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DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE Personnel Standards

I. Preface

The Department of Health Science (hereafter called the "Department") is committed to providing high quality programs which contribute to a broad understanding of human health. Emphasis is on the examination of the entire life span from infancy through the older adult years, with special attention to improving the quality of life and human condition in an ever-changing and multi-cultural society. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning and to the establishment of an environment where learning and the expansion of knowledge are central to all activities. 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, and service. It is the position of the Department that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department proposes a personnel document, consistent with the University Mission and Goals and with UPS 210.000, which describes the criteria for assessing faculty productivity with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion.

II. Department Structure

The Department of Health Science is led by a Department Chair who is selected via a modified UPS 211.100 procedure approved by the President. The Department offers degree programs in Health Science (B.S., MPH, and Minor) as well as coursework, which contributes to various specializations, professional credentials and certifications, to general education, and to individual physical development and lifelong health and well being.

III. Scope of Document

The document will summarize policies and procedures with respect to the selection and function of the Department Personnel Committee, the preparation of Developmental Narratives and Plans, the preparation of Portfolios, and will describe criteria to be used in the evaluation of Portfolios during the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process.

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

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

The Committee shall consist of three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. All committee members must have a higher rank of classification than those being evaluated. No person shall serve as a Committee member during the year in which he/she is being considered for personnel action. The alternate committee member shall participate on the Committee in the event that a regular committee member cannot complete the term. Should such a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty.

C. **Election of Committee Members**

1. The Department Chair will conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the Fall Semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot. All tenured faculty who meet the requirements in IV-B above are automatically on the slate of potential committee members except the following: (a) the Department Chair, (b) those who are being considered for personnel action that year, and (c) those who will be on sabbatical leave during any part of that year.

2. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for three committee members, one of whom must have previously served on the Committee. The three faculty members receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected as "regular" committee members. The person with the 4th 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 (or by drawing names randomly, should the tie involve more than two people).

3. The Committee shall elect its Chair for a one-year term.

D. **Committee Responsibilities**

1. The Committee will review and evaluate Portfolios (the functional equivalent of the former Working Personnel Action File) of faculty members involved in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

   Following a review of the Portfolio, the Committee will prepare a written composite evaluation describing the candidate's performance (faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion) or progress (if probationary faculty) under each of the evaluation areas--teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and professional, university, and community service as described in Section VI of this document.

2. The Committee's evaluation for each area is to be based on information provided in the Portfolio. Each committee member utilizes his/her best professional judgment in assessing how well the established evaluation criteria have been met.

   a. Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention

       The Committee then prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides supportive rationale for rating the probationary faculty member's PROGRESS in each category as **excellent, good, marginal, or inadequate** meaning that their work to date suggests that they are making progress towards these ratings. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the committee members.
b. Faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion

The Committee then prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides supportive rationale for rating the faculty member's PERFORMANCE in each category as **excellent, good, marginal, or inadequate.** Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VI.

3. After the Committee completes its evaluation and reviews the Chair's evaluation, the committee shall formulate a recommendation, which states in writing the reasons for the recommendation relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. All actions taken by the Committee shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.

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

5. The Committee shall submit its evaluation and recommendation statements to the Department Chair in accordance with the published timelines for the personnel action cycle.

**E. Chair's Responsibilities**

According to UPS 210.00 the chair has the responsibility to:

1. Communicate the standards and criteria for RTP to all department faculty members.

2. To inform each new faculty member within two weeks after the assumption of official duties at the University of all personnel procedures including those covered by this document.

3. To provide guidance, advice, and support to assist new probationary faculty in preparing their Prospectus.

4. To provide the probationary faculty member with written feedback on the Prospectus prior to May 1.

5. To consult, during the spring semester, with each faculty member for whom a personnel recommendation will be made during the following fall semester to assure that the annual updating of the Portfolio has been initiated and that the compilation is proceeding according to the requirements of this document. Such consultation should be documented and submitted to Faculty Affairs and Records.

Tenured chairs not seeking promotion have additional responsibilities (see UPS210.000 IV. D. Responsibilities of Department Chairs).
F. Abbreviated Review Files for Third and Fifth Year Probationary Faculty

Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their full performance review during year 2 or year 4 would, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit a “Review File.” The Review File comprises only three items: (1) an updated curriculum vitae, (2) statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review. When subject to a periodic review, the faculty member shall submit the Review File by October 1, review of which shall be completed by June 1. The DPC, the Department Chair, and the appropriate administrator shall provide a signed statement indicating that the Review File was received, reviewed, and evaluated. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the signed statement, and a copy shall be forwarded to Faculty Affairs and Records for placement in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the appropriate administrator may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member’s progress.

V. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus

According to UPS 210.000, “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 (s)he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the department standards for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair’s office by February 28. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the division chair and the dean who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to May 1st. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s portfolio for all performance reviews.”

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare the information required for the Portfolio and to deliver the materials to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. A general timetable for submitting the Portfolio is provided in UPS 210.000 I.K. Specific timetables for each year are prepared and distributed by the Faculty Affairs Office early in the fall semester. Tenured faculty being considered for promotion must submit only a Portfolio (according to the published timetables).

C. Portfolio Contents and Organization

The Portfolio, including its Appendices, is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions.

“For Probationary Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the
Portfolio and its Appendices. Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) will provide each new probationary faculty member with a binder and enumerated tabs. 

*For Tenured Faculty:* The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period since the submission of the file for promotion to Associate Professor to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered. 

2. It is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to ensure the completeness of the Portfolio and Appendices. 

3. In the Portfolio and Appendices, faculty members shall describe and document significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the period under review. Quality over quantity should be emphasized; a more limited number of appropriately documented high-quality accomplishments is generally more compelling than a compendium of all activities. Note, however, that all accomplishments should be listed in the Portfolio Vita (described in section III.B.4.e). A clear connection between the narratives, the Table of Contents of the Appendix, the Portfolio, and the documents or artifacts in the Appendix shall be established. The Portfolio and accompanying Appendices shall normally be prepared using one small to medium-sized binder for each section – i.e., one binder for the main Portfolio and one for each section of the Appendix. 

`– Teaching Materials, Student Opinion Questionnaire forms, Scholarly and Creativity Activity, and Services. All binders should fit into one banker’s box (approximately 10x12x16) typically provided by the College. Additional space may be required to house raw Student Opinion Questionnaires forms for faculty who have taught numerous courses.”`

4. The Portfolio shall be organized as directed in UPS 210.000 Section B.4.

VI. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

All tenure-track faculty will be evaluated within three performance categories—(1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activity, and (3) professional, university, and community service. High quality performance is expected of each faculty member in all three areas. However, in support of the "preeminence of learning" mission of the university, and to be in compliance with UPS 210.000, the primary emphasis in the retention, tenure, and promotion process shall be on teaching performance. *Scholarly and creative activity,* also an essential part of faculty activity, is the second most important performance category.

A. Teaching Performance

As stated in UPS 210.000, each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio and Appendices according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple indicators of teaching performance. These academic grading standards, and at least two other specific criteria are listed in section II.B.1.b. Specific Criteria for Teaching.
1. Teaching

a. General Criteria for 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 their curricula and academic degree programs, and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills to contribute to society.

A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in the discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn both within and outside the classroom. A Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance (1000 words maximum) is required to identify those specific accomplishments related to teaching.

Section III.B.of UPS 210.00 identifies the specific contents to be included in a portfolio.

b. Specific Criteria for Teaching

1. Pedagogical Approach and Methods

The primary objective of pedagogy is to help students to learn. Peer evaluation of teaching performance shall address those factors that contribute to effective pedagogy including the following: the appropriateness of the breadth and depth of course content to the level of each course taught; the currency of the topics and relevancy of the assignments; and the effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures. Faculty members may contribute to student learning by such activities as academic advising, development of new courses, use of innovative approaches to teaching and fostering student learning, organization of pedagogical workshops, supervision of student research or performance, and other similar activities.

2. Student Opinions of Instruction

Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not be used by any level of evaluation as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.

Evaluations of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student opinion questionnaires and contained in written comments on these forms. The evaluations may take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance.
3. Expectations Regarding Student Achievement
Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught. The peer evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught. Grade distributions for courses shall range between 2.3-3.2 for lower division courses and 2.5-3.3 for upper division courses. If a course has lower or higher grade distributions, the faculty member shall include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy the problem, and/or provide a rationale for higher or lower grade distributions than department standards.

4. Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher
Each faculty member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to maintain and improve teaching effectiveness. This program should include self-assessment of teaching objectives and methods and student achievement, participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, 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.

5. On-going Professional Development in the Discipline
All faculty members are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by conference participation and/or other interaction with their colleagues. Scholarly and creative activities are expected to be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and student participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings.

6. Classroom Visitations
Classroom visitations by department colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. 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. Assessment shall be in the context of the level and objectives of the course. Assessments by external evaluators may be included.

