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Introduction
The Mathematics Department is committed to maintaining a high level of professional competence and collegiality in its faculty. Throughout this document, the term “mathematics” shall be interpreted broadly and in particular shall encompass the fields of mathematics, applied mathematics, statistics and mathematics education. This document is intended to be consistent with the procedures and/or policy contained in the CSU-CFA Memorandum of Understanding and in the University Policy Statement (UPS 210.000) in evaluating and recommending faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion. The most demanding standards of these three documents shall be applied as is permissible by each of them.

The Department of Mathematics at California State University, Fullerton brings a rich mix of resources and perspectives as a result of its comprehensive mission and purpose. In accordance with the University’s Mission and Goals, the Mathematics Department seeks to develop a professional culture where all areas of mathematics are valued and nurtured.

The criteria by which faculty shall be evaluated are: (1) Teaching; (2) Scholarly and Creative Activities; (3) Professional, University, and Community Service. It is the responsibility of the Mathematics Department Chair to review and provide written feedback on the Prospectus (See UPS 210.000, Section III.A.). It is the responsibility of both the chair and the Personnel Committee to evaluate the quality of the material submitted in the Portfolio and to decide on the levels of performance in each of these areas, subject to the following general guidelines.

Retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) shall be based solely on competence and professional qualifications, as prescribed in UPS 210.000. CSUF recognizes that teaching is the most important activity of its faculty and that faculty involvement in research, scholarship and creative activity is essential. Therefore, the most important criterion for retention, tenure, and/or promotion shall be teaching. The second most important criterion shall be scholarly and creative activity. High quality performance in both areas is required for retention, tenure, and/or promotion, while service to the department, university and community of mathematics is also expected.

I. Department Policy on Teaching
The Portfolio shall include:
- A concise (1000 words) Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance.
- A list that shows the semesters, course number, course title, and WTU for all sections of all classes taught during the cumulative period under review.
- A blank copy of the departmental Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ).
- Statistical summaries of the Student Opinion Questionnaire forms for each class taught during the cumulative period under review.
- Statistical summaries of grade distributions for each class taught during the cumulative period under review, as well as any material which may help interpret these statistical summaries including department grade point averages distributed each semester by the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies.
A table that lists the following information for each section of each course taught during the cumulative period of review:

- Total enrollment
- Number of students who completed the evaluation on each of the summary questions on the SOQ.
- Percentage of A-B responses on the three summary questions on the SOQ.
- Percentage of A-C responses on the three summary questions on the SOQ.
- Class GPA.

The Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance is a self-evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching performance in which the following areas are addressed.

- Statement of teaching philosophy, including pedagogy.
- How the faculty member has addressed criticisms raised in previous reviews.
- Class preparation.
- Availability to students.
- Course content and rationale.
- How student learning is assessed.
- Written student comments on SOQs.
- Any class GPAs lying outside of department norms.
- Performance of teaching related duties for which released/assigned time was granted.

Supporting documentation shall be included in the portfolio Appendix I. Minimally, a faculty member shall provide copies of all course syllabi, review materials, quizzes, tests, and final exams that have been utilized over the review period. Representative copies of class notes, class handouts, and lecture notes may also be included, but need not be comprehensive. Concise explanatory sub-narratives may be included where needed to explain complex points. The narrative shall clearly indicate where in the Portfolio or Appendix I supporting documentation can be found.

Teaching shall be evaluated relative to the following criteria:

**A. Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

Each level of review shall evaluate the narrative and supporting material and assign a rating according to the guidelines listed below

**Unsatisfactory:** Performance falls well below the criteria for a Satisfactory rating.

**Needs Improvement:** Performance falls below the criteria for a Satisfactory rating, but there is a strong indication that a Satisfactory rating can be obtained in the near future.

