborative teaching activities.
11. Video or audio recordings of lessons taught.
12. Independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member.
13. Documentation of service as thesis advisor for master's degree students.
14. Documentation of service as committee member for external master’s or doctoral students.
c. Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance

A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is arrived at based on three factors defined below:

1.) Pedagogical approach and methods
Pedagogical approach and methods includes a self-assessment of the faculty member as a teacher. Self-assessments shall address the faculty member's pedagogical approach, philosophy of teaching, and teaching performance highlighting strengths and areas for growth in teaching. Methods, goals, and direction of future teaching shall also be discussed. Course syllabi and samples of course materials (e.g., Power Point presentations, lecture notes, course materials, multi-media created for courses, sample activities, exams, or completed papers or projects from students) shall also be included. The Committee shall rate pedagogical approach and methods as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent** -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment and grading procedures.

**Good** -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment and grading procedures.

**Fair** -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate marginally acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment and grading procedures.

**Poor** -- Self-assessment and course materials demonstrate unacceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment and grading procedures.

2.) Evaluation of instruction
The evaluation of a faculty member's instruction shall be demonstrated through multiple means. Whereas faculty members are required to submit their Student Opinion Questionnaires, they shall not, be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. The quantitative and qualitative data from Student Opinion Questionnaires is to be presented along with other methods of evaluation.

a.) Student Opinion Questionnaires
Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered
more informative than isolated comments or courses. The following scale shall be applied when rating the statistical summaries of student opinions of each class:

- **Excellent** -- 89.5% or more A and B ratings with at least 60% A
- **Good** -- 74.5 to 89.4% A and B ratings
- **Fair** -- 59.5 to 74.4% A and B ratings
- **Poor** -- less than 59.4% A and B ratings

Student comments from the Student Opinion Questionnaires are also to be considered. These comments can contextualize the quantitative ratings and provide other insight into student evaluation of teaching.

b.) Additional considerations

The overall Evaluation of instruction portion of Teaching Effectiveness can be further enhanced with additional considerations to broaden the calculated rating of specific classes based on SOQs. In this type of evaluation each course shall be rated separately and the evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, typical grade distributions, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member's overall level of experience and efforts to improve teaching performance.

One method of evaluating instruction is for faculty members to submit peer evaluations of their actual classroom teaching. Faculty members from the same institution can be invited to evaluate a faculty member's instruction in the classroom and provide an assessment of the teaching and classroom environment. Faculty members can submit multiple evaluations from different classes.

Another method of review for classes with patterns of lower SOQ ratings is for a faculty member to submit a peer evaluation of a specific course conducted by another faculty member from the same institution. In this review, the peer evaluation can address those student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student evaluation forms and contained in written student comments on these forms. This provides the faculty member with an external evaluation of the class that considers multiple factors (class size, preparation involved, etc.) in addition to the SOQ ratings.

In evaluating a faculty member's instruction, the Committee is to consider the entire period of review but places greater emphasis on the three most recent years of a faculty member's teaching. This view is to allow the Committee to evaluate a faculty member's development as a teacher and trace progress over time. The Committee shall rate evaluation of instruction as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

- **Excellent** – The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are excellent as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ and additional considerations that reflect an outstanding performance in evaluation of instruction.
**Good** – The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are good or above as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ and additional considerations that reflect a good performance in evaluation of instruction.

**Fair** – The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are fair or above as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ and additional considerations that reflect a fair performance in evaluation of instruction.

**Poor** – The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are poor as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ and additional considerations that reflect a poor performance in evaluation of instruction.

3) **Ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher**

All faculty are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by conference participation and/or other interaction with their colleagues. It is expected that scholarly and creative accomplishments will be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and student participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings. Each faculty member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to maintain and improve teaching effectiveness. This program could include participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, attending conferences, developing or revising curriculum based on new professional standards or requirements, and familiarity with the pedagogical literature in the faculty member's discipline. When specific weaknesses have been identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these weaknesses.

The Committee shall rate ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent** – Evidence of at least three activities in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Good** – Evidence of at least two activities in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Fair** – Evidence of at least one activity in the Portfolio demonstrate marginally acceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Poor** – No evidence in this type of activity in the Portfolio demonstrates unacceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

4) **Composite Rating of Teaching Performance**
Based on a composite of the ratings of the three areas described above, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching performance as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent** – At least two scores of Excellent and one score of Good, or three scores of Excellent is considered outstanding teaching performance.

**Good** – At least three scores of Good or two scores of Good and one score of Excellent is considered clearly acceptable teaching performance.

