CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PERSONNEL EVALUATIONS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

DIVISION OF POLITICS, ADMINISTRATION AND JUSTICE

Personnel files in the Division of Politics, Administration and Justice are prepared in accordance with the MOU, UPS 210.000 and these Division standards. The standards below define both qualitative and quantitative criteria by which faculty under review shall be judged.

I. Developmental Narrative and Development Plan

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write prospective developmental 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 division standards for retention, tenure and promotion. These narratives 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, prior to May 1st. These narratives shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member's Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure track position.

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

Probationary faculty who were hired prior to August 17, 2001 will have approved Development Plans in the portfolio in lieu of a Development Narrative. For faculty who have approved Development Plans. Progress toward retention, tenure and promotion will be measured against expectations in UPS 210.000 and the division standards.

II. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Teaching performance is evaluated by student opinion questionnaires, analysis of grade distributions, and qualitative evaluation of material provided by the candidate. The same level of performance as marked by the same indicators of teaching performance is required for retention, for tenure, and for promotion. However, please see the separate criteria for early tenure and early promotions, in Part V. below.
A. Narritive Self-Evaluation

The candidate must supply a detailed and thoughtful narrative discussing his or her teaching philosophy, and the purpose and focus of each course. The candidate must also supply an evaluative statement concerning student opinions, assistance to the educational process, grade distributions, and reports of peer visitation to classrooms, if any. The Chair and the Division Personnel Committee (DPC) will evaluate the degree to which the candidate's teaching appears to be up-to-date, rigorous, organized, creative and effective. See U.P.S. 210 .000

The Division commends to candidates the concepts used in the University Mission & Goals to identify high quality teaching. Please see Appendix I for a useful listing of concepts that faculty might employ in making the case that teaching is of high quality.

B. Peer Evaluation.

Peer evaluation shall be based on examination of course outlines, exams, new course proposals, grade distributions and research related to teaching. In examining this material, the committee will be looking for evidence that course content is up-to-date, current, academically rigorous, and organized, and that assignments and examinations are reasonable. In addition, public lectures, public colloquia, public symposia and conference presentations may be used as a reference for peer evaluation.

The candidate is encouraged to request peer visitation for his/her classes. Classroom visitors will be chosen by mutual agreement between the candidate and the DPC.

C. Course Methods and Materials

The candidate must supply supporting material, including:
- All course syllabi and examinations
- A representative sample of assignments
- A generous sample of supporting class materials, such as handouts, lists of films used, lists of guest speakers, etc.

The DPC and the Chair will use this material to help in evaluating the degree to which courses appear to be up-to-date, rigorous, organized, creative, and successful in terms of student learning.

D. Student Opinion Surveys

Student opinion surveys are mandatory in all classes, using the approved Division questionnaire. The Division considers quantitative scores on the opinion questionnaires as evidence of the candidate's teaching skills.
A mean of medians of 3.0 on question 11 is considered significant evidence of good teaching. Candidates scoring below 3.0 on this measure, and any other candidate asserting that this measure does not accurately or completely reflect their performance, may submit other quantitative evidence of teaching performance.

Candidates are also expected to summarize and analyze written comments on the student opinion forms. These written comments are considered qualitative evidence of teaching performance. The Chair and the DPC will review student comments, and, among other things, will look for students’ reports concerning their learning outcomes.

E. Assistance to the Educational Process

Advising and counseling students and participation in the comprehensive examination process for graduate students are considered important components of the teaching process. Candidates who have participated in these activities must discuss them in the Portfolio narrative, and must provide evidence of such activity, and of the quality or importance of such activity, in the Working Personnel Action File. The DPC and the Chair will evaluate these activities as part of the assessment of teaching.

F. Grade Distributions

Providing grade distinctions among students is an obligation of the faculty. In the narrative and in other appropriate places within the, Portfolio the candidate must offer context and comparisons of his/her grade distributions, including the grading patterns of other faculty in the department and in the University for similar courses. The essential tool for this is the memorandum published each semester by the campus Office of Analytical Studies, containing summaries of grade distributions. The candidate must comment on significant deviations from department statistical norms. The Division Personnel Committee and the Chair will evaluate the candidate’s grade distributions principally by comparing them with Department and University statistical norms.

III. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The Division considers scholarly and creative activity second in importance to teaching. We expect candidates to publish in peer-reviewed sources.

