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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Department Goals

The advancement of learning is central to the mission of the Department of Geological Sciences. The primary goal of the department is to provide an environment conducive to the highest quality teaching, learning, and scholarship. To achieve this, it is necessary to provide guidelines to ensure continued faculty development in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities (SCA), and Service to the profession, the university, and the public community. To this end, yet another department goal is to guide each affected faculty member through the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process as smoothly as possible. The department subscribes to the philosophy that the RTP evaluation procedures are directed towards helping the faculty member develop to his/her fullest potential.

B. UPS 210.000

As UPS 210.000 is the controlling document in faculty personnel policies and procedures, and provides the framework for appointment and RTP, the affected faculty member has the responsibility of becoming thoroughly familiar with UPS 210.000. For probationary faculty, this relates primarily to the description and preparation of the Portfolio. The Portfolio contains the evidence of performance and is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. The faculty member shall assure that the Portfolio meets the organization and content requirements specified in UPS 210.000.

C. Department Personnel Document Goals

The purpose of this department faculty personnel document (DPD) is to supplement UPS 210.000 by specifying the evaluation criteria and the kinds of activities that relate to these criteria, as well as the performance standards and the types of evidence necessary to document success in each evaluation criterion throughout the RTP process. It is important that a healthy RTP dialogue be established early and be maintained between the faculty member and the department. This dialogue will be promoted by: (1) communication of needs and desires of both the faculty member and the department; (2) multiple opportunities for the faculty member to assess his/her progress towards personal goals described in the Developmental Narrative (DN), as well as in the Teaching, Research and Service narratives of the Portfolio; and (3) timely advice and assistance from the faculty mentor, department chair, and department personnel committee (DPC). The ultimate goal of the evaluation process is for the affected faculty member to reach his/her potential as a teacher-scholar.

D. Developmental Narrative

While UPS 210.000 and this Department Personnel Standards document are the controlling instruments in the RTP process, the Developmental Narrative (DN) is an outline of goals set
forth by the probationary faculty member that will help guide the probationary faculty member successfully through the RTP process. The Teaching, SCA and Service segments of the DN shall be based on the position description and written expectations under which the appointment was made.

There is no formal approval process for the DN. The DN will be reviewed only by the department chair and by the dean, who will each provide written feedback prior to May 1 of the first year. The probationary faculty member should consider this feedback when making any revisions to their DN. The DN must be included in the Portfolio submitted during the second probationary year. During subsequent years, the DN may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

For those faculty who have approved Development Plans (in contrast to Developmental Narratives), progress toward RTP will be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and this Department Personnel Standards document.

E. Faculty Mentor

The probationary faculty member's progression from initial appointment through the RTP process shall be assisted by a mentor: a tenured faculty member who shall be selected in accordance with UPS 210.000. The mentor, through his/her accumulated experience and wisdom, should assume a proactive role and provide guidance to help the probationary faculty member in setting achievable and realistic goals. Particularly during the first year of the probationary faculty member's service, the mentor and affected faculty member will meet as needed to discuss the DN to insure it is consistent with the DPD and UPS 210.000.

F. Department Personnel Committee

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of three tenured members of the department and one tenured alternate, none of whom may be on any type of leave during that year of service. The department chair may not serve on the DPC. The three DPC members shall be selected by secret ballot from a slate of all qualified faculty members within the department. If there are fewer than four qualified tenured faculty in the department, similarly qualified faculty from related disciplines should be added to the slate to bring the total number of candidates to four. If multiple candidates from related disciplines are nominated (and agree to participate if elected), a separate secret ballot shall be conducted to determine which non-departmental faculty member(s) shall fill any vacancies in the slate.

Once the Committee is selected, the alternate will be selected by secret ballot from the remaining qualified faculty members. As described in UPS 210.000, there are certain RTP situations in which an otherwise qualified DPC member may be deemed unable to serve. Additionally, DPC members are expected to disqualify themselves in situations involving an apparent conflict of interest. Regardless of the cause, the alternate will serve on the DPC in the event that the number of committee members drops below three.
II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Productive faculty engage in three complementary aspects of professional life: (1) TEACHING in and out of the classroom, (2) SCHOLARLY and CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (SCA) that enhance student and peer learning, and (3) PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY and COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES (Service) that support the advancement of learning.

The evaluation of the faculty member shall be tabulated on the department evaluation form (Appendix 1) by each DPC member. Performance shall be rated as EXCELLENT (E), SUFFICIENT (S), or INSUFFICIENT (I), as defined in section III of this document (Standards of Performance). The final rating in each evaluation category will equal the mode of the ratings from the DPC members. At each level, the key evaluation decision is between Sufficient and Insufficient. Although a rating of Sufficient is the minimum requirement for positive RTP action, it is the department’s goal that all faculty members attain and sustain excellence in each evaluation category.

The level of accomplishment required varies depending on the RTP review level of the faculty member. In all cases, however, the evaluation will give greatest consideration to Teaching, with slightly lesser consideration to SCA. Excellent Service can never substitute for insufficient performance in either the Teaching or SCA categories. Correlation between criteria expressed here and the evaluation categories of Excellent, Sufficient, and Insufficient is deferred to section III (Standards of Performance) where specific standards are matched with particular review levels in the RTP process.