3. Rating Criteria
*Overall teaching performance* - Based upon the total evidence provided by a combination of the identified items including: both qualitative and quantitative data from student opinion questionnaires, academic grading standards, and at least two other specific criteria, the reviewers will rate the faculty member's overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, marginal, or inadequate**. SOQ percentages in questions 5-11 will be used to rate teaching effectiveness.
Criteria for assignment of ratings for Teaching:

"Excellent" -- clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; 90% or more of student opinion questionnaires at A or B ratings (or 60% or more A ratings); grade distributions that fall within the department guidelines; and at least two specific criteria of teaching effectiveness.

"Good" -- clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; 75-89% of student opinion questionnaires at A and B ratings; grade distributions that fall within the department guidelines; and at least one specific criteria of teaching effectiveness.

"Marginal" -- unclear self-assessment of teaching; 55-74% of student opinion questionnaires at A and B ratings; grade distributions that do not fall within the department guidelines; and at least one specific criteria of teaching effectiveness.

"Inadequate" -- unclear self-assessment of teaching; 54% or less of student opinion questionnaires at A and B ratings; grade distributions that do not fall within the department guidelines; and no specific criteria addressed.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities

Faculty members at every level are expected to engage in focused, ongoing scholarly and creative activity. It is the position of the University and this Department that such activity enhances the professional growth and teaching effectiveness of the individual faculty member, contributes to the advancement of the field, provides increased learning opportunities for students, and enhances the overall reputation of the Department and the University. The faculty member shall provide a 1000 word self-evaluation narrative statement describing (1) his/her scholarly agenda, (2) accomplishments during the period of review, (3) work in progress, and (4) future plans. The self-assessment shall be supported by appropriate documentation, with any collaborative work clearly described in terms of individual contributions.

The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activity may be evidenced through (1) creation of new knowledge, (2) integration of knowledge, and/or (3) dissemination of knowledge. It is expected that over the period of review faculty members' scholarly and creative endeavors will result in high quality, peer-reviewed pieces of work -- i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, books, or other comparable works. External grants submitted, especially those awarded, will strengthen performance in this category. Other indicators adding support to faculty's scholarly and creative accomplishments are works in progress and non peer-reviewed publications and achievements.

It is expected that those evaluating the Portfolio will consider the quality as well as the quantity of performance. When the scholarly activity has made a major impact on the discipline or on professional practice, it may be appropriate to assign additional weight to it. In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document
the importance of their work, as well as the quality of the publications/outlets where
their work appears.

It is the position of the Department, in line with the University Mission and Goals, that
collaborative research/scholarly efforts are of benefit to the institution as well as to the
individual. Therefore, all first-author or equal-authored contributions shall be treated
similarly to individual efforts in evaluating Portfolio materials. All co-authors on
projects should be identified, with their respective contributions described. It also is
expected that within the review period, each faculty member will be a first author
on at least one high quality peer-reviewed journal publication.

As with all evaluation categories, a faculty member's scholarly and creative
contribution shall be rated as excellent, good, marginal, or inadequate. The
following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several
"hierarchical" indicators of performance. In general, Level I includes evidence of
work in progress and on-going activity. Level II includes accomplishments that are an
important part of one's scholarly agenda such as scholarly presentations, book reviews,
and external fund-raising, but generally are one step below that of Level III. Level III
includes the publication of one's work in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, books,
or other comparable outlets, as well as obtaining major external grants.

**Level I**
- Research in progress
- Papers submitted for publication/presentation
- Grant proposals submitted
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level II**
- Scholarly presentations at professional meetings
- Published peer-reviewed abstracts
- Papers published in conference proceedings
- Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)
- Published book review
- Articles/chapters/books (non peer-reviewed)
- Peer-reviewed publications accepted, with required changes
- Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)
- Grants received, with major grants qualifying as a Level III indicator
- Other comparable types of activities judged to be of significance to the field e.g.,
  video projects, curriculum development, software development, etc.

**Level III**
- Articles published or in press (as lead author or major author) in major
  peer-reviewed scholarly journals*
- Peer-reviewed books/book chapters published or in press (as lead author or major
  author)
- Major externally funded grants (as Principal Investigator or equal Co PI)
- Other comparable types of published, peer-reviewed activities judged to be of
  significance to the field--e.g., video projects, software development, etc.
Although multiple indicators are listed in Level III, it should be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly work in the field and, thus, are expected to be part of a faculty member's accomplishments at each level of review.