**Satisfactory:** There are strong indicators that the faculty member is well-prepared for class, utilizes clear and reasonable grading practices, is
punctual, maintains his/her office hours, and covers the content in the syllabus for each course that he/she teaches. As the faculty member progresses through the probationary period, his/her teaching performance shows increasing levels of breadth and depth through teaching assignments at all levels of the undergraduate (and possibly graduate) curriculum. Typically, by the time of the tenure decision, it is expected that a faculty member will have successfully taught at least 2 different courses at the lower division level, and at least 3 different courses at the upper division or graduate level. It is the department chair’s responsibility to facilitate this expectation, although the instructional needs of the department may override this requirement in certain cases.

**Above Satisfactory:** An Above Satisfactory rating may be assigned if, in addition to the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, the faculty member has contributions in at least two further activities, which may include, but are not limited to:

AS1. Writing notes, computer packages useful in pedagogy, or supplementary material for distribution to classes that is judged to be of high quality by each level of review.

AS2. Directing students in independent study (Math 499) or research (Math 497, 599).

AS3. Curriculum development such as a major contribution to writing and implementing a new course.

AS4. Advisement and mentoring beyond that required by departmental assignments.

AS5. Recognition for outstanding teaching, such as established awards from university or professional organizations.

AS6. Teaching a wide variety of upper division and/or graduate level courses.

AS7. National Fellowships for teaching such as Project NExT.

**Superior:** Exceptional contributions in at least two of the above activities (AS1.-AS7.) may be indicative of Superior performance. Examples of exceptional contributions include:

SUP1. A strong record of supervision of undergraduate or graduate research students over the period of review.

SUP2. Major college-wide, campus-wide, or external awards received for outstanding teaching.

SUP3. Writing extensive notes or supplementary material for a variety of classes that is judged to be of high quality by each level of review.

---

1 In the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching performance, the math department considers Math 280 to be an upper division teaching assignment and Math 303A/B to be lower division teaching assignments.
B. *Classroom Visitation*

Each faculty member who is active in the RTP process shall have his/her teaching observed in the spring semester every year by two members of his/her choice of the DPC (henceforth referred to as his/her peer-review committee) and the department chair. Tenured faculty who are still active in the RTP process will have their classes observed every other year. The process for conducting classroom observations will be as follows:

- At least five days prior to any class visits, the faculty member, his/her peer-review committee, and the department chair will mutually agree upon a period of two weeks during which observations will occur.
- The classes observed shall include all sections of all courses taught by the instructor.
- Each member of the peer-review committee, and the department chair, will observe at least one class.
- The peer-review committee and department chair will utilize the mathematics department “Class Observation Form.”
- At most one person shall observe a class at any one time.
- Within two weeks of the final visitation, the peer review committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss its observations and provide constructive feedback to the faculty member.
- All class observation forms will become a permanent part of the faculty member’s Portfolio.

Based on an average of the classroom observation overall ratings and the consideration of patterns in comments on the class observation forms, each level of review will assign an overall rating of Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Superior.

C. *Student Evaluation of Teaching Performance*

Each level of review shall evaluate both the numerical summaries and the accompanying written student comments for each course taught during the review period. If the faculty member taught multiple sections of the same course in a given semester, the numerical summaries on each of the three summary questions on the SOQ may be combined and reported as an average over all student responses. The following guidelines will be used in assigning a rating on this measure of teaching performance.

**Unsatisfactory:** Contributions fall well below the criteria for a Satisfactory rating.

**Needs Improvement:** Contributions fall below the criteria for a Satisfactory rating, but there is an upward trend that suggests a Satisfactory rating can be obtained in the near future.
**Satisfactory:** A rating of Satisfactory shall be assigned if for each course\(^2\) taught during the period of review, at least one of the following criteria is met:

S1. At least 70% of the total responses on each of the three summary questions fall in the A – B range, and the supporting written comments are generally positive.

S2. At least 80% of the total responses on each of the three summary questions fall in the A – C range, with at least 60% being in the A – B range, and many of the supporting written comments are positive.

It is possible for a faculty member to be assigned a Satisfactory rating in this measure of his/her teaching performance even if the above thresholds have not been met in every course, provided the written comments are very positive in each course for which both S1. and S2. failed to be met.