A. Research Agenda

The candidate must develop a clearly defined research agenda, which indicates the central research problem he/she is concerned with, the methods to
be used and the ultimate goals of the research. The research agenda shall be between 500 and 1,500 words in length. A first draft of a candidate’s research agenda shall be included within a candidate’s Portfolio for his or her first full personnel review. Typically that is at the beginning of a second probationary year. It is assumed that the research agenda follow from the Development Narrative. The Chair and the DPC will assess the research agenda, commenting on whether its goals seem reasonable, and whether such goals, if attained, seem likely to produce scholarly and creative activity products sufficient for achieving tenure.

A research agenda may change over time. The candidate is expected to detail and discuss in Portfolio narratives changes in the agenda as they develop. With successive evaluations, the candidate should comment on the progress of the agenda. See U.P.S. 210.000

B. Faculty Mentors

One or more mentors from among the tenured faculty will be appointed for each new full-time faculty member, whether temporary or probationary. This appointment will be made not later than the beginning of the second semester by the Chair, in consultation with the DPC. Prior to making such appointment(s), the Chair will inquire with the affected faculty as to any preferences that he or she may have for a mentor.

Mentors will work with the candidate in developing his or her Developmental Narrative or the Development Plan and the research agenda and will help to monitor the candidate’s progress.

No report from mentors as mentors will be required in a Portfolio. However, a mentor may, as any faculty member may, provide his or her views about the performance of an untenured faculty member, via memo either to the candidate or to the Chair.

C. Publication Expectations

We divide publications into ‘blind’ peer reviewed, peer reviewed and other publications. Into the first category we place blind reviewed journal articles, articles in law reviews from American Bar Association-approved law schools, scholarly books and monographs, and textbooks that involve significant scholarly contributions. Into the second we place textbooks that do not involve significant scholarly contributions, external proposals for grants that are funded, scholarly research notes, response articles in scholarly journals, articles published in other law reviews, articles in scholarly edited books, and authorship of edited books that do not involve significant scholarly contributions. Into the third we place such work as scholarly convention papers, peer reviewed contract reports and works commissioned by government and private agencies articles in magazines, feature news articles and book reviews.
As a minimum requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor we require that candidates produce either one book or two additional articles from the first category and at least two additional works from the first or second categories. For promotion to full Professor we require at least an additional book or two articles from the first category and an additional work from either the first, second, or third categories. This work for promotion to full Professor shall have been published since the promotion to Associate Professor. In the sense used here, "published" shall be taken to include work formally accepted for publication.

The Division Personnel Committee and the chair will evaluate the quality of the scholarly contributions. This will include work from all three categories. Please see Appendix II for suggestions for providing evidence of high quality scholarship.

IV. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

The Division views Professional, University and Community Service activity as an important contributor to the development of good teacher/scholars. As such, it is the third most important activity to be undertaken by a faculty member. The Division recognizes that there are many ways of being an active professional.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to carefully document and describe his or her Professional, University and Community Service activity in the Portfolio narrative. See U.P.S. 210.000

A. Professional Activity

Some indicators of professional activity include:

- Appearances on panels at professional meetings
- Offices or positions including committee membership in professional organizations
- Program planning for local, regional or national professional organizations
- Memberships on editorial boards of professional journals
- Reviewing articles for professional journals or books for publishers
- Consulting work with public and non-profit agencies
- Other professional assistance provided to public or nonprofit agencies
- Assistance with the accreditation process

B. University and Community Service

Some indicators of University and Community Service include:
• Service on Divisional committees, advisorships and offices
• Service on School and University committees, including the Academic Senate
• Assistance to student groups and clubs
• Development of community academic programs
• Political activity at the international, national, state or local level.

For tenure or promotion to Associate Professor minimal activity shall include at least five activities from category A and seven activities from category B.

For promotion to Professor at least six additional activities from category A and nine additional from category B are required.

V. EARLY TENURE AND EARLY PROMOTIONS

The Division considers early tenure and early promotions to be extraordinary actions. Positive recommendations will be made only when the DPC and/or the chair conclude that excellent performance has occurred in teaching, and in scholarly and creative activity.