A. Teaching

Teaching effectiveness will be based on DPC evaluation of the faculty member’s performance during the review period, as described in the teaching narrative and supported by materials in the Portfolio Appendix. The evaluation will specifically consider:

1. Student responses to instruction: Student responses to instruction (SRI) should reflect the affected faculty member’s conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization and attention to student needs. Although summaries of student response to questions on the department SRI form (Appendix 3) are useful quantitative indicators of performance, qualitative evidence such as written student comments on the back of the SRI forms, as well as unsolicited written and signed comments by students, may be included in the evaluation. All raw SRI data and the original forms must be included in the Portfolio appendix.

2. Classroom peer reviews: The principal purpose of classroom peer review of teaching effectiveness is to provide the faculty member timely advice on how to improve his/her teaching performance. The DPC shall be responsible for performing these evaluations. For probationary faculty, classroom peer reviews will be conducted at least once each semester. Post-tenure faculty who are eligible for promotion will be evaluated at least once per year, or more frequently as deemed necessary by the DPC. Any faculty member may request additional peer reviews. Faculty conducting the review shall abide by guidelines set forth in the instructions (Appendix 4), shall complete the appropriate form (Appendix 5), shall
discuss the review with the faculty member, and shall forward signed copies to the department chair and the faculty member being reviewed. All classroom peer reviews shall be included in the Portfolio.

3. Student Research: Involvement of students in the faculty member’s research is viewed as a critical part of the educational process at CSUF. Supervision of undergraduate student theses is, therefore, required. A thesis proposal, filed in the student’s department folder, constitutes evidence of attracting students for research. Copies of completed senior theses should be on-file in the department. Supervision of graduate theses is encouraged and should be discussed in the DN. Additional service on graduate thesis committees, both within CSUF and at other institutions, is highly recommended.

4. Expectations regarding student achievement: The faculty member’s expectations of student achievement should be appropriately rigorous for the level and goals of the course. Learning outcome goals for each course, as well as copies of course syllabi and other appropriate materials, shall provide a gauge for this assessment. The results of grading practices should be reasonably consistent with the norm for comparable courses in the department (Appendix 7). Higher medians and narrower ranges are acceptable without grade inflation providing that inspiration, combined with rigor, can be documented.

The strongest evidence of expectations of student achievement may include, but not be limited to:

(a) course syllabi and representative course materials;
(b) lab or field exercises;
(c) exams or student-originated work to support pedagogical approach and methods, as well as expectations regarding student achievement in lecture/lab courses.

5. Pedagogical approach and method: Each course should prepare students for more advanced courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite, and should build on previous courses. Faculty should employ appropriate and diverse teaching and learning assessment methods. The strongest evidence of pedagogical approach may include, but not be limited to:

(a) incorporation and assessment of innovative teaching techniques or strategies in lectures, laboratory, or field environments;
(b) original curricular development.

6. On-going professional development as a teacher: Faculty should demonstrate a thoughtful, deliberate effort to improve his/her teaching effectiveness. The strongest evidence of on-going professional development as a teacher may include, but not be limited to:

(a) revision of course materials or instructional strategies;
(b) completion of textbooks, laboratory manuals, field guides, etc.;
(c) contributions in such activities as GE course coordinator, laboratory coordinator, field course coordinator;
(d) documentation of participation in pedagogical workshops or seminars.
7. On-going professional development in the discipline: Faculty should be current in their discipline so as to maintain their teaching effectiveness. The strongest evidence may include, but not be limited to:
   (a) professional (technical) meeting attendance;
   (b) consulting; certifications (e.g., CA registered geologist);
   (c) attendance on professional field trips or activities during which the faculty member was furthering his/her knowledge;
   (d) participation in workshops or training sessions sponsored by professional organizations;
   (e) funding of extramural grants for teaching equipment and/or pedagogical innovations;
   (f) orchestrating/organizing symposia, workshops, other group interactions in support of the teaching objectives of the department.

All examples of student work must be presented in a way that protects students’ anonymity.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities (SCA)

Research is considered to be an essential subset of SCA. Research should be original and/or innovative, should adhere to the scientific method, should produce peer-reviewed products, and should lead to new or improved understanding of the discipline. Traditional scientific research and pedagogical research are considered to be endeavors of equal importance. The relative emphasis of these two areas of research must be addressed in the faculty member’s DN. Standards for both are the same (see section III.B).

The faculty member is required to present some of his/her scholarly work in peer-reviewed media. UPS 210,000 clearly indicates that there should be high quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, and that quantity does not substitute for quality. In SCA with multiple authors, it is essential that the faculty member specify his/her contribution and describe how that contribution is a significant part of the activity. Signed multiple-author forms are strongly encouraged: if senior author, the affected faculty member should obtain a signature form or letter from a junior author; if a junior author, the affected faculty member should obtain a signature form or letter from the senior author. Student involvement in SCA shall be considered as an enhancing factor. Awards for some aspect of SCA must be documented and shall be considered an enhancing factor.