**Above Satisfactory:** A rating of Above Satisfactory shall be assigned if for each course\(^3\) taught during the period of review, at least one of the following criteria is met:

AS1. At least 80% of the total responses on each of the three summary questions fall in the A – B range, and the majority of the supporting written comments are positive.

AS2. At least 90% of the total responses on each of the three summary questions fall in the A – C range, with at least 70% being in the A – B range, and the majority of the supporting written comments are positive.

It is possible for a faculty member to be assigned an Above Satisfactory rating in this measure of his/her teaching performance even if the above thresholds have not been met in every course, provided that in each course for which both AS1. and AS2. have failed to be met, at least one of the thresholds stated in S1. and S2. for a Satisfactory rating has been met, and almost all of the written comments are positive.

**Superior:** A rating of Superior shall be assigned if for each course\(^4\) taught during the period of review, at least 90% of the total responses on each of the three summary questions fall in the A – B range, and almost all of the supporting written comments are positive.

**D. Overall Rating of Teaching Performance**

Each level of review shall assign an overall rating for the teaching performance, as defined below:

**Unsatisfactory:** One (or more) of the ratings in IA. – IC. is Unsatisfactory.

---

\(^2\) Single section course or combined multiple section course.

\(^3\) See note 2 above.

\(^4\) See note 2 above.
Needs Improvement: One (or more) of the areas IA. – IC. has been assigned a rating of Needs Improvement, but the other areas are rated at least Satisfactory.

Satisfactory: A Satisfactory rating or higher has been assigned in each of IA. – IC.

Above Satisfactory: All three categories have been assigned a rating of at least Satisfactory and an Above Satisfactory rating or higher has been assigned in at least 2 out of the 3 categories.

Superior: All three categories have been assigned a rating of at least Satisfactory and a Superior rating has been assigned in at least two out of the three categories.

II. Department Policy on Scholarly and Creative Activity

Each faculty member shall provide a concise narrative self-evaluation of their scholarly and creative activities, not exceeding 1000 words. The successful faculty member shall have a well-defined research agenda in his/her chosen area of specialization. Throughout the RTP period there shall be evidence of ongoing activities such as: preprints that lead to publications in peer-reviewed journals of high quality: intramural and, where appropriate, external grant proposal submissions: and dissemination of results at seminars and professional meetings. Documentation supporting these activities shall be included in the Portfolio Appendix II, and the narrative shall clearly indicate where in Appendix II this documentation can be found.

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide evidence that can be used to assess the quality of his/her contributions. Examples of such documentation are:

- Referee reports
- External reviews of his/her work in scientific databases such as MathSciNet (ams.org/mathscinet), and Zentralblatt (zentralblatt-math.org/zmath and zentralblatt-math.org/matheduc/)
- Journal impact factors
- Journal acceptance rates
- Lists of citations
- Patents that are awarded as a result of the work

For co-authored activities, documentation of the unique and specific contribution of each author to the work shall be included in Appendix II. FAR has a coauthor disclosure form that may be used for this purpose.

A. Probationary Year 2 (Probationary Year 3 for a faculty member who has one year of service credit)

Unsatisfactory: This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has satisfied neither of the requirements S1. – S2. listed below for a Satisfactory rating at this stage of the RTP process.

Needs Improvement: This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has satisfied only one of the requirements S1. – S2. listed below for a
Satisfactory rating at this stage in the RTP process, but there is a strong indication that a Satisfactory rating can be obtained in the near future.

**Satisfactory:** A Satisfactory rating shall require evidence of a developing research agenda. It is expected that, *since his/her appointment date*, the faculty member will have:

- **S1.** At least one paper submitted, or very close to submission, to a peer-reviewed journal of high quality.
- **S2.** Disseminated his/her results through seminar presentations and/or presentations at regional, national or international meetings.

**Above Satisfactory:** An Above Satisfactory rating shall be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, the faculty member has at least one contribution in one or more of the following list:

- **AS1.** A paper that was submitted during the probationary period accepted or published in a peer-reviewed journal of high quality.
- **AS2.** A funded intramural or external grant proposal.
- **AS3.** Submission of a multi-year external grant proposal to a major granting agency such as NSF or NIH, on which the faculty member is a principal investigator/co-principal investigator.
- **AS4.** Acceptance or publication of a book chapter or peer reviewed conference proceedings paper. The peer review process shall be described in detail by the faculty and preferably the referee reviews will be provided.