Evidence of excellence in teaching normally includes means of medians of at least 3.2 on the student opinion questionnaires on question 11, together with qualitative evidence of teaching judged by the DPC and the Chair to be truly excellent. Such a judgment of true excellence must include at least these elements: a finding of (a) high quality in course content, and of (b) commitment to student success. Such a judgment of true excellence must also include at least two of these elements: a finding of (c) integration of student learning with faculty scholarly activity; (d) continuing improvement in a candidate’s teaching; and (e) upholding core academic values.

Excellence in scholarly and creative activity must include at least four peer reviewed contributions since initial appointment or since the last promotion, and qualitative evidence that allows the DPC and the chair to judge the contributions to be truly excellent.

As is true with any judgment, the professional discernment of members of the DPC and the chair will be determinative. However, any judgment of true excellence must include at least these elements: a finding that at least three of the required four peer reviewed contributions have been published in selective outlets, as established by a) the capabilities or reputation of members of the editorial boards; (b) peer rankings of the journal; (c) acceptance rates; and/or (d) high quality law reviews (see III.C above). Please compare Appendix II.

In addition, a judgment of true excellence must be based in part on at least one of the following, which support the claim that the scholarly contribution
was original, important, or noteworthy: (d) positive reviewers’ comments about a manuscript during a peer review process; (e) published reviews of books and articles; (f) citations to an article or other contribution; (g) book adoptions or inclusions within anthologies for classroom or other professional use.

Excellence in Professional, University and Community Service must include at least seven additional activities from category A and ten additional activities from category B since the last promotion.

APPENDIX I.

CONCEPTS DRAWN FROM THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON MISSION & GOALS STATEMENT THAT MAY INDICATE HIGH QUALITY TEACHING

Note: As is true for any other claim arising in a personnel evaluation process (i.e., in a Portfolio or similar item), candidates must make arguments that their work reaches an indicated standard. Such claims and arguments are most persuasive when they are accompanied by solid evidence to support them. Thus, for example, where a candidate claims that his or her course embodies the best of current practice, theory, and research, the candidate is best-advised to say clearly what his or her understanding is of best current practice, theory, and research, and how such understanding provides a foundation for work with students. As with all other materials, narratives and evidence, the DPC and the Chair will evaluate the claims and the evidence, and will reach judgments.

Evidence of High Quality in Course Content.

• embodying the best of current practice, theory, and research.
• enabling students to develop the habit of intellectual inquiry.
• integrating knowledge with the development of values and professional ethics.
• preparing students for challenging professions.

Evidence of Integrating Student Learning with Faculty Scholarly Activity.

Evidence of Continuing Improvement in Teaching,
• employing collegial assessment of student learning.
• modifying classes based upon analysis of evidence of student learning.
• integrating advances in learning technology, including information and communication technologies.

Evidence of Upholding Core Academic Values,
• showing commitment to freedom of thought, inquiry, and speech.
• attending to issues of culture, ethnicity, and gender.
• promoting a global perspective.
• encouraging interdisciplinary learning.

Evidence of Commitment to Student Success,
• ensuring that all students have the opportunity to succeed.
• showing sensitivity to the needs of students of varying age, ethnicity, culture, academic experience, and economic circumstances.

Evidence that Teaching Supports the Development of Students’ Sense of Community, Citizenship, and Involvement,
• enhancing a sense of membership and participation in the campus community.
• providing students with opportunities for collaborative activities.
• developing the teamwork, leadership, and citizenship skills necessary for student to make meaningful contributions to society.
• strengthening students’ relationships to their communities.
• preparing students to contribute productively to society.

APPENDIX II

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF HIGH QUALITY SCHOLARSHIP

It is the candidate’s obligation to document the peer review process and the quality of publication outlets. The following are some suggested ways of supplying convincing documentation.

• Showing the capabilities or reputation of members the editorial boards of journals in which the candidate has published
• Showing that the procedures used for review of published work clearly mark a publication has been peer reviewed within the meaning of the categories set out in Part II.B of these standards.
• Showing that acceptance rates for a publication outlet mark the outlet as selective in accepting contributions
• Showing that reviewers' comments about a manuscript support a claim that the scholarly contribution was original, important, or noteworthy.
• Showing that peer rankings of the journal mark it as selective or important.

Some forms of post-publication review of published material also may provide evidence that an item of scholarship is of high quality. These include:

• Showing that citations to an article or other contribution mark it as an important or noteworthy item of scholarship.
• Showing that positive reviews of books and articles mark them as important or noteworthy.
• Showing that book adoptions for classroom or other professional use mark a contribution as professionally sound and useful.