Accomplishments in SCA will be based on DPC evaluation of the faculty member’s performance during the review period, as described in the SCA narrative and supported by materials in the Portfolio Appendix. At each level of RTP evaluation, SCA is grouped into the following criteria:

Peer-reviewed Publications

1. Sole or senior authorship of research published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required, in professionally recognized, rigorously and externally peer-reviewed, scientific journals. This publication criterion is satisfied most directly by research articles in
journals with standards comparable to those of the Geological Society of America (see Appendix 8 for examples). A full citation (with title, authorship, date, journal, volume, pages) shall be included in the Portfolio; a reprint or preprint of the paper shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

2. *Sole or senior authorship of research or review article published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required, in a professionally recognized, rigorously peer-reviewed scientific medium*, such as a book, book chapter, symposium volume contribution, geologic map (with text), professional organization fieldtrip guidebook, article or other comparable expression that does not qualify for category II.B.1. A full citation (with title, authorship, date, medium, volume, pages) shall be included in the Portfolio; a reprint or preprint of the contribution shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

3. *Co-authorship of research published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required in peer-reviewed media* (see 1 and 2 above). A full citation (with title, authorship, date, medium, volume, pages) shall be included in the Portfolio; a preprint or reprint of the contribution shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

4. *Sole or co-authorship of manuscript that has been submitted for publication in peer-reviewed scientific media*. A copy of the manuscript and a letter from the editor acknowledging its submission shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

5. *Sole or co-authorship of peer-reviewed paper not recommended for publication*. A copy of the manuscript, with reviews and pertinent correspondence, shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

6. *Sole or co-authorship of research manuscript in late stage of development for submittal to peer-reviewed media*. A copy of the working manuscript shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

---

**Contract Research Reports**

7. *Sole or co-authorship of final, accepted contract report, accompanied by a written review by a representative of the contracting agency*. The contract must be between the university and client; private consulting reports are not considered as SCA in RTP evaluation. In the case of multiple-authored reports, the amount of the faculty member's contribution shall be documented with a signature form. A copy of the research report and the client review shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

8. *Sole or co-authorship of final, submitted contract report*. In the case of multiple-authored reports, the amount of the faculty member's contribution shall be documented with a signature form. A copy of the working manuscript shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.
Extramural Grant and Contract Proposals

9. Principal investigator (PI) status on funded extramural research-related grant or contract proposal. Copies of the proposal and the acceptance letter shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

10. Co-investigator (co-PI) status on funded extramural grant or contract proposal. The amount of contribution to both the writing of the grant or contract proposal and the subsequent performance shall be documented with a signature form. Copies of the proposal and the acceptance letter shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

11. PI or co-PI status on submitted extramural grant or contract proposal for which the decision is pending. A copy of the proposal shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

12. PI or co-PI status on un-funded extramural grant or contract proposal. Copies of the proposal and external reviews shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

Published Abstracts

13. First authorship of published abstract presented at professional meetings, or co-authorship with a significant contribution of SCA. In the case of co-authorship, the amount of the faculty member’s contribution shall be documented with a signature form. Invited contributions, or those involving student participation, shall be identified in the Portfolio narrative. A copy of the abstract and letters of invitation, if any, shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

Other SCA

14. PI or co-PI status on funded intramural grants or contracts. Copies of the proposal and the acceptance letter shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

15. First or co-authorship for non-peer-reviewed publication. In the case of multiple-authored publications, the amount of the faculty member’s contribution shall be documented with a signature form. A copy of publication shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

16. Presenter of technical workshops, short courses, or training sessions in which the affected faculty member has made a scientific contribution. Appropriate documentation of the nature of the contribution shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

17. PI or co-PI status on unfunded intramural grant proposal. A copy of the proposal shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.
18. Construction and/or calibration of analytical equipment/instrumentation in support of research plans. Establishing a functional research lab, as appropriate for the affected faculty member’s area of expertise, is especially pertinent during the early probationary period (i.e. years 1-3).

C. Professional, University and Community Service Activity

Professional, university, and community service activity shall be evaluated with regard to the service objectives set forth in the individual’s DN. Service contributions during the review period will be evaluated by the DPC based on activities described in the service narrative and supported by materials in the Portfolio Appendix. These objectives should reflect the commitment of the university to the advancement of learning.

Professional service activity may include, but not be limited to:

1. Organizer, convener, or chair of invited-paper symposia, technical-theme sessions, or contributed-paper sessions at professional conferences.

2. Officer, or active participant in an official capacity (e.g., board member, division chair; publication editor or associate editor), for professional organizations. Recipient of an award from a professional society. A copy of the award letter, or other documentation, shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

3. Reviewer of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals or other technical publications. Documentation that demonstrates completion of review, but does not violate the confidentiality of authors, shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

4. Reviewer of proposals for granting agencies such as NSF, DOE, and PRF-ACS. Documentation that demonstrates completion of review, but does not violate the confidentiality of applicants, shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

5. Leader or co-leader of field trips for professional organizations. A copy of title page with leader designations shall be included in the Portfolio appendix.

6. Presenter of technical seminars or lectures to academic or other professional organizations.

7. Consultant activity of technical nature to public or private organizations. Alternatively, such activity may be considered under SCA, depending on the scientific level of the consulting activities and concurrence between the activity and the mission of the department and university.

University and community service activity may include but not be limited to:

8. Active participation in departmental governance and functions (e.g., service on various committees such as curriculum, computer, seminar, space, student club advisor, graduate
advisor). Each year of service on any given committee counts as one contribution in section III.