**Superior:** A Superior rating shall be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for an Above Satisfactory rating, the faculty member has at least one contribution in one or more of the following list:

- **SUP1.** Multiple contributions in AS1. In such a case the faculty member shall address the relationship between the different papers published, if any.
- **SUP2.** Funding of a multi-year external grant proposal on which the faculty member is a principal investigator/co-principal investigator.
- **SUP3.** Major college-wide, campus-wide, or external awards received for outstanding scholarly and creative activities.

**B. Probationary Year Four**

**Unsatisfactory:** This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has satisfied less than three of the requirements S1. – S4. listed below for a Satisfactory rating at this stage in the RTP process.

**Needs Improvement:** This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has satisfied precisely three of the requirements S1. – S4. listed below for a Satisfactory rating at this stage in the RTP process, but there is a strong indication that a Satisfactory rating can be obtained in the near future.

**Satisfactory:** A Satisfactory rating shall require evidence of significant development of the research agenda since the end of the last full review period. It is expected that the faculty member will have:
S1. At least one paper that was submitted during the probationary period accepted or published in a peer-reviewed journal of high quality.

Furthermore, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member will have:

S2. Submitted at least one further paper for publication in a peer-reviewed journal of high quality.

S3. Disseminated their results through seminar presentations and/or presentations at regional, national or international meetings.

S4. Submitted at least one intramural or external grant proposal.

Above Satisfactory: An Above Satisfactory rating shall be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member has either:

AS1. A second paper that was submitted during the probationary period accepted or published in a peer-reviewed journal of high quality. In such a case the faculty member must address the relationship between the different papers, if any.

or

AS2. At least two papers submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals of high quality and at least one contribution in one or more of the following list:
   a. A funded intramural or external grant proposal.
   b. Submission of an external grant proposal to a major granting agency such as NSF or NIH, on which the faculty member is a principal investigator/co-principal investigator.
   c. Acceptance or publication of a book chapter or peer reviewed conference proceedings paper. The peer review process shall be described in detail by the faculty and the referee reports shall be provided.

Superior: A Superior rating shall be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for an Above Satisfactory rating, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member has at least one contribution in one or more of the following list:

SUP1. At least two papers submitted and accepted for publication (or published) in peer-reviewed journals of high quality. In such a case the faculty member must address the relationship between the different papers, if any.

SUP2. Funding of a multi-year external grant proposal on which the faculty member is a principal investigator/co-principal investigator.

SUP3. Major college-wide, campus-wide or external awards received for outstanding scholarly and creative activities.
C. **Probationary Year Six**

**Unsatisfactory:** This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has failed to satisfy requirement S1, listed below for a Satisfactory rating at this stage of the RTP process.

**Needs Improvement:** This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has satisfied requirement S1, listed below for a Satisfactory rating at this stage in the RTP process, but has failed to satisfy requirement S2.

**Satisfactory:** A Satisfactory rating shall require evidence that the faculty member’s research agenda is continuing on an upward trajectory. The total record over the entire probationary period shall show substantive contributions to the faculty member’s area of expertise, and should indicate an on-going commitment to scholarly and creative activity. The following conditions must be met:

S1. A minimum of two published (or accepted) papers in peer-reviewed journals of high quality, based on work initiated during the probationary period, and on which the faculty member has made substantial contributions. In exceptional cases, one such single authored peer-reviewed publication may suffice, but in such a case the Portfolio must provide supporting evidence of the ongoing development of the work throughout the probationary period, as well as documentation that the work makes a groundbreaking contribution to the field of specialization, lays the foundation for further significant research, and is of outstanding quality.

S2. *Since the end of the last full review period (or the previous full performance review if requesting early tenure or early promotion)*, it is expected that the faculty member will have, in addition to the requirements in S1:
   a. At least one paper submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal of high quality.
   b. Disseminated their results through seminar presentations and/or presentations at regional, national or international meetings.

