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Faculty Affairs and Records
I. Preface, The Department of Educational Leadership (hereafter called 'the Department'), is committed to providing the highest quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community, and region. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning with an emphasis on establishing an environment where learning, creation of knowledge, and dissemination are central to everything we do. We also believe that education—teaching and learning in all forms—is the primary task of higher education today. Instructional faculty are the key to quality programs and effective learning environments. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning through contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service to the Department, College of Education, University, the profession, and the community. The Department proposes a personnel document consistent with the University Mission and Goals that (a) recognizes the unique nature of our programs as linked to the communities we serve and (b) responds to the multiple roles of the faculty at various stages of their careers.

The Department designed the following assessment guidelines for the RTP Portfolio. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and review bodies will be aided in their respective roles by having as clear and objective a statement of the Department's expectations as possible. Furthermore, the Department faculty specifically affirm their position that students' best interests and needs are served when the faculty represents a wide diversity of interests and activities creating a "mosaic of talent." We intend to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the many functions and responsibilities performed by Department faculty.

Teaching, scholarly and creative, professional, and service activities are frequently interconnected in the interdisciplinary, applied field of educational leadership. We also encourage and reward collaboration across programs, departments, and units to serve the educational needs of our students. Consequently, it is the faculty member's responsibility to determine how and in which categories to describe and document activities that cut across the three Portfolio areas of performance. It is also the faculty member's responsibility to address in the narrative for each section how the included activities contribute to development in that specific Portfolio area. Additionally, if appropriate, faculty have the opportunity/responsibility to include evidence of experiences of cultural taxation (UPS 210.002).

II. Faculty Responsibilities

As full-time employees of CSU Fullerton, faculty are expected to meet professional responsibilities as they apply to each of the Portfolio evaluation categories.

In the area of teaching, examples of these responsibilities include

- quality teaching practice,
- curriculum development,
- ongoing professional development,
- commitment to just, equitable, and inclusive education, and
- collaboration for program development and evaluation, including assessment and accreditation.
In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, faculty are expected to engage in activities that enhance the overall mission of the professoriate, for example:

- expanding knowledge,
- applying knowledge to consequential problems in education, and
- advancing the reputation of the University.

In the areas of professional, university, and community service, examples of faculty responsibilities include:

- contributing to the advancement of the field,
- increasing opportunities for students in the discipline,
- attending University, College, and Department meetings,
- completing committee assignments,
- completing other duties as assigned by either the Department Chair or Dean of the College of Education,
- supporting the work of the Department, College, and University, and
- contributing to the community in general through service activities.

III. Department History and Structure

The history of the Department began in the 1960s at CSUF. The faculty in school administration officially became the Educational Administration Department on September 15, 1981. The M.S. in Education with a concentration in Educational Administration was approved in January 1985. The Department's name changed to Educational Leadership in 1996. The Doctorate in Education Program (Ed.D.) was approved in 2007-2008. The M.S. in Education with a concentration in Higher Education began in 2009. In 2021, the master’s programs became independent degree programs as the Master’s in Educational Leadership and Administration (P-12 education) and the Master’s in Higher Education (student affairs focus).

IV. Role of the Chair in the Personnel Process

With respect to the personnel process, the following guidelines shall apply:

- Before the end of the first 2 weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair shall consult with new probationary faculty members concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors.
- The Department Chair will review files for faculty in the Department unless the Department Chair is not of sufficient rank to be eligible to review the file. In that case, the Dean assumes the “chair” responsibilities as required by UPS 210.000.

V. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the "Committee") shall evaluate Portfolios and make specific recommendations concerning retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to members of the Department as specified in UPS 210.002.

B. Committee Structure

All Committee members shall be tenured faculty not serving as chair of a department. Committee members must have a higher rank or classification than faculty members being reviewed. No individuals shall serve as a member of the Committee during any
period in which they are the subject of a personnel review process. An alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any circumstances in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete the term.

C. Election of Committee Members

The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the 3rd week of classes in the fall semester each year. All tenured faculty members of the Department who meet requirements in Section V.B above are automatically on the slate of nominees for the Committee except: (a) department chairs, (b) faculty who decline in writing to the Chair prior to the 2nd week of classes in the fall, and (c) faculty being considered for a personnel action that year. Any tenured faculty member in the Department may make an additional nomination or nominations of individuals from other departments. These individuals shall be listed on the ballot if they agree in writing to serve on the Committee. Nominees shall be presented to the faculty for election in the following manner: identified by department affiliation and rank, and alphabetized by last name. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote for three nominees by secret written ballot. The alternate member shall be the individual who received the most votes among nominees not elected to the Committee.

D. Committee Chair

The Committee shall select its Chair for a 1-year term.