9. Active participation in CNSM and university governance and functions (e.g., service on various committees such as awards, library, research, curriculum, grievance, international education). Each year of service on any given committee counts as one contribution in section III.

10. Presentations made to university or community groups.

11. Active participation in community activities that are concordant with the mission of the university and department.
III. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

Retention of Probationary Faculty

Recommendation for retention is based upon a sufficient level of performance in the three aspects of the faculty member’s professional activities in accordance with standards set forth in this document and UPS 210.000. A Sufficient (S) rating on the departmental form for evaluation of faculty performance (Appendix I) is a minimum level of satisfactory performance. It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate appropriate progress in performance levels and accomplishments such that a positive tenure decision is likely. Probationary faculty members appointed with service credit are evaluated under the probationary year criteria equal to the actual years served at CSUF plus the service credit year(s) (see UPS 210.000 regarding Service Credits).

Table 1 is a grid that illustrates the evaluation rating permutations of Teaching and SCA. Note that faculty members are expected to achieve at least Sufficient ratings in both categories.

Table 1. Grid for assessing overall RTP rating of probationary faculty based on Teaching and SCA. This combined rating is used in Table 2 for tenure/promotion.

|  | Teaching |  |
|---|-----------|--|---|
|  | Insufficient | Sufficient | Excellent |
| Insufficient | **Insufficient termination at end of second year may be recommended**; termination at end of fourth year **will be recommended** | **Insufficient termination at end of fourth year may be recommended** | **Insufficient termination at end of fourth year may be recommended** |
| Sufficient | Insufficient termination at end of fourth year **may be recommended** | Sufficient | Sufficient |
| Excellent | Insufficient termination at end of fourth year **may be recommended** | Sufficient | Excellent |

A. Teaching

Specific goals for each review period are described below. The DPC will look for patterns of improvement in each Teaching evaluation category, especially where needed, and for evidence of sustained performance. The expectation of improvement is built into the review criteria. For example, an overall first-year average SRI score of 3.00 is required for a rating of Sufficient
during the second probationary year review, whereas a minimum overall 5-year average of 3.20 must be obtained for a rating of Sufficient during sixth-year (i.e. tenure consideration) review. SRI scores for each review level were set by considering the department mean of 3.18, calculated for all classes taught for the 10-year period from Fall 1992 to Spring 2002 (see Appendix 6).

The department steadfastly maintains that while an absolute SRI number is needed as a target, the practice of making it rigid also runs the risk of possibly discouraging pedagogical innovation and maintenance of standards for student performance, as well as encouraging grade inflation. In certain situations, the DPC may find that an average SRI score that is slightly below/near the stated threshold for the particular level of review could be compensated for by other laudable contributions, such as strong peer reviews and innovative methods. Therefore, if the affected faculty member has isolated or specific instances that deviate from a pattern of steady improvement, these instances shall be fully explained and justified (e.g., experimenting with a new teaching approach or strategy) in the Portfolio. Therefore the DPC reserves the right to exercise some degree of flexibility in the overall evaluation of Teaching. The department favors target standards for SRI scores, but not at the expense of fairness and common sense whereby sincere effort, creativity and innovation might be unduly penalized.

1. Second probationary year review (for year 1): During the first probationary year, the faculty member is expected to solidify his/her teaching performance.

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score (average of all class averages) exceeding 3.50; (2) classroom peer reviews averaging excellent for all categories; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) two contributions from different categories of II.A.5 - 7.

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score of 3.00 (average of class averages). However, the affected faculty member should be aware that the minimum average score of all class averages for years 1 – 5 must exceed 3.20. Notable weaknesses indicated by students in response to individual questions or in written comments shall be addressed and corrected; (2) classroom peer reviews must average sufficient for all categories, and those individual categories that are deemed insufficient shall be addressed and corrected; (3) sufficient rating in II.A.4; (4) one contribution from II.A.5 - 7.

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet all of the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient. Weaknesses identified on SRI forms and classroom peer reviews will be addressed.

2. Third probationary year period review (for year 2): This is a periodic review, covering a single year of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after two years of activity, and thus the DPC will look for evidence of growth and progress toward tenure between years 1 and 2. Performance criteria for this one-year period are:
**Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score (average of class averages) exceeding 3.50; (2) classroom peer reviews must average excellent for all categories; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) two contributions from two different categories from among II.A.5 – 7.

**Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score (average of class averages) of 3.20. Notable weaknesses indicated by students in response to individual questions, or in written comments, shall be addressed and corrected; (2) classroom peer reviews must average sufficient for all categories; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) sufficient rating in II.A.4; (5) one contribution from among II.A.5 – 7.

**Insufficient** – Failure to meet all of the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient. Weaknesses identified on SRI forms, classroom peer reviews, and from II.A.1 - 7 shall be addressed.

3. Fourth probationary year review (for years 1 – 3): This is a full performance review covering three years of activity (years 1, 2, and 3; i.e., the half-way point in the probationary period); therefore requirements are cumulative. By this pivotal fourth year, the DPC expects to see strong evidence of growth and progress through years 1 – 3 towards tenure.

**Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score (average of class averages for all courses taught years 1 – 3) exceeding 3.50; (2) classroom peer reviews must average excellent for all categories; (3) supervisor for three completed student thesis proposals, one of these having lead to a completed student thesis; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) six contributions from at least two categories from among II.A.5 – 7.

**Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score (average of class averages for all courses taught years 1 – 3) of 3.20; (2) classroom peer reviews must average sufficient for all categories; (3) supervisor for two completed student thesis proposals; (4) sufficient rating in II.A.4; (5) three contributions from at least two different categories from among II.A.5 – 7.

**Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

4. Fifth probationary year review (for year 4). This is a periodic review, covering a single year (year 4) of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after four years of activity and thus the DPC will look for strong evidence of continued growth and progress toward tenure through years 1-4. Remember it will be the cumulative record of years 1 – 5 that will be evaluated for consideration for tenure; hence the fourth (full performance) and fifth (single year) year reviews are critical gauges for tenure consideration during the sixth year.
Excellent – Minimum requirements are: SRI score (average of class averages) exceeding 3.50; (2) classroom peer reviews must average excellent for all categories for the period; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) one contribution from two different categories among II.A.5 – 7.

Sufficient – Minimum requirements are: SRI score of 3.20 (average of class averages); (2) classroom peer reviews must average sufficient for all categories; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) sufficient rating in II.A.4; (5) one contribution from among II.A.5 – 7 during the period (fourth year).

Insufficient – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activity

The DPC will look for patterns of improvement in each evaluation category, especially where needed, and for evidence of sustained performance. During the early years (i.e., 1 – 3), the probationary faculty member is expected to initiate and establish research facilities and to pursue funding for SCA. During the later years (i.e. 4 - 5), the probationary faculty is expected to have an established research program and to have successfully obtained funding for their SCA.

1. Second probationary year review (for year 1): This is full review, covering a single year of activity. During the first probationary year the affected faculty member should demonstrate progress in establishing his/her research program.

   Excellent – Minimum requirements are: (1) initiation of a research program that involves students; (2) at least one contribution from among II.B.1 – 12; (3) one contribution from II.B.13; and (4) two additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 18.

   Sufficient – Minimum requirements are: (1) initiation of a research program showing strong potential for student involvement; and (2) two contributions from among II.B.1 – 18.

   Insufficient – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

2. Third probationary year review (for year 2): This is periodic review, covering a single year of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after two years of activity, hence the DPC will look for evidence of growth and progress toward tenure.
3. **Fourth probationary year review (for years 1 – 3).** This is a full performance review covering three years of activity. Because this review covers three years, requirements are cumulative and therefore the DPC expects to see strong evidence of growth towards tenure. The affected faculty must be fully aware that at least one peer-reviewed, sole or first-authored publication (II.B.1) will be required for tenure (6th-year review); hence timely submittals must be planned accordingly.

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) the maintenance of a research program that involves students; (2) one contribution from II.B.1 – 12; (3) one contribution from II.B.13; and (4) two additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 18.

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) the maintenance of a research program that involves students; (2) two contributions from among II.B.1 – 18.

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for sufficient shall be deemed insufficient.

4. **Fifth probationary year review (for year 4):** This is periodic review, covering a single year of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after four years of activity, hence the DPC will look for strong evidence of growth and progress toward tenure.

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program that involves students; (2) two contributions from among II.B.1 – 12 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.14 – 8, 11 and 12 will count); (3) one contribution from II.B.13; (4) two additional contributions
from among II.B.1 – 18 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.4 – 8, and 11 – 18 will count).

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program that involves students; (2) four contributions from among II.B.1 – 18.

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet all of the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

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

Although establishment of sufficient teaching and a sustainable level of SCA should be the primary focus of probationary faculty members, the affected faculty member, nevertheless, is expected to be an active participant in departmental affairs (governance, development, and student affairs) and to gradually become familiar with functioning of the College of NSM (CNSM) and the university. The affected faculty member also should become involved in professional activities that will lead to increased recognition and interaction with professional peers. *It is important for the affected faculty member to be looking ahead to meet the minimum requirements for Sufficient in Service in order to be recommended for tenure.* Hence by the sixth probationary year (tenure decision year), the faculty member should have achieved the following minimum requirements for Service. Note that for committee work, the number of contributions equals the numbers of years served on all committees.

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) one contribution from II.C.1 or 2; (2) four additional contributions from at least three different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (3) ten contributions from among II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in four; (4) two contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) two contributions from different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (2) five contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in two; (3) one contribution from II.C.10 or 11.

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.
IV. GRANTING OF TENURE

Promotion and granting of tenure are normally considered together for a probationary faculty. A recommendation for granting of tenure is based on the cumulative record from time of appointment (including service credit; see UPS 210.000), and demonstrates a willingness of the department and university to commit to a long-term relationship with the faculty member.

Regular Promotion and Granting of Tenure

In the normal RTP progression, the sixth year is the review year for tenure consideration, hence the evaluation will be based on the cumulative record of years 1 – 5. It is the affected faculty member’s responsibility to demonstrate a sustained and consistent record of accomplishment and to continually strive to meet the department’s goal that all faculty members—regardless of rank—attain and sustain excellence in each evaluation category. Tenure can be recommended when a minimum overall level of performance of Sufficient is achieved, as presented and documented in the Portfolio and guided by goals set forth in the faculty member’s DN. However, if Service falls slightly below the minimum for Sufficient, but Teaching and SCA are both Excellent, the DPC may recommend tenure.