**Above Satisfactory:** An Above Satisfactory rating shall be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, *since the end of the last full review period*, the faculty member has:

AS1. At least one paper, that was submitted during the probationary period, accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal

AND

at least one contribution in one or more of the following list:

AS2. A funded intramural or external grant proposal.

AS3. Submission of an external grant proposal on which the faculty member is a principal investigator/co-principal investigator.

AS4. Acceptance or publication of a book chapter or peer-reviewed conference proceedings paper. The peer-review process shall be
described in detail by the faculty member and the referee reviews shall be provided.

**Superior:** A Superior rating shall be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for an Above Satisfactory rating, *since the end of the last full review period*, the faculty member has at least one contribution in one or more of the following list:

SUP1. At least two papers submitted and accepted for publication (or published) in peer-reviewed journals of high quality. In such a case the faculty member must address the relationship between the different papers, if any.

SUP2. Funding of a multi-year external grant proposal on which the faculty member is a principal investigator.

SUP3. Major college-wide, campus-wide or external awards received for outstanding scholarly and creative activities.

### III. Department Policy on Professional, University, and Community Service

Faculty members must provide a concise narrative self-evaluation of their professional activities and their service activities to the university and community. This narrative shall not exceed 1000 words. Supporting documentation as to the quality and quantity of these activities shall be provided in the Portfolio Appendix III.

#### A. Professional Activities

As a faculty member progresses through the probationary period and beyond it is expected that he/she will show continuing professional growth as evidenced by increasing and diversified contributions to the mathematics’ profession. The levels of review shall evaluate both the number and quality of the faculty member’s contributions in professional activities and shall assign an overall rating according to the following guidelines.

**Unsatisfactory:** This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has failed to satisfy both of the requirements listed below for a Satisfactory rating.

**Needs Improvement:** This rating shall be assigned if the faculty member has satisfied only one of the requirements listed below for a Satisfactory rating.

**Satisfactory:** A Satisfactory rating shall require that the faculty member has:

S1. Maintained membership in at least one professional organization at the national level (e.g. AMS, MAA, SIAM, NCTM, ASA) throughout the review period.

S2. Attended at least one regional, national, or international mathematics conference between each full review.
**Above Satisfactory:** An Above Satisfactory rating may be assigned if, in addition to the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member has additional contributions in at least two activities, which may include, but are not limited to:

AS1. Serving as a referee for a professional mathematics journal.
AS2. Publishing reviews of research or books.
AS3. Serving as a reviewer for a system-wide grant.
AS5. Professional consulting.
AS6. Writing a successful patent application that is based on work completed since the start of the probationary period.
AS7. Organizing special institutes, seminars or workshops of significant value.
AS8. Obtaining financial support via an on-campus or external grant to support the organization of special institutes, seminars or workshops.
AS9. Active participation in a professional organization or at meetings of a professional organization, including planning or organizing special institutes, seminars or workshops; conducting seminars or colloquia; and organizing meetings at local, regional, or national level.
AS10. Serving as an individual reviewer, or on a panel of reviewers, for an external granting agency.

**Superior:** A Superior rating may be assigned if, in addition to the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member has additional contributions in at least four activities in the preceding list.

**B. Department, University and Community Service Activities**

An appropriate level of service to the department, school, and university is expected of every faculty member throughout their academic career at CSUF. However, as a faculty member progresses through the probationary period, it is expected that she or he will devote the majority of her or his time to developing her or his teaching and scholarly and creative activities. Therefore, a high level of service activity is not required, nor indeed encouraged, during this period. The minimal requirement for a Satisfactory rating in the area of service throughout the probationary period is that a faculty member has met the expectations listed below:

S1. Regular attendance and collegial participation at department meetings.
S2. Attendance at department colloquia or seminars.
S3. Service and collegial participation on assigned departmental committees.
S4. Conscientious performance of duties assigned by the department (for example mandatory student advising).
S5. Conscientious performance of duties for which released/assigned time was granted (for example course or program coordination).