**Fair** – At least one score of Good and two scores of Fair or two scores of Good and one score of Fair is considered marginally acceptable teaching performance.

**Poor** – Three scores of Fair or worse is considered unacceptable teaching performance.

### B. Scholarly and creative accomplishments

Each faculty member shall establish a record of scholarly/creative endeavor that generates, integrates and/or disseminates knowledge. When appropriate, these endeavors shall be integrated with teaching, actively involve students, and attract external support. Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activity generates benefits for the faculty member as well as for the University. Such activity may: a) complement teaching; b) contribute to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement; c) promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike; d) increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines; e) enhance the professional growth of the faculty member; f) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University; g) advance the reputation of the University; and h) enhance collaborative scholarship. Scholarly and creative activity is expected to be consistent with the areas of inquiry associated with counselor education, counseling and/or psychology, and social justice.

#### 1. Indicators

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating scholarly and creative activity:

**a. Self-assessment (mandatory)**

The self-assessment must include both a reflective review of the faculty member's scholarly and creative activity and her/his future goals and direction with reference to the benefits listed above and applicability to the faculty member's Prospectus. The statement shall emphasize the scholarly accomplishments of the faculty member since her/his appointment at CSUF or since the last action and should be documented by supporting evidence.

**b. Publications**

1) Types of Publications

a.) Articles published or accepted in professionally recognized, externally peer-reviewed journals should be included. (Published research related to pedagogy that meets this standard shall be included in this category.) High quality articles include original data driven manuscripts (qualitative or quantitative), extensive literature reviews, case-studies or other clinically focused manuscripts, and theoretical pieces that are consistent with the field of counselor education, counseling, and/or psychology. Documentation must include evidence of peer review, of quality as outlined below, and of one of the following: (1) the letter of acceptance and commitment to publish the article or (2) a reprint of the published article.
b.) Books (authored or edited), including textbooks, or chapters in edited books, either published or accepted for publication by a process of external (peer) review should be included. Documentation must include the following: (1) a copy of the publication in the final printed version; or (2) the galley page proofs.

c.) Other scholarly work may include an edited book series; book or article prizes; book reviews; reprints of a faculty member’s scholarly work; professionally produced visual media (DVDs, etc), published training manuals or curriculum, trade or self-help books, etc. These items are not considered as high quality as refereed publications, and it is up to the faculty member to place the publication in the appropriate professional context for evaluation.

2) Evaluation of Publications
Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement and the contribution of the faculty member to the publication. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide the necessary evidence to evaluate the quality of the publication. Indicators may include:

a.) The publication process and the type of review (i.e., refereed, blind reviewed).
b.) Whether the publication is in a state, regional, national or international journal.
c.) The status of the journal as measured by rejection/acceptance rates and impact factor.
d.) The prestige of the publication as measured by its contribution to the profession and its ranking in the Social Sciences Citation Index.
e.) Whether the authored work is single-authored, and the specific contributions in first-authored, or equal-authored works.
f.) How often the authored work is cited by others as reported in citation databases such as the Social Sciences Citation Index. External peer reviews on published materials, for example, book reviews written by professional peers in academic outlets such as PsycCRITIQUES.

3) Documentation of Publications
Documentation of all accomplishments shall include a complete citation in APA Style for each scholarly and creative work; a copy of each scholarly or creative work published since the faculty member's appointment; and copies of letters of acceptance for those completed works that are "in press" or otherwise in the process of publication. For works presented in a medium other than print, the copy may be in a form suitable for evaluation as appropriate to the discipline (e.g., DVD, CD, VHS Tape, etc.).

Work that has been accepted for publication or presentation after a peer-review or jury process shall be distinguished from work that was not subject to a peer review or jury process. Scholarly or creative works are considered to have been completed when they have been accepted for publication or presentation without further revision; books and book chapters must have proof beyond a letter of acceptance such as the final printed version or the galley page proofs.

c. Applied Scholarship

1) Consideration is given to internal or external grants funded by the University, government agencies, and/or private agencies. Grants which have been approved or which have been accepted but not funded may also be presented as evidence of scholarly work.
2) Applied scholarship activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the faculty member and are carried out through consultation, policy analysis, program evaluation, and so forth are also considered. In documenting applied work, faculty shall include not only their own written record of the project, but also, where possible, the evaluations of those who received the service. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products, are encouraged in this category.

d. Scholarly Presentations

Scholarly papers and presentation given shall be seen as additional but lesser scholarly contributions as they are considered steps toward publication. These are to be cited in APA Style and include the name, date and location of the presentation. Peer review is one indicator of quality for this category of scholarship. Documentation must include evidence of peer review. Another indicator is whether the presentation is given at a local, state, regional, national, or international conference.

2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activity

These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how her/his scholarly and creative accomplishments address some or all of the criteria listed below and the particular objectives identified in the faculty member's Prospectus.

a. The Department employs traditional criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work, and may include:

1) Clarity of conceptualization.
2) Originality of scholarship.
3) Contribution to the faculty members' discipline and/or to interdisciplinary scholarship.
4) Impact on scholarship in the field.
5) Quality of the forum in which the work appears (for example, acceptance rates of journal articles or whether the journal is regional or national).
6) Peer reviews from outside the University of a faculty member's scholarly contribution to the profession.

b. In addition, in light of the missions of the Department and the HHD philosophy, the Department also evaluates scholarly and creative activities based on the degree to which they:

1) Complement teaching.
2) Contribute to the advancement of counseling and, more broadly, to human achievement.
3) Contribute to professional expectation of evidenced based practice as defined by applied empirical research (qualitative or quantitative), clinical expertise, or multicultural competency.
4) Complement clinical application.
5) Promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike.
6) Increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines.
7) Contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University.
8) Enhance the professional growth of the faculty member.
9) Advance the reputation of the University.
10) Enhance collaborative scholarship.
11) Impact traditionally underserved populations and/or topics in counseling and psychology.

3. **Guidelines for Rating Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments**

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of work over the entire period is required to achieve tenure, with some of this work being first authored. The Department recognizes the mentoring process in a faculty member’s first year, thus scholarly and creative accomplishments are expected to flow from the second year onward from an organized plan of activity. Based upon the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member’s overall scholarly and creative accomplishments as "**excellent**," "**good**," "**fair**," or "**poor**" as follows:

- A rating of "**excellent**" shall be given for a comprehensive self-assessment and *outstanding* performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of six items of high quality scholarship, including at least three refereed publications, one of which should be a first or single authored blind-refereed journal article, over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period, are expected for a rating of "**excellent**."

- A rating of "**good**" shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment and *clearly acceptable* performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of four items of high quality scholarship, one of which should be first authored, with at least three refereed scholarly publications over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period, are expected for a rating of "**good**."

- A rating of "**fair**" shall be rendered for an adequate and/or up to a comprehensive self-assessment and *marginally acceptable* performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of two items of high quality scholarship, with at least one refereed scholarly publication over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period, are expected for a rating of "**fair**." Scholarly performance at this level or slightly better (i.e. three items of high quality scholarship with at least one refereed scholarly publication) with a self-assessment that is lacking in thoroughness or content and flow would merit a fair rating.

- A rating of "**poor**" shall be rendered for an inadequate self-assessment and/or *unacceptable* performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of three or less high quality scholarly items, even if one of these is refereed, with an inadequate self assessment would merit a poor rating. Conversely, a comprehensive self-assessment with a total of two items of high quality scholarship and no refereed scholarly publications, or only one item of high quality scholarship would merit a rating of poor.

C. **Professional, University, and Community Service**

Untenured faculty members shall present, in the Prospectus, service objectives related to two categories of service: Professional/Community service, and University service.

1. **Professional/Community Service**

Faculty in applied fields such as those in the Department are encouraged not only to make original scholarly contributions in the form of written material, but also to communicate and implement knowledge by means of presentations and consultations, workshops and trainings, activity within national and local organizations, and leadership positions within national and local organizations. The benefits of professional/Community service are many, including:
a. Complement teaching by allowing the teacher to draw from applied experience.
b. Promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied.
c. Promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike.
d. Enhance the professional growth of the faculty member.
e. Advance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.
f. Directly impact positive change in communities, organizations, and individuals.

For the purpose of professional maintenance and growth, each faculty member is encouraged and expected to engage actively in the affairs of the discipline and related professions, such as the following: assuming professional leadership roles at the regional, state, national, and international level; attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops; acquiring professional licenses, credentials and certificates; serving on the editorial boards of professional journals; reviewing manuscripts/submissions for book proposals, professional journals or conferences; providing direct service to the community or consultations relevant to the field; reviewing grant proposals; receiving professional training or providing additional professional training to others; being interviewed by the media; and engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the Profession/Community and in support of the University's Mission and Goals. Ongoing, active involvement in a minimum of two Professional/Community service activities over the entire period of review is required for achievement of tenure in the Department.