A. Teaching

The faculty member being considered for tenure should have established a sustained level of performance and accomplishment in teaching as related to the criteria established in section II, and specifically indicated below:

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score (average of all class averages) exceeding 3.50; (2) average classroom peer reviews of excellent in all categories; (3) supervision of five student theses, two of which have been completed; (4) excellent rating of II.A.4; (5) nine contributions from II.A.5 – 7, with at least one contribution in each category.

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) SRI score of 3.20 (average of all class averages); (2) average classroom peer reviews of sufficient in all categories; (3) supervision of three student theses, one of which has been completed; (4) sufficient rating of II.A.4; (5) five contributions from at least two different categories among II.A.5 – 7.

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly and creative activities should demonstrate a sustained level of growth and accomplishments that represent contributions to the discipline. These contributions shall relate to categories outlined in section II.B.1 – 18, and specifically indicated below. Peer-reviewed
publications, extramural grants funded, and presentations of research results at scientific meetings are considered the most important measures of a viable and sustained research program.

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) two contributions from II.B.1; (3) one extramural grant or contract proposal funded (II.B.9 or 10); (4) three additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 3, 7, 9 or 10 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.7, 9 and 10 will count); (5) eight contributions from II.B.13; and (6) five additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 18 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.4 – 8, and 11 – 18 will count).

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) one contribution from II.B.1; (3) one extramural grant or contract funded (II.B.9 or 10), or one extramural grant or contract submitted (II.B.11 or 12) and two intramural grants funded (II.B.14); (4) two additional contributions from II.B.1 – 3, 7, 9 or 10 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.7, 9 and 10 will count); (5) five contributions from II.B.13; and (6) four additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 18 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.4 – 8, and 11 – 18 will count).

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

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

Professional, university and service activities shall demonstrate a sufficient level of accomplishments within the professional and university communities. An active role in departmental affairs is expected. Assuming leadership roles in service activities, particularly in professional societies/organizations, is considered to be more important than simply being a member or passive participant. Note that for committee work, the number of contributions equals the numbers of years served on all committees.

- **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) one contribution from II.C.1 or 2; (2) four additional contributions from at least three different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (3) ten contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in four; and (4) two contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

- **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) two contributions from different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (2) five contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in two; and (3) one contribution from II.C.10 or 11.

- **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.
Table 2 is a grid that illustrates the sufficiency permutations between Service and the combined academic performance in Teaching and SCA from Table 1. Note that tenure typically is denied when Service is Insufficient.

Table 2. Grid for assessing tenure/early tenure for probationary faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance in Teaching and SCA (from Table 1)</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Insufficient</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Tenure may not be recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Sufficient</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellent</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure -or- early Tenure and/or promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion**

Early tenure and/or early promotion may be recommended for faculty who have received Excellent ratings in Teaching, SCA, and Service and who have met the normal progression requirements sufficient for tenure (see Granting of Tenure this document; see UPS 210.000 for timing eligibility and how service credits are considered).

**V. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

Promotion to Professor shall be recommended for a faculty member who has demonstrated that he/she is a teacher/scholar of distinction. The affected faculty member shall demonstrate that he/she has a sustained record of growth and accomplishments as a teacher/scholar and has built a solid regional, national, and/or international scientific reputation. The review period is the time interval since promotion to Associate Professor.

**Regular Promotion to Professor**

In the normal RTP progression, the eleventh year is the review year for promotion to Professor, hence the evaluation will be based on the cumulative record of years 6-10. It is the affected
faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate a sustained and consistent record of accomplishment and to continually strive to meet the department's goal that all faculty members, regardless of rank, attain and sustain excellence in each evaluation category.

A. Teaching Performance

For the faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor, the department expects him/her to be an exemplary teacher, with a sustained record of performance and accomplishment in teaching as related to the criteria defined in section II, and specifically indicated below.

- **Excellent** — Minimum requirements are: (1) overall SRI score **3.50** (average of all class averages for the review period); (2) average classroom peer reviews of excellent; (3) supervision of six student theses, three of which have been completed; (4) excellent rating of II.A.4; (5) one contribution from both II.A.5 and 6; and (6) six contributions from II.A.7.

- **Sufficient** — Minimum requirements are: (1) overall SRI score of **3.20** (average of class averages for the review period); (2) average classroom peer reviews of sufficient; (3) supervision of four student theses, two of which have been completed; (4) sufficient rating of II.A.4; (5) one contribution from either II.A.5 or 6; and (6) four contributions from II.A.7.

- **Insufficient** — Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient

B. Scholarly and Creative Activity

After receiving tenure, the faculty member is strongly encouraged by the department to develop a leadership role in SCA. The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained level of scientific productivity through the continuation of a research program that involves students.

Primary contributions during the review period (i.e., since the last promotion) should be from the areas described in section II.B.1 – 13, with emphasis on peer-reviewed publications, successful grant proposals, and presentation of research results at scientific meetings.

- **Excellent** — Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) two contributions from II.B.1; (3) one extramural grant or contract proposal funded (II.B.9 or 10); (4) three additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 3, 7, 9 or 10 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.7, 9 and 10 will count); (5) eight contributions from II.B.13; and (6) five additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 18 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.4 – 8, and 11 – 18 will count).