E. Committee Procedures

1. The Committee shall evaluate the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. In its written evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service. Where appropriate, the Committee shall formulate recommendations and shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation. (Here and throughout, see UPS 210.000 for further requirements and information)

2. The Committee’s evaluation for each area is to be based on the Portfolio according to the professional judgment of the Committee members, UPS 210.002, and the Department Personnel Standards. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for rating the faculty member under review as excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate, with respect to each of the three areas of performance. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VII.

3. All actions taken by the Committee, including recommendations, 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 how individual members voted.

5. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair according to Faculty Affairs and Records guidelines.

VI. General Guidelines

A. Developmental Narrative (Prospectus in UPS 210.000)
Each probationary faculty member shall construct a Developmental Narrative during the initial year of probationary status. The Department Chair or an identified tenured faculty member will provide guidance, advice, and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation and revision of the narrative. The narrative is due to the Department Chair by February 28. The Department Chair and College Dean will review the narrative, and each will provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College but prior to May 1. The Committee will not review the Developmental Narrative. During subsequent years, the Developmental Narrative may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to prepare and submit the required information and documentation for the Portfolio in the required application in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to (a) attend workshops held by Faculty Affairs and Records at the beginning of each fall semester, (b) attend collegewide personnel workshops, and (c) seek assistance from colleagues.

C. Portfolio Organization and Documentation

The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the standard table of contents as specified in UPS 210.000. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. The Developmental Narrative shall be included in the Portfolio. Curriculum vitae shall be included, and citations shall follow APA guidelines. Self-assessment narratives are limited to 1,000 words. The student opinion questionnaires are added by Faculty Affairs and Records in the required application.

VII. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-Time Faculty

The Department recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service activities, as well as the cultural taxation evidence unaccounted for in the aforementioned areas.

A. Teaching Performance

The primary mission of CSUF faculty is teaching. Faculty in the Department will submit a self-assessment, reflecting on both quality of teaching and ongoing professional learning and, if applicable, describing experiences of cultural taxation.

Faculty will be evaluated equally in four domains: (a) curriculum; (b) instruction; (c) just, equitable, inclusive education (JEIE, as defined by the College of Education); and (d) students' perceptions of the instructor.

Faculty must demonstrate reflection on practice in each of the domains in the self-assessment portion of the Portfolio, highlighting evidence of quality of teaching and ongoing professional development, including growth displayed and areas for continued growth in teaching practice.

A complete teaching portfolio involves (a) a cogent self-assessment discussion and (b) aligned supporting evidence.

Faculty should discuss improvements and/or trends in teaching performance. For example, professional development training, midpoint assessments, peer observation...
feedback, response to student opinion questionnaires (SOQs), and other assessment measures. What and how have faculty changed as a result, and with what outcomes? The self-assessment should address any significant discrepancies between SOQ data and other measures of teaching effectiveness.

UPS 210.000 specifies a 1,000-word limit for the self-assessment narrative. However, faculty may include optional references and tables in the Portfolio with additional information and evidence to provide greater depth in any domain. This additional evidence should be cited in the self-assessment narrative.

1. Teaching Domains

a. Curriculum

**List of Courses Taught**  
A list of all courses taught during the review period is required by UPS 210.000. The list must include the course number, title, and unit value. The Department will review the courses taught to frame the evaluation of teaching assignments. Reviewers may extend special consideration to unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (e.g., nature and difficulty of courses), but the faculty member must discuss such circumstances and indicate evidence in the Portfolio.

**Course Syllabi**  
The most recent syllabus for each course taught must be included. Earlier syllabi should be included as well if relevant to the self-assessment discussion. The self-assessment narrative may discuss how course syllabi reflect curriculum development, new course design, and course revisions. This may include adoption of new course proposals.

**Course Materials**  
Candidates are required to submit course materials per UPS 210.000. Course materials may include assignments or other materials aligned to syllabi, especially those noted in the narrative and referenced in the Portfolio. Faculty should provide three examples of quality course materials in each full review year (years 2, 4, and 6) that demonstrate explicit connections between theory and practice. Examples may include assignment description and detail, content (such as videos or mini-lectures), or other course support materials. Examples should be from at least two different courses.

b. Instruction

For each full review period (years 2, 4, and 6) faculty must include one piece of evidence from each of the following focus areas: (i) Alignment of Learning Outcomes and Instruction and (ii) Professional Learning Related to Instruction. In addition, faculty must include a third piece of evidence from either (i), (ii), or (iii) (see below). Faculty must address (iv) when responsible for chairing dissertations.

i. **Alignment of Learning Outcomes and Instruction**  
Evidence for alignment of student learning outcomes and instruction will vary by course. Faculty will select one course to demonstrate attention to student learning outcome mastery evident in the faculty instruction and assignments. Evidence may include completed student assignments, instructor feedback, or other examples of instructional effectiveness.

ii. **Professional Learning Related to Instruction**  
Faculty must provide evidence of improvement in teaching as a result of additional training and
development. Evidence could include revisions to assignments, revised syllabi, and other examples of instructional strategies adopted as a result of professional development.

iii. Observations Faculty are encouraged to engage in the peer observation process for professional growth purposes. Faculty may choose to include supporting documentation from peer observation(s) in accordance with UPS 210.080 during the review period.

iv. Dissertation Advising (as Committee Chair) Dissertation advising is a core teaching activity in the Ed.D. Program. However, the Department does not administer SOQs to dissertation advisees because the one-on-one nature of dissertation advising would compromise the anonymity and validity of SOQ data.