**Note:** For tenure, the scholarship category must include at least three peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be first authorship. In all cases, the quality of the scholarly work shall be considered in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the quality of his/her accomplishments. Examples of quality indicators are journal acceptance records, publication distribution figures, the scope of the publication (regional, national, or international), the quality of the editorial board and review process (blind vs non-blind), and the extent of the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored work.

**Criteria for assignment of ratings for Scholarship and Creative Activity:**

"Excellent" -- appropriate rating when faculty has numerous (four or more) high quality indicators in Level II and four or more high quality indicators in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of "good". **For tenure, a faculty member must have three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications.**

"Good" -- appropriate rating when faculty has several (three or more) high quality indicators in Level II, and at least three high quality indicators in Level III. **For tenure, a faculty member must have three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications.**

"Marginal" -- appropriate rating when faculty member has at least two indicators beyond Level I.

"Inadequate" -- appropriate rating when faculty performance is limited to Level I indicators.

**Note:** Many exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, in any category it is possible that any one indicator may be so important (qualitatively or quantitatively) that it deserves as much weight as two or three indicators normally would. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration should be given.

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

All faculty members are expected to participate in appropriate professional, university, and community activities. In the area of professional service, such activity is expected to surpass that of simply belonging to relevant organizations and attending conferences. As faculty members progress through their careers, it is expected that they increasingly will engage in professional activities such as serving on professional committees, assuming leadership positions, serving as a program planner, conducting
seminars and workshops, and serving as a professional consultant, on editorial boards, and/or as a reviewer of scholarly/professional materials. Similarly, faculty are expected to actively serve the needs of the university and community by participating in a broad range of campus activities and in external community activities. All faculty, after their first probationary year, are expected to increasingly make noteworthy contributions towards the "work" of the Department and university as it conducts its business and serves its community clientele. The following represents a sample breakdown of typical service activities into hierarchical categories.

**Level I**
- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at conferences/workshops
- Membership on Department committees

**Level II**
- Membership on professional committees
- Reviewer of professional journals/conference papers/books
- Program planner, session organizer at professional conferences
- Workshop/seminar coordinator
- Conference/workshop presentations
- Speaking to community groups
- Consultant activities
- Member of advisory boards/expert panels
- Member of College/University committees
- Media interviews

**Level III**
- Chair of major Department committee
- Academic program coordinator/lab director
- National/regional officer of professional association
- Editorial board of professional journal
- Chair of national/regional committee
- Program chair, professional conference/workshop
- Chair College/University committee
- Member, large number of professional, university, and/or community committees
- Organizer of major community functions/workshops
- Exceptional service as documented by honors, awards, etc.

**Criteria for assignment of ratings for Professional, University and Community Service:**

"Excellent" -- appropriate rating when faculty has numerous (four or more) high quality indicators in Level II and three or more high quality indicators in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of "good".
"Good" -- appropriate rating when faculty has several (three or more) high quality indicators in Level II, and at least two high quality indicators in Level III.

"Marginal" -- appropriate rating when faculty member has at least two indicators beyond Level I.

"Inadequate" -- appropriate rating when faculty performance is limited to Level I indicators.

VII. Guidelines for Applying Evaluation Criteria in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions

A. Retention During Probationary Years
   A recommendation for retention after the first year is contingent upon making progress toward the requirements for tenure and promotion. For example, in year two it is expected that a faculty member has some work published or in review. By the fourth year, the faculty member should be showing evidence of increased progress towards achieving tenure. Progress ratings are defined in Section IV.D.2.a of this document.

B. Tenure Requirements
   A person recommended for tenure must have completed a doctorate from an accredited university, and must be evaluated as "excellent" in either teaching or scholarly activity, with no less than a "good" rating in the other two categories. In addition, for tenure, a person must have a minimum of three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be as first author. Performance ratings defined in Section IV.D.2.b of this document.

C. Promotion to Associate Professor
   Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

D. Early Promotion to Associate Professor
   A probationary faculty member is not normally promoted during probation. However, a faculty member may apply for promotion after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF. A person recommended for early promotion to Associate Professor must be evaluated as "excellent" in two of the three evaluation categories with at least a "good" rating in the third category.

E. Early tenure
   In any case that involves early tenure, a faculty member must receive "excellent" ratings in all three evaluation areas.

F. Promotion to Full Professor
   The decision to grant promotion to the rank of professor must be based on a record of sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all categories. At a minimum, a person recommended for promotion to Full Professor must be evaluated as "excellent" in teaching and scholarship, and at least "good" in service.
G. Early Promotion to Full Professor

In any case that involves early promotion to full professor, a faculty member must receive “excellent” ratings in all three evaluation areas.