- **Sufficient** — Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) one contribution from II.B.1; (3) one
extramural grant or contract funded (II.B.9 or 10), or one extramural grant or contract submitted (II.B.11 or 12) and two intramural grants funded (II.B.14); (4) two additional contributions from II.B.1 - 3, 7, 9 or 10 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.7, 9 and 10 will count); (5) five contributions from II.B.13; and (6) four additional contributions from among II.B.1 - 18 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.4 - 8, and 11 - 18 will count).

♦ **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for sufficient shall be deemed insufficient.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

The faculty member should demonstrate recognition of his/her stature as a teacher/scholar through a balanced spectrum of professional, academic, and community service activities and accomplishments. Note that for committee work, the number of contributions equals the numbers of years served on all committees.

♦ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) three contributions from among II.C.1 and 2; (2) six contributions from II.C.3 - 7; (3) twelve contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in six; and (4) three contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

♦ **Sufficient** – Minimum requirements are: (1) two contributions from among II.C.1 and 2; (2) four contributions from among II.C.3 - 7; (3) eight contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in four; and (4) two contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

♦ **Insufficient** – Failure to meet the criteria for Sufficient shall be deemed Insufficient.

**Early Promotion to Professor**

Early Promotion to Professor may be recommended for faculty who have received Excellent ratings in Teaching, SCA, and Service and have met the normal progression requirements for promotion (see UPS 210.000 for timing eligibility).
APPENDIX 1
EVALUATION OF PORTFOLIO: Form

SUBMITTED BY: ________________________    DATE: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E=Excellent</th>
<th>S=Sufficient</th>
<th>I=Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TEACHING PERFORMANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.4-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY:</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.1-3, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.10-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PROFESSIONAL AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES:</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.3-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.8, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.10, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENTS:
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APPENDIX 2

STUDENT RESPONSE TO INSTRUCTION: Procedures

Administration

Evaluations will be scheduled by the DPC and administered by a DPC member or other designated faculty member. Envelopes for each class contain SRI forms, directions for administrating the forms, #2 pencils, and these instructions, with the instructor’s number and the 5-digit schedule number attached to the outside. The administrator will read the following information before handing out the forms.

The statement to be read to each class is

"Please fill out these forms in a thoughtful and serious manner. Your evaluations and written comments can be used by your instructor to improve this course. We also use the results of this form to evaluate our faculty within our department, so it is extremely important that you consider your ratings and comments carefully. Please write comments about the course and/or the instructor on the back. These help to evaluate an instructor in ways that multiple choice questions cannot. Thank you for your help."

Instruction to students on filling out forms

1. The instructor code and schedule number are written on the board. Please write the numbers on the form and \textbf{make sure} to pencil in the appropriate bubbles as well.

2. Please use a #2 pencil, no ink pens; some pencils are available from the administrator. Please return all pencils as they are needed for other evaluations.

3. Answer all other questions; delete the section group code on the reverse side.

4. Please write the semester and year in the space provided at the bottom of the form.

5. Make bold, dark pencil marks.

6. Pass forms to aisle for administrator to collect when completed.
APPENDIX 3
STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTION (SRI): Questionnaire

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The results of this questionnaire are important in the evaluation of teaching performance for RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION and POST-TENURE review made by departmental and university personnel committees. They are ANONYMOUS and are reviewed by your instructor only AFTER your grades have been submitted.

Please complete BOTH SIDES of the form. On the front side, choose a response to the question or statements using a scale of A=excellent, B=very good, C=good, D=fair and E=poor. On the back, please write your comments.

Semester: ____________

1. Stated the objectives of the course clearly.
2. Used teaching methods that enabled students to achieve the course objectives.
3. Expressed ideas and concepts clearly.
4. Demonstrated knowledge of the subject.
5. Demonstrated significance of the subject.
6. Demonstrated preparation for classes.
7. Showed interest in teaching the subject.
8. Stimulated students’ interest in the subject.
9. Encourages students to THINK critically.
10. Emphasized comprehension of the subject.
11. Was sensitive to student’s comprehension of subject and responded effectively.
12. Treated students with respect.
13. Was impartial and fair.
APPENDIX 4
CLASSROOM PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE:
   Procedures

Rationale for Class Visitations:

In-class peer reviews provide another means of evaluating teaching effectiveness and for
improving future course offerings. These results may also provide important insights
about teaching performance that may not be gained from the student evaluations. A copy
of this in-class peer review shall be placed in the affected faculty member’s personnel
file, and should be included in the Portfolio.

Guidelines for Administering the “Teaching Performance Evaluation”:

1. Please review the report form before visiting the classroom. After the class, fill
   out the form to the best of your ability. Your report should focus on the
   instruction for that particular class and not on “outside” or preconceived
   perceptions of the affected faculty member’s teaching performance.

2. Normally, a complete class visit is recommended. Be sure to stay in the class
   long enough to be able to fill out the report fairly. A one-half hour visit is an
   absolute minimum.

3. The 10 items on the report are generally recognized as important variables in a
   teaching/learning environment. Concentrate on these factors, not the instructor’s
   individual “style” (e.g., exuberant, cheerful, dull, etc.). A teacher need not be
   cheerful to be effective! However, if an instructor’s style significantly adds or
   detracts from the classroom environment, it should be noted in the written
   comments.