   (1) **Required evidence for dissertation advising** In lieu of SOQ data, faculty will provide a list of published dissertations or works in progress for which they served as dissertation committee chair, including candidate name, year of publication (or anticipated year), and dissertation title.

   (2) **Optional evidence for dissertation advising** Additional evidence of high-quality dissertation advising may include:

   - evidence of student dissemination of dissertation findings through refereed journal articles, peer-reviewed conference sessions (e.g., papers, posters, and professional conference presentations), or other scholarly works,
   - assessment data specifically identifying the dissertation chair (e.g., exit or alumni surveys),
   - examples of completed feedback loops (preliminary student work, faculty feedback, and student revised work),
   - written and signed letters from dissertation advisees or dissertation committee members.

v. Optional Additional Evidence for Instruction

   - Video, audio, or online course recordings, especially those demonstrating explicit connections between theory and practice. Student anonymity should be protected, or consent secured for recordings.
   - Examples of innovative instruction
   - Mentoring students from groups underrepresented in education

   c. Just, Equitable, and Inclusive Education (JEIE) Faculty will demonstrate a commitment to just, equitable, and inclusive education as defined by the College of Education, with evidence of JEIE woven throughout the curriculum, instruction, and professional learning. Evidence of effectiveness must include student work. At least three pieces of evidence are required for each full review period (e.g., a total of nine by the 6th year). Evidence must include the assignment description and a completed student assignment. Faculty will include reflection on the evidence in the self-assessment narrative.
d. Students’ Perceptions of Instructor’s Teaching Effectiveness

i. **Statistical Summaries of SOQs** (see UPS 210.002.II.B.c). Faculty must include University-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.) If service credit was given, data on student opinions from all years for which credit was given are to be included. The guidelines below will be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness based on SOQs, with scores averaged over the period of review.

Faculty must submit a summary table of percentages over the review period.

- a) Excellent = 90% or more A and B ratings
- b) Good = 80 to <90% A and B ratings
- c) Needs Improvement = 70 to <80% A and B ratings
- d) Inadequate = Less than 70% A and B ratings

ii. **Student Comments from Original SOQs** Faculty must include student comments from University-provided original SOQs. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.)

iii. **Reflection and Analysis of SOQ Feedback** Faculty must analyze and reflect on SOQ feedback from two courses over each full review period (years 2, 4, and 6), including planning for specific instructional changes as a result of the analysis. A sample template is available at [Single Course Analysis of SOQs](#), (Appendix A) or faculty may use another method of analysis.

iv. **Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions** Faculty must include the University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each course.

v. **Optional Evidence** Faculty may include optional evidence in the form of written and signed comments by students, mid-course evaluations, and other student feedback.

Optional Additional Evidence of Students’ Perceptions

Faculty are encouraged to keep the Portfolio as focused and coherent as possible. However, up to three items of evidence may be submitted as “optional additional” if they do not fit in the five described categories.

2. **Composite Rating of Teaching Effectiveness**

Based on their professional judgment of the depth, breadth, and significance of evidence, reviewers will rate the Portfolio on both of the following:

- a. *Quality of teaching practice*, and
- b. *Ongoing professional learning*, including growth displayed and reflection on areas for continued growth.

Table 1: Reviewers will render a rating based on the following criteria described on
the Teaching Rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The faculty member shows strong evidence of both effective teaching AND professional learning. An excellent narrative that is an accurate and cogent reflection of the faculty member’s teaching and learning through the teaching rubric, with at least three categories of VII.A.1a, b, c, and d are Excellent, and the other is at least Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The faculty member shows strong evidence of either effective teaching OR professional learning. A good narrative that is an accurate reflection of the faculty member’s teaching and learning through the teaching rubric, with at least three categories of VII.A.1a, b, c, and d are Good, and the other is at least Needs Improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>The faculty member shows some evidence but needs improvement in effective teaching or professional learning. Per rubric, narrative needs improvement, and any single category of VII.A.1a, b, c, or d is Inadequate or when the criteria for Good are not met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>The faculty member shows insufficient evidence of effective teaching or professional learning. Per rubric, when narrative or two or more categories are Inadequate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHING RUBRIC (Appendix B)**

**B. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activities generate benefits for the faculty member as well as the University. Given the range of possibilities in defining high quality and meaningful impact, the onus is on the candidate to provide descriptive evidence, considering the Department values of JEIE, as defined by the College of Education. **In line with our value of JEIE, we support collaborative work within our field. Examples include co-authored works (especially when co-authored with students and alumni), community-based knowledge in research, and research on underserved communities.** “Mentoring students–and particularly engaging them in research and other scholarly and creative activities–is an especially valuable form of faculty work. It therefore also deserves consideration in the evaluation process” (UPS 210.002).