Deficiency in one of these requirements will result in a rating of Needs Improvement, whereas deficiency in more than one of these requirements will result in an Unsatisfactory rating.

**Above Satisfactory:** An Above Satisfactory rating may be assigned if, in addition to the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member has at least one contribution in the following list:

AS1. Service on college, university, or system-wide committees.
AS2. Taking a leadership role on department committees.
AS3. Organization of department colloquium series or seminar series.
AS4. Ongoing maintenance of department webpage.
AS5. Organization of focused departmental discussion groups.
AS6. Serving the community through application of knowledge of mathematics.

**Superior:** A Superior rating may be assigned if, in addition to the requirements for a Satisfactory rating, since the end of the last full review period, the faculty member has contributions in at least three different activities listed in AS1. – AS6.

**C. Overall Rating of Performance in Professional, University, and Community Service**

The DPC shall assign an overall rating for performance in professional, university, and community service as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Activities</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>SUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>SUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Department Policy on Retention, Tenure and Promotion**

Faculty members who do not receive two years of service credit are normally subject to three full reviews (see UPS 210.000, Section I.K). For those faculty receiving two years of service credit, there are normally only two full reviews. In such a case, it will be assumed that the criteria specified below for the first full review have been met.
A. **Probationary Retention**

The outcome of each of the first two full reviews is a recommendation either for regular retention, retention subject to a full review, or termination. In the case where a faculty member is retained subject to a full review, the resulting review will be judged relative to the criteria for the review that has given arise to that recommendation.

**Probationary Year 2 (Probationary Year 3 for faculty with one year of service credit):** A probationary faculty member shall be recommended for retention if his/her performance is at least Satisfactory in each of the three areas of review. Failure to meet this level of performance shall result in a recommendation for either a full review during the next RTP cycle, or a terminal year.

**Probationary Year 4:** A probationary faculty member shall be recommended for retention if his/her performance is at least Satisfactory in each area of review, and if in Teaching and/or Scholarly and Creative Activities his/her performance is Above Satisfactory. Failure to meet this level of performance shall result in a recommendation for either a full review during the next RTP cycle, or a terminal year.

B. **Tenure**

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure during the sixth probationary year, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may be considered for early tenure. This may require a faculty member to request a full performance review during Probationary Year 3 in order to have completed three full reviews at the time of the early tenure request. In such a case, the portfolio shall be evaluated relative to the Probationary Year 4 guidelines. Furthermore, any portfolio submitted in consideration of early tenure shall be evaluated using the Probationary Year 6 guidelines.

1. **Normal Term Tenure:** An eligible faculty member will be recommended for tenure if, in the sixth probationary year review his/her performance is at least Satisfactory in each areas of review, and if in Teaching his/her performance is at least Above Satisfactory.

2. **Early Tenure:** Early tenure shall require three consecutive full reviews in which performance in each area of review is at least Satisfactory. In addition, in the last two full reviews, performance in both Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activities shall be Superior, and performance in Professional, University and Community Service shall be at least Above Satisfactory.

C. **Promotion of a Probationary Faculty Member**

A probationary faculty member shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time as the tenure decision. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may be considered for early promotion. This may require a faculty member to request a full performance review during
Probationary Year 3 in order to have completed three full reviews at the time of the early promotion request. In such a case, the portfolio shall be evaluated relative to the Probationary Year 4 guidelines. Furthermore, any portfolio submitted in consideration of early promotion shall be evaluated using the Probationary Year 6 guidelines.

1. **Promotion to Associate Professor**: Promotion of a probationary Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

2. **Early Promotion to Associate Professor**: Early promotion of a probationary Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor shall require three consecutive full reviews in which performance in each area of review is at least Satisfactory. In addition, in the last two full reviews, performance in Teaching shall be Superior, and performance in Scholarly and Creative Activities shall be at least Above Satisfactory.