2. University Service

The success of any University or Department is partially dependent on the active participation of its faculty members in the various organizational and governance tasks. In the case of the Department an unusually heavy demand for involvement in program activities, such as advisement, curriculum development, program review for accreditation purposes, and so forth, fall upon a relatively few full-time faculty. All Department faculty are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of their Department, as well as those of the College and University. At a minimum, a faculty member is expected to keep office hours, attend meetings of the Department on a regular basis, participate in College and University faculty events, and serve on at least two committees or perform comparable tasks (i.e. completing multiple, one-time, labor intensive tasks such as updating all syllabi to be compliant with changes in law (SB 33) or creating the Masters Clinical Training Handbook needed for accreditation, etc.) over the entire period of review for tenure. Contributions that exceed minimal expectations (e.g., participating on numerous committees or in activities of a more demanding nature, or assuming positions of leadership in such tasks) will enhance the faculty member’s rating for service.

3. Evaluating Service

The Department believes that the quality, quantity, and impact of a faculty member's service contributions need to be considered in the context of the potential benefits to the profession, community, and/or University, and in light of prevailing professional standards.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "excellent" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in three or more Professional/Community service activities and active, quality involvement in three or more Department, College and/or University service activities. Quality involvements might include at least an average of 1-2 hours per week, whether attending meetings or conducting business for that service activity, or a leadership position (for example, President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, or chairing a committee) that requires responsibilities beyond attending meetings.
The service activity must either be time and labor intensive for a short duration (a month or more) or may require contributions over a semester or academic year.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "good" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least two Professional/Community service activities and active, quality involvement in at least two Department, College, and/or University service activities.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "fair" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least one Professional/Community service activity or active, quality involvement in at least one Department, College, or University activity.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "poor" will be given for a record of service that fails to include active, quality involvement either in Professional/Community service or in service to the Department, College, and/or University.

The untenured faculty member is reminded that the first two criteria, teaching and scholarly and creative accomplishments are of primary importance and must be developed in the probationary years. The other criterion, Professional, University, and Community service, needs to be developed, but is less heavily weighted for probationary faculty.

In order to qualify for promotion to Professor, tenured faculty are expected to continue to provide leadership in service activities that are in accordance with expectations for promotion (i.e., three or more Professional/Community service activities and active, quality involvement in three or more Department, College and/or University service activities). A qualitative difference, however, is expected in the type of involvement as faculty members assume a senior role. At least one of the campus service activities must be at the University level. A tenured faculty member can show growth and service leadership by serving as a board member (i.e. President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer) or chairing a College, University, Professional, or Community service committee.

D. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1. Retention of Probationary Faculty
   Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual's progress in meeting the criteria for tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member must be rated at a minimum:
   - "good" in two areas, one of which must be teaching
   - "fair" or better in the other area, with progress toward "good"
   - scholarly and creative accomplishments must be rated "fair" or better, with progress toward "good"

2. Criteria for Granting of Tenure
   Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure. In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member must be rated, at a minimum:
   - "good" or "excellent" in teaching performance and scholarly and creative accomplishments, one of which must be "excellent". (NOTE: It is not expected that each faculty
member will have been rated "good" or "excellent" over the entire period of review for tenure; what is important is attainment of a rating of "good" or "excellent" by the end of the review period.)

- at least "good" in Professional, University, and Community service

3. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Because the professoriate entails continual growth and reassessment, the University expects that tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in all three areas of performance, and that successful faculty members will display accomplishments, growth, and future potential throughout their careers. Therefore, the decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described above. Further, during review for Professor, accomplishments used for prior promotion to Associate Professor shall not be used again for promotion to Professor. In the cases where there has been a lengthy period since promotion to Associate Professor, the most recent five years of evidence shall normally be emphasized in evaluating a record of continuing performance, but shall not exclude consideration of total productivity over the entire Associate period.

In order to be granted promotion to Full Professor, the faculty member must be rated, at minimum:

- "excellent" in two areas, one of which must be teaching or scholarly accomplishments
- at least "good" in the other area

4. Early Promotion and Early Tenure

a. Early Promotion to Associate Professor

Early promotion to Associate Professor requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth and potential that strongly indicate that, by the completion of the probationary period, the expectations for tenure stated in this document will be met in the area of Professional, Community, and University service and exceeded in the areas of Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity.

b. Early Tenure

Early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in Teaching, Service, and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceed the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and the Department Personnel Standards. In order to be considered for early tenure, an eligible faculty member shall apply in writing to Faculty Affairs and Records on or before September 10.

c. Early Promotion to Professor

Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at a level of Excellent.

A candidate for promotion may withdraw his or her promotion request without prejudice at any level of review prior to the final decision.