Scholarly activities may (a) complement teaching; (b) contribute to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement; (c) promote currency in knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike; (d) increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines; (e) enhance the professional growth of the faculty member; (f) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, the College, the University, and the larger community; (g) advance the reputation of the University; (h) make significant contributions to the dissemination and
application of knowledge in educational and community settings; and (i) enhance collaborative scholarship.

Items in the following sections are not listed in order of importance. Faculty members under review are responsible for showing how their work addresses some or all of these criteria and the importance of the specific criteria in evaluating each scholarly or creative work.

The Department employs traditional and emergent criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work:

- clarity of conceptualization
- connection to the theoretical and scholarly literature
- originality of scholarship
- external peer review
- publication in journals, books, or media
- professionally recognized scholarly and prestigious invitations
- advancement of knowledge in the field
- influence on educational practice and settings
- influence on communities.

1. Indicators

a. **Self-Assessment (mandatory)** is a written discussion of the faculty member's performance in scholarly and creative activities. The self-assessment may refer to continuing, regular activities that result (or are judged likely to result, in the case of 2nd-year and 3rd-year probationary faculty) in funded grants of at least $20,000 as a PI or Co-PI that include scholarly work such as a literature review, research questions, methodology, and rationale for the study, and creative performances or exhibits (UPS 210.002, Section II.B.2.b.1). The self-assessment must include (a) discussion of the faculty member's research agenda in a focused, well defined, on-going body of work and (b) reflective review of the faculty member's scholarly and creative activities documented by supporting evidence. If applicable, experiences of cultural taxation should be described for consideration in evaluation (UPS 210.002). The narrative is limited to 1,000 words.

b. **Scholarly Publications** consist of the dissemination of external books, peer-reviewed journals, and other forms of media. Documentation must include one of the following: (a) letter of acceptance and commitment to publish, (b) reprint of published articles, or (c) copy of a published book in the final printed version. Documentation of peer review of the submission must be included for each publication, including email communications between editor(s) and author(s) indicating acceptance of the manuscript as the result of a peer review process. Acceptance rate, impact factor, audience for publication and/or readership reach, and citation information may be included for consideration.

c. **Engaged Scholarship** A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project includes the following five criteria. Examples of engaged scholarship include: Unfunded grants; community-based partnerships; etc. Faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence for each project as described below. Such projects must address all areas listed below.
i. **A clear rationale of the need** for the work and strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out. The plan must be supported by theory or evidence-based practices.

ii. **A conceptual or theoretical basis** for the work as conducted within the context of peer-reviewed knowledge. This is typically accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale for additional work.

iii. **Multiple forms of evidence** that demonstrate both quantitative and qualitative impacts of the project (e.g., letter from partners, data collected). A clear impact on a district or community partner is required.

iv. **A description of the process and outcomes** that includes (a) research questions informed by and situated in the literature, (b) analysis of findings contextualized in needs of a particular community or district or school or classroom and the discipline, (c) implications that illustrate practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the better, and (d) directions for future work.

v. **Evidence of dissemination activities and feedback from stakeholders.** Dissemination may be accomplished in various ways, including formal presentations to partnership groups and reports for partners.

d. **A High-Quality, Externally Funded Grant** that meets all following criteria:

   i. The proposal has a conceptual or theoretical basis (i.e., conducted in the context of existing knowledge.) This is typically accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale for additional work.

   ii. The faculty member under review is the principal investigator (PI) or co-PI on the grant.

   iii. Funded grant is at least $50,000.

   iv. Documentation is provided for an external peer review process. The peer review process should reflect the competitiveness of the grant. One of the best methods for documentation of peer review, especially for grants unfamiliar to most reviewers, is to provide copies of reviewer comments in the text of the grant proposal.

   v. Evidence is provided for a substantial impact of the funded grant (e.g., number of candidates affected, number of partner districts impacted, scope of dissemination strategies, evidence of college or university and/or PreK-12 collaboration, letters of support).

e. **Pragmatic Scholarship** consists of consultancies, policy analysis, program evaluation, serving as a member of a research project, non-peer-reviewed publications, and other forms of scholarship with an emphasis on the practical aspects of knowledge. In documenting pragmatic scholarship, faculty should include not only their own written record of the project, but must also provide external comments or other documentation of the identifiable benefits to the field (e.g., letters of support that account for impact of the candidate’s work on
the project). Publications and reports related to such activities, including dissemination products, are encouraged in this category.

f. **Scholarly Presentations** are peer-reviewed papers and presentations given or accepted to be given at professional meetings, symposia, seminars, or colloquia. They may consist of featured presentations, poster sessions, panel discussions, and other forms of work, all of which must be peer-reviewed and based on a theoretical or conceptual framework. Documentation of the peer review process must be included in the Portfolio. Evidence should include reviewer comments and letters of acceptance.