3. **Promotion to Professor**: Promotion of a probationary Associate Professor to the rank of Professor shall normally be considered at the same time as the tenure decision and shall require three consecutive full reviews in which performance in each area of review is at least Satisfactory. In addition, in the last two full reviews, performance in all three areas of review shall be at least Above Satisfactory.

4. **Early Promotion to Professor**: Early promotion of a probationary associate professor to the rank of professor shall require three consecutive full reviews in which performance in each area of review is at least Satisfactory in the first full review and is Superior in the last two full reviews.

D. **Promotion of a Tenured Associate Professor**

Promotion of a tenured Associate Professor to the rank of Professor shall normally be considered, upon the request of the faculty member, during his/her fifth year in rank. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may be considered for early promotion. Accomplishments documented for promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor. In cases where there has been a lengthy time period since promotion to Associate Professor, the most recent five years of evidence shall normally be emphasized in evaluating a record of continuing performance, but shall not exclude consideration of total productivity over the entire period in the Associate rank.

1. **Promotion to Professor**: A positive recommendation for promotion will require ongoing growth in all areas of review. Performance in teaching for the preceding four years must be at least Above Satisfactory. The faculty member will have sustained a vigorous research agenda as evidenced by a continuous record of high quality publications, and dissemination of results through presentations at regional, national or international meetings. It is expected that,
during the review period, a minimum of three papers will have been published (or accepted) in high quality journals, and on which the faculty member has made substantial contributions. In exceptional cases, less than three peer-reviewed publications may suffice, but in such a case the Portfolio must provide supporting evidence of the ongoing development of the work throughout the review period, as well as documentation that the quality of the work is outstanding. Performance in the area of Professional, University, and Community Service over the preceding four years must have been sustained at a level that would meet or exceed the criteria specified in this document for an Above Satisfactory rating.

2. Early Promotion to Professor: Early promotion of a tenured Associate Professor to the rank of Professor shall require that the faculty member has displayed sustained vitality and excellence in all three areas of review. Performance in Teaching for the entire period in rank must be Superior. In addition, the faculty member must have maintained a vigorous research agenda as evidenced by a continuous record of publications of outstanding quality, and dissemination of results through invited presentations at national or international meetings. It is expected that, during the review period, a minimum of three papers will have been published (or accepted) in top-tier journals, and on which the faculty member has made substantial contributions. Finally, performance in the area of Professional, University, and Community Service for the entire period in rank must have been at a level that would meet the criteria specified in this document for a Superior rating.

V. Personnel Committee

1. The DPC shall consist of five voting members and one alternate. At least three tenured full Professors shall be members of the DPC.

2. All five voting members will have two-year terms staggered so that two are elected in odd years, and three are elected in even years.

3. One alternate having a one-year term of office shall be elected each year. The alternate shall become a voting member of the DPC only when the number of participating voting members is fewer than three, or when he or she has replaced a DPC member who has resigned.

4. All eligible faculty members as defined in UPS 210.000 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall be nominated.

5. Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on the DPC. If an Associate Professor or Professor is subject to a post-tenure review, he/she may serve on the DPC but cannot participate in the review of his or her own Portfolio.

6. A person may serve consecutive terms only if no eligible faculty member is available. Alternates who did not participate in personnel decisions shall be considered as not having served and are therefore eligible for election.
7. Former Department Chairs are not eligible to serve until one year after his/her last year as Chair.

8. Given that three members must be Professors, eligibility may differ between ballots as a DPC election proceeds.

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

10. Election of committee members and the alternate shall be conducted at the last department meeting each spring semester for the term to start at the beginning of the next academic year. The election is facilitated by the Department Coordinator assisted by a tenured full professor.

11. Balloting is secret. Election shall require a majority of the votes cast (not including abstaining votes). Separate balloting shall be conducted for the different types of seat. The two-year seats shall be filled first, then any one-year seats resulting from a DPC member’s resignation, retirement, or leave, then the alternate seat. If no majority is reached, the name(s) with the fewest number of votes shall be removed from the slate. The total number of votes achieved by these named people must not constitute a majority of the votes cast. The procedure is repeated, at each iteration voting for the number of positions yet to be filled, until all members have been elected by majority vote.
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