4. Ideally, visitations should occur during the last quarter of the semester.

5. Sit at the back of the classroom and avoid interaction with the class and the
   instructor.

6. After the class, the evaluator should simply ask the instructor if that class was
   representative (i.e., a fair sampling) of his/her instruction, and if they would like
   to be visited again. The purpose of this is to make allowances for a class that does
   not meet the instructor’s capabilities/expectations.

7. The results of the class visitation(s) should be discussed ASAP with the faculty
   member. The personnel committee member should indicate areas of strength and
   discuss ways in which course or teaching methods could be improved.
## APPENDIX 5
CLASSROOM PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major/non-major</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Duration</td>
<td>mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE INSTRUCTOR:</th>
<th>*E</th>
<th>*S</th>
<th>*I</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was well prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrated knowledge of course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presented material in an organized and clear manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Taught with an academic rigor that was challenging for the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clarified material well with examples and/or illustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taught with an effective pace of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encouraged student participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dealt with students in a fair, impartial manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Response and handling of student questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Things the instructor did especially well:

B. Things the instructor could do to improve his/her teaching, classroom environment, etc.

C. Additional Comments:

*E=Excellent, *S=Sufficient, *I=Insufficient

Evaluator: ___________________________
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APPENDIX 6
INTERPRETATION OF SRI'S OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES COURSES:
Guidelines

Given the differing expectations and backgrounds, it is recognized that Student Rating of
Instruction (SRI) scores vary somewhat between classes targeting different student
populations (i.e. General Education vs. graduate students). To illustrate this point,
average SRI scores for the specified course categories over the period Fall 1992 to Spring
2002 are tabulated below. Faculty members may use these values for self-assessment, to
gauge how their SRI scores for individual courses measure up to 10-year averages for
similar courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>10-yr av ± σ</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-level courses for general education</td>
<td>101, 101L, 140</td>
<td>3.11±0.47</td>
<td>3.83-1.63</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-, 300-level courses for general education</td>
<td>201, 305, 333, 335, 340, 376</td>
<td>3.35±0.45</td>
<td>4.00-2.26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper division courses for general education</td>
<td>310T</td>
<td>3.41±0.28</td>
<td>3.82-2.41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level courses for majors</td>
<td>303AB, 321, 322, 338, 355, 356, 360,375, 380</td>
<td>3.41±0.38</td>
<td>4.00-1.95</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level courses for majors</td>
<td>401, 404AB, 406, 423, 435, 436, 437,455, 456, 460, 470, 481ABC, 495, 499</td>
<td>3.48±0.45</td>
<td>4.00-2.19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-level graduate courses</td>
<td>500, 501AB, 506T, 510T, 535T, 575T, 590, 599</td>
<td>3.81±0.35</td>
<td>4.00-2.55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional courses for prospective science</td>
<td>102, 420</td>
<td>3.71±0.49</td>
<td>3.98-2.03</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = number of sections

Except for the 2nd-year review, the SRI criterion for receiving a Sufficient rating in
Teaching is 3.20. This number was selected by considering the 10-year department
average of all courses taught (3.18). The only category of courses having a lower 10-year
average than 3.20 is composed of GEOL101, 101L and 140 (average = 3.11).

In the event that the majority of a faculty member's teaching load for any given review
period consists of GEOL101, 101L and 140 sections, and they do not meet the overall
SRI criteria for Sufficient of 3.20, they may earn a Sufficient rating in Teaching if (1)
their average SRI score in 101, 101L and 140 sections exceeds 3.11, and (2) their average
SRI score in all other GEOL courses exceeds 3.43 (the 10-year department average of all
courses other than 101/101L/140).
Grading in courses taught by Department faculty is expected to follow a consistent pattern falling within the Normal Expected GPA Range for the specified course categories indicated in the following table. However, it is recognized that occasionally the grading in a course may justifiably fall outside of the appropriate Normal Expected GPA Range. In such cases, a brief explanation should be provided with the documentation of grade summaries in the faculty member's Portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE COURSES</th>
<th>NORMAL EXPECTED GPA RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education courses</td>
<td>101, 101L, 310</td>
<td>2.25-3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-, 300-level courses for both general education students and majors</td>
<td>201, 305, 333, 335, 340, 376</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level courses for majors</td>
<td>303AB, 321, 360, 375, 380</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level courses for majors</td>
<td>401, 404, 406, 420, 456, 481A</td>
<td>2.75-3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-level graduate courses</td>
<td>500, 501AB, 510T, 535T, 575T</td>
<td>3.0-4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8
PEER-REVIEWED RESEARCH JOURNALS IN THE EARTH SCIENCES:
Examples

American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin
Basin Research
Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology
Earth and Planetary Science Letters
Engineering Geology
Environmental and Engineering Geoscience
GSA Bulletin
GSA Today
Geology
Geophysical Journal International
Geophysical Research Letters
Groundwater Monitoring and Remediation
Journal of the Geological Society of London
Journal of Geology
Journal of Geophysical Research
Journal of Geoscience Education
Journal of Paleolimnology
Journal of Paleontology
Journal of Petrology
Journal of Sedimentary Research
Journal of Structural Geology
Palaios
Paleobiology
Precambrian Research
Quaternary Research
Sedimentary Geology
Sedimentology
Tectonics
Tectonophysics