2. **Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activities**

   High-quality scholarly work includes at least three of the following:

   - Work resulting in an increased understanding or counternarrative that contributes to the field, related to community voices, community action, social activism, and social justice.
   - Work with a conceptual or theoretical basis and is conducted in the context of present or emerging knowledge. This can be accomplished through a review of related literature to show what was done in the past.
   - Work adding new knowledge to the field and/or extending the meaning or application of present or emerging knowledge. Dissemination of knowledge can be demonstrated through the publication of innovative articles, policy analysis, or program development, as well as through books, textbooks, or media that synthesize knowledge.
   - Work externally reviewed by peers. Work accepted for publication or presentation after a peer review or jury process shall be distinguished from work not subjected to peer review or jury process.
   - Work published in sources such as books, journals, and media. Faculty should provide documentation of the quality, scope, and importance of the book, journal, or media.

   **Note.** Co-authored publications to which faculty make substantive intellectual contributions may be considered high-quality publications. Substantive contributions can be demonstrated by (a) contribution of 50% or more to the intellectual/creative process OR (b) contribution to the intellectual/creative process of a highly significant or vital nature. When there are more than two co-authors, the contribution may fall below 50% but still be highly significant and/or vital in nature. Contributions must be specified and verified by co-authors in the Co-Authorship Disclosure Form. The Co-Authorship Disclosure Form should be submitted as part of the Portfolio.

3. **Guidelines for Ratings**

   It is expected that faculty will demonstrate an ongoing, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication shall stem from a sustained program of focused work over the review period. Based on the totality of evidence presented, reviewers using the standards outlined above in 1 and 2 shall rate the faculty member’s overall scholarly and creative activity as **Excellent, Good, Needs**
Improvement, or Inadequate. Reviewers will consider the length, complexity, and contribution to the field of each scholarly publication in evaluating whether the minimum or average publication threshold has been met. Impact factor is an example of a trusted indicator that can be used to demonstrate the quality of a scholarly publication. For pragmatic and engaged scholarship, examples of evidence indicating quality may include an award specifying the contribution or impact of the scholarly activity or a letter from a leader in the field attributing a specific improvement or impact in the field to the candidate’s scholarly activity.

“Quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the intended audience, the status of a journal, press or venue, whether a publication is an article or a note and whether a performance or exhibit is regional, national, or international in scope) and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work” (UPS 210.002, Section II.B.2.b.1). Evidence of cultural taxation should be taken into account in the evaluation (UPS 210.002).

Table 2: Progress Chart: Rating progression for a combination of publications AND pragmatic scholarship or scholarly presentations for each year of the review periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications / Pragmatic or Scholarly Presentations</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1 or 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4 / 4</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Guidelines for assistant or associate professors seeking tenure and promotion to associate or full professor:
   i. A rating of excellent shall be rendered for exemplary performance in
scholarly activity during full review period (years 2, 4 and 6). For a rating of excellent, it is generally expected that the Portfolio will contain a) and b). For the final review (year 6), candidates must also have one additional item from c):

a) One scholarly publication (including co-authored publications) for each contract year beyond the first year.

b) At least one pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentations for each contract year beyond the first year.

c) By the 6-year review, one or more of the following:
   1. Evidence that all four scholarly publications are of high quality
   2. An additional scholarly publication
   3. A meaningful, engaged scholarship project that meets all criteria for engaged scholarship in Section VII.B.1.c can replace one scholarly publication
   4. A funded grant that meets all criteria for high-quality, externally funded grants in Section VII.B.1.d.

ii. A rating of good shall be rendered for a portfolio containing scholarly publications and, pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentations, as indicated in the Table 2: Progress Chart above.

iii. A rating of needs improvement shall be rendered for a portfolio containing scholarly publications and, pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentations, as indicated in the Table 2: Progress Chart above.

iv. A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for a portfolio not meeting the criteria for a rating of needs improvement as indicated in Table 2: Progress Chart above.

b. Guidelines for tenured associate professors seeking promotion to full professor

i. A rating of excellent shall be rendered for a portfolio containing (a) four high-quality scholarly publications OR (b) three high-quality scholarly publications and one grant/engaged scholarship activity OR (c) two high-quality scholarly publications and two grants/engaged scholarship activities.

ii. A rating of good shall be rendered for a portfolio containing (a) three scholarly publications OR (b) two scholarly publications and one grant/engaged scholarship activity.

iii. A rating of needs improvement shall be rendered for a portfolio containing at least two scholarly publications OR one scholarly publication one grant/engaged scholarship.

iv. A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for a portfolio not meeting the
4. Scholarly and Creative Activity Notes

a. Quality, quantity, and the impact of the faculty member’s contributions should all be considered in light of prevailing professional standards.

b. All scholarly and creative activities must be properly documented with a complete APA style citation, letters of acceptance, documentation of peer review, letters of invitation, dates, places, final printed versions of galley pages, locations, copies of final printed versions of publication, letters of review and evaluation of performances. A detailed statement should be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Records has an appropriate form.

c. Documentation should be provided for scholarly and creative work in progress. Care should be taken to distinguish work in progress from completed work. See UPS 210.000.

d. The impact of scholarly and creative activities is not measured by the image of a specific journal or publisher but by the activity’s overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or benefit students and/or the community. It is incumbent upon the faculty member under review to clearly delineate such evidence in the Portfolio.

e. Receipt of a higher rating may be considered when cultural taxation evidence is extensive (See UPS 210.002, II.B.2.a).

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

Service is an essential component of professional commitment to the University, society, and profession. Through service, faculty can participate in governance and activities that contribute to the ever-changing needs of students, the community, and society. Professional service activities may:

● complement teaching and/or scholarship by allowing the instructor to draw from applied experience,
● promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied,
● bring recognition as a leader to the faculty member from their peers,
● enhance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students, and
● enhance the quality of education for our students and community.

As with the area of scholarship, the quality, duration, and significance of faculty contributions should be considered in the context of potential benefits and in light of prevailing and emerging professional standards. The evaluation should take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

1. Indicators

Evidence of service shall be recognized and evaluated by indicators as listed below or service activities as listed in UPS 210.002, Section II.B.3.b. Indicators are not listed in order of importance. It is the responsibility of faculty members under review to show how their work addresses some or all of these indicators:
a. conducting a self-assessment that discusses impact of contributions to the profession, the field, and the individual (mandatory, limited to 1,000 words)
b. assuming professional leadership roles
c. attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops that may not be peer-reviewed or theoretical in nature
d. acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates
e. editing professional journals
f. reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals, or conferences
g. providing private practice or consultations relevant to the field
h. reviewing grant proposals
i. receiving professional training or providing additional professional training to others
j. receiving professional honors, awards, or special recognition
k. holding an invited membership in state or national policy committees and forums
l. actively participating in CSU system, University, College, and/or Department committees and activities (provide evidence of faculty member's contributions)
m. providing special services to the community (e.g., lectures)
n. participating in community groups (e.g., involvement with public school program)
o. actively serving as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups
p. formulating or participating in programs or institutes
q. actively participating on advisory boards for the University or community
r. providing lectures or staff development to University audiences and other University classes
s. providing service valuable to school districts, the wider community, or region
t. engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community
u. serving as faculty member or expert practitioner on dissertation committees.

2. Rating Criteria for Service Activities

Faculty are expected to render service in multiple settings (Department, College, University, profession, and/or community). Faculty at the associate rank are expected to provide service at the college, university, and/or professional level as well as to the Department. Faculty at the assistant rank are expected to focus primarily on service activities at the department level.

Ratings

- A rating of excellent shall be rendered for 4 professional activities yearly during the review period that reflect a high degree of consistent involvement in terms of quality, duration, and significance* as supported by the list of indicators in Section VII.C.1 above.
● A rating of **good** shall be rendered for 3 professional activities yearly that reflect a high degree of **consistent** involvement in terms of quality, duration, and significance as supported by the list of indicators in Section VII.C.1 above.

● A rating of **needs improvement** shall be rendered for 2 professional activities yearly that reflect a high degree of **consistent** involvement in terms of quality, duration, and significance as supported by the list of indicators in Section VII.C.1 above.

● A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for involvement in less than 2 professional activities yearly that reflect a high degree of **consistent** involvement in terms of quality, duration, and significance as supported by the list of indicators in Section VII.C.1 above.

D. General Note on Ratings

In the evaluation of indicators to assign ratings, the Committee shall consider (a) quality, duration, and significance of indicator service activities; (b) quantity of indicators; and (c) time period between reviews.

* Descriptions of Quality, Duration, and Significance

  Quality  Role in the indicator service activity (i.e., responsibilities, applications, degree of contribution)

  Duration  Time frame for the indicator service activity. A rationale should be presented for a duration of less than one semester.

  Significance  Impact of the indicator service activity (i.e., effects, changes, benefits to others)

**SERVICE RUBRIC (Appendix C)**

VIII. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A. Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty

To be retained, probationary faculty must receive ratings of:

1. **Good** or **Excellent** in at least 2 of the 3 areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.

2. Probationary faculty shall not receive a rating of **Needs Improvement** in the same area for more than one review cycle.

B. Criteria for Granting of Tenure and Promotion

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure after 6 probationary years, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed.

Promotion from one rank to another requires that the faculty member request promotion via the University-approved form and according to University timelines.

1. Promotion to Professor

   Promotion to Professor requires ratings of:

   a. **Excellent** in Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities,
b. **Excellent** in one other area, and
c. **At least Good** in the third area.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure
Promotion to Associate Professor requires ratings of:
   a. **Excellent** in Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities,
   b. **Excellent** in one other area, and
   c. **At least Good** in the third area.

3. Early Tenure and Promotion
   a. Refer to UPS 210.002 for eligibility requirements. In all cases, requirements for promotion and/or tenure delineated in other sections must be satisfied to a greater extent. Early Tenure requires a rating of **Excellent** in all three areas.
   b. Early Promotion to Professor requires a rating of **Excellent** in all three areas.
Appendix A
Analyzing Student Opinion Questionnaire Data to Document and Improve Teaching

NAME - TERM
Single Course Analysis

Course Number:
Course Title:
Course Context:

1. **SOQ response rate**

2. **Department Personnel Standards related to SOQs**

   Student Opinion Forms (SOQs) Assessment based on average percentage of ratings over the full period of review.
   - Excellent = 90% or more A and B ratings
   - Good = 80% - <90% A and B ratings
   - Needs Improvement = 70% - <80% A and B rating
   - Inadequate = Less than 70% A and B ratings

   I received XXXX A or B ratings that meet criteria for an excellent review.

3. **Analysis of the numeric data for my course**
   - Overall mean rating for the course :
   - Items with high and low means:
     - High:
     - Low:

4. **Analysis of written comments**

5. **Connection to philosophy of teaching**

6. **Moving forward**
## DPS Rubric - Teaching Performance
### Composite Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate (Unsatisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Self Assessment</td>
<td>1000-word narrative</td>
<td>A cogent self-assessment discussion aligned with supporting evidence that includes reflection on teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Curriculum</td>
<td>Course List</td>
<td>Review the courses taught to frame evaluation of teaching assignments. The list must include the course number, title, and unit value.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent syllabi of every course taught during the period of review.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Materials</td>
<td>Three examples</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section (a) - Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>One or more item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Instruction: Faculty must include one piece of evidence from (i), one piece of evidence from (ii), and one piece of evidence from either (i), (ii), or (iii). Faculty must address iv when applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Outcome Alignment</th>
<th>At least one example</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. Professional Learning</td>
<td>Selected evidence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Observations</td>
<td>Optional Peer Observation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Dissertation Advising</td>
<td>List of dissertations Participation on two dissertation committees</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Optional Evidence</td>
<td>Additional relevant examples (if provided)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section (b) - Composite Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate (Unsatisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excellent in three elements and at least Good in others.
When at least three elements are Good and others are at least Needs Improvement
When any single element is inadequate or when the criteria for Good are not met
When two or more elements are inadequate

c. JEIE: Evidence of JEIE should be woven throughout the other domains, but it should also be listed with specific examples of its use and its use in curriculum, instruction and/or professional learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate (Unsatisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section (c) - Composite Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Evidence of JEIE in curriculum, instruction, and/or professional learning. Three pieces of evidence are required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d. Students’ perceptions of the instructor’s teaching effectiveness**

#### I. SOQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summaries</th>
<th>Summary table with an overall percentage of averages over the review period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>90% or more “A” and “B” ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>80%&lt;90% “A” and “B” ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>70% &lt;80% “A” and “B” ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>&lt;70% “A” and “B” ratings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Original student comments from SOQs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Substantial majority are positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Mostly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>More negative than positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Preponderance of negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Analyses</th>
<th>Two courses analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Distributions</th>
<th>Statistical breakdown of grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- To be rated Excellent or Good, grade distributions shall fall within normal range: 3.2 - 3.8 for graduate.

#### II. Optional Additional Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional evidence (if provided)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section (d) composite rating

- **Excellent:** Excellent in three elements and at least Good in others.
- **Good:** When at least three elements are Good and others are at least Needs Improvement.
- **Needs Improvement:** When any single element is Inadequate or when the criteria for Good are not met.
- **Inadequate (Unsatisfactory):** When two or more elements are inadequate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
<th>Quality of Teaching</th>
<th>Ongoing Professional Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Excellent narrative and at least three categories of a, b, c, and d are Excellent and others are at least Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Good narrative and at least three categories a, b, c, and d are Good and others are at least Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Narrative needs improvement and any single category is Inadequate or when the criteria for Good are not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>When narrative or two or more categories are Inadequate (Unsatisfactory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

#### DPS Rubric

**Professional, University and Community Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrative self-assessment</strong></td>
<td>Examples that complement teaching and/or scholarly and creative activities, promote the discipline, display peer recognition of leadership, enhance reputation of the University and quality of education</td>
<td>Includes all or most types of examples in the description, with clear and effective synthesis demonstrating relationship between teaching, scholarship, and service. (1-2 examples with evidence of deep level of service possible)</td>
<td>Includes 2-3 types of examples in the description, with synthesis demonstrating relationship between service and teaching or service and scholarship. (1 example with evidence of deep level of service possible)</td>
<td>Includes one example in the description, with unclear or vague relationship between service and teaching, or service and scholarship</td>
<td>Does not include any examples in the description. Examples provided do not show relationship of service to teaching or scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators appropriate to level of rank</strong></td>
<td>Assistant rank focus on department level service; Associate rank focus on department, college, university, and/or professional level service</td>
<td>Appropriate focus or above for rank</td>
<td>Appropriate focus for rank</td>
<td>Below level of focus for rank</td>
<td>Below level of focus for rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators are listed or similar to those listed in the DPS Service Section VII.C.1</strong></td>
<td>See DPS Service Section VII.C.1</td>
<td>All indicators identified are listed or similar to those listed in DPS Service Section VII.C.1</td>
<td>Most indicators identified are listed or similar to those listed in DPS Service Section VII.C.1</td>
<td>Few indicators identified are listed or similar to those listed in DPS Service Section VII.C.1</td>
<td>No indicators identified are listed or similar to those listed in DPS Service Section VII.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality, Duration, Significance</strong></td>
<td>Quality: Role in service activity Duration: Length of time of service Significance: Impact or effect of service activity</td>
<td>Quality: Evidence of consistent AND engaged membership Duration: At least 1 year Significance: Evidence of outcome(s)</td>
<td>Quality: Evidence of consistent AND engaged membership Duration: At least 1 semester Significance: Evidence of outcome(s)</td>
<td>Quality: Evidence of consistent OR engaged membership Duration: One semester Significance: Little evidence of outcomes</td>
<td>Quality: No evidence of consistent or engaged membership Duration: Less than 1 semester Significance: No evidence of outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

SCORING KEY
A = Strongly Agree
B = Agree
C = Agree Somewhat
D = Disagree
E = Strongly Disagree

The instructor…

1.1 The instructor helped me to understand how systems and structures perpetuate educational inequities and consider solutions to address equitable outcomes.

1.2 The instructor encouraged me to examine my own privileges and biases.

1.3 Made learning applicable to educational leadership.

1.4 Was well prepared for classes.

1.5 Was responsive to student inquiries (e.g., email, before and after class, office hours, appointments).

1.6 Gave useful feedback.

1.7 Drew connections between course readings and student learning outcomes.

1.8 Demonstrated mastery of the content covered in this course.

1.9 Promoted a classroom environment that supported historically marginalized perspectives.

1.10 Encouraged me to examine my own privilege and biases.

1.11 Helped me to understand how systems and structures can maintain educational inequities.

1.12 Helped me to understand my role as a change agent for social justice.

1.13 Utilized technology that was effective in supporting learning.
# 1. Student Opinion Questionnaire  [Continue]

## Organization of the course

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.14 The course requirements, including expectations for learning, were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 The course requirements, including expectations for grading, were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this class, I was challenged to...

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.16 Think critically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17 Reflect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18 Collaborate with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19 Discover ways to bring about change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20 Meet high expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21 Consider issues of equity and diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22 Better understand the students and communities we serve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Overall Rating

Overall Rating Items  
A = Exceeded Expectations  
B = Fully Met Expectations  
C = Minimally Met Expectations  
D = Did Not Meet Expectations  
E = Was Highly Problematic

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.23 I would rate this course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24 I would rate this instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 I would rate my learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Comments

2.1 Comments:

---
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### 1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

**SCORING KEY**
A = Strongly Agree  
B = Agree  
C = Agree Somewhat  
D = Disagree  
E = Strongly Disagree

**My advisor...**

1. The instructor helped me to understand how systems and structures perpetuate educational inequities and consider solutions to address equitable outcomes.

2. The instructor encouraged me to examine my own privileges and biases.

3. Made learning applicable to educational leadership.

4. Encouraged me to examine my own privilege and biases.

5. Promoted a classroom environment that supported historically marginalized perspectives.

6. Utilized technology that was effective in supporting learning.

7. Responded promptly to my concerns and questions.

8. Gave useful feedback.

**Overall Rating**

Overall Rating Items
A = Exceeded Expectations  
B = Fully Met Expectations  
C = Minimally Met Expectations  
D = Did Not Meet Expectations  
E = Was Highly Problematic

9. I would rate this course

10. I would rate this instructor

11. I would rate my learning
2. Comments

2.1 Comments: