MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).
January 11, 2023

To: Mark Ellis, Ph.D.
   Chair, Department of Secondary Education

Lisa Kirtman, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Education

From: Carolyn Thomas, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Departmental Personnel Standards for the Department of Secondary Education

The proposed Departmental Personnel Standards from the Department of Secondary Education have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.

CT:mc

cc: Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support
Dr. Carol Lundberg, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. Nicholas Henning, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records
Official Departmental Personnel Standards for the

Department of Secondary Education

Approved by Dr. Carolyn Thomas, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 1/11/2023 for implementation in the 2023-2024 Academic Year

According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

According to University Policy Statement 210.002 (6/8/22 version), Section III.A.: • Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards… …shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. • All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall normally be reviewed by the department as part of the program performance review or an accreditation process. • Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.

I. Preface

The Department of Secondary Education (hereafter called “the Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible that meet the evolving needs of our students,
The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning, with an emphasis on establishing an environment where the creation and dissemination of knowledge are central to the advancement of truth. The Department also believes that teaching, in all its forms, is the primary task of this department.

The Department recognizes that 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, scholarship, and service to the Department, College of Education, University, profession, and the community.

The Department proposes a personnel document consistent with the Mission and Goals of the University. This document responds to the multiple roles of the faculty at the various stages of their careers.

The Department shall institute the following procedures designed to assess the Portfolio for the purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and review bodies shall be aided in their respective roles by having available clear and objective statements of the Department’s expectations. Furthermore, the faculty members specifically affirm their position that the best interests and needs of students are served when the faculty represent widely diverse interests and activities creating a mosaic of talents. With this document, the Department recognizes both the full range of talents possessed by the faculty and the great diversity of functions inherent in the mission of an institution of higher education.

II. Faculty Responsibilities
As full-time employees of CSU Fullerton, Department faculty shall meet professional responsibilities as they apply to each of the Portfolio evaluation categories.

In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include, for example:

- developing and implementing comprehensive syllabi
- communicating clear expectations to students
- demonstrating a variety of teaching and assessment strategies
- modeling effective teaching practices
- reflecting on teaching practices
- committing to just, equitable, and inclusive teaching and learning practices

In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, faculty are expected to engage in activities that shall enhance the overall mission of the professoriate, for example:

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

In the areas of professional, university, and community service, these responsibilities include, for example:

- 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 College and Department duties as assigned by either the College, Dean, or Department Chair
• supporting the work of the Department, College, and University; and
• contributing to the community in general through service activities.

III. Department Mission
The Mission of the Department is to develop quality secondary school teachers. We are committed to providing a program that reflects the complex contexts of the secondary classroom and models a professional community where learning is interactive and dynamic. Our philosophy is to prepare educational leaders through a course of study that bases practice upon knowledge of current research. We develop students as life-long learners, reflective practitioners, and change agents who positively influence decision making in schools and communities to improve the education of adolescents.

The Department offers the Single Subject Credential Program, in collaboration with academic departments. A Master of Science in Transformative Teaching in Secondary Education is also offered, with concentrations available in Secondary Education and Teaching Foundational Level Mathematics.

IV. Role of the Department Chair in the Personnel Process
With respect to the personnel process, the following guidelines shall apply:
• Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair may consult with new probationary faculty members concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors in consultation with the faculty.
• The Department Chair shall review the files for faculty unless the Department Chair is not of a sufficient rank to be eligible to review the file or is being considered for promotion themselves. In that case the Dean shall assume the responsibilities of the “Department Chair.”

V. Department Personnel Committee
   a. Committee Functions
      The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the “Committee”) shall evaluate Portfolios and make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to the members of the Department as specified in UPS 210.000 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

   b. Committee Structure
      All Committee members shall be tenured faculty and shall not be serving as the Department Chair of a department. Committee members shall have a higher rank or classification than those being reviewed. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he/she is the subject of the personnel review process. However, faculty who are undergoing post-tenure review may serve.
An alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any circumstances in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete his or her term of office or he or she is ineligible to participate.

c. Election of Committee Members
The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester each year.

All tenured faculty members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B above shall be automatically placed on the slate of nominees for the Committee. If the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members, nominations of individuals not in the Department shall be made in writing to the Department Chair prior to the election. In addition, nominees shall make a written declaration to the Department Chair prior to Wednesday of the second week of the semester indicating that they wish to be considered. Nominees shall be presented to the Department faculty for election in the following manner: alphabetized by last name, identified by Department affiliation and rank. Nomination(s) from outside of the Department shall be listed on the bottom of the ballot alphabetically in the Department from whence the nomination came. No person shall appear on more than one nomination ballot.

Each tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote by secret written ballot for three members from the list of nominees. In the case of a tie, the Committee member shall be decided by a coin flip by the Department Chair, in the presence of Department faculty members.

The alternate member shall be the individual who received the highest number of votes among those nominees not elected to the Committee.

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

e. Committee Procedures
   i. 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 under each category of the criteria listed in Section VII of this document. The Committee shall formulate a separate recommendation that shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation.
   ii. The Committee’s evaluation for each area shall be based solely on the information submitted in the Portfolio in accordance with UPS 210.000 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 area of performance. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VII.
   iii. All actions taken by the Committee, including recommendations, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.
iv. The Committee members shall sign the evaluation, the recommendation, and the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way the individual members voted.

v. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

VI. General Guidelines
   a. Prospectus
      With the guidance, support, and advice of an appointed faculty mentor, each probationary faculty member shall construct a Prospectus during his or her initial year of probationary status. The Prospectus shall be comprised of narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service that “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 approved Departmental Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion” (UPS 210.000). Each narrative shall not exceed 500 words. Throughout subsequent revisions of the Prospectus the faculty mentor may also be available for counsel. While having no formal approval process, the Department Chair and College Dean shall review the Prospectus and shall each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College, but prior to May 1. The Committee does not provide feedback on the Prospectus but does view it within the Portfolio contents for all full performance reviews. During subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that shall typically occur during the probationary period. Faculty members’ progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion shall be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Standards.

b. Portfolio Preparation and Submission
   It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare the required information and documentation for the Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to attend the workshops held by the Faculty Affairs and Records Office at the beginning of each fall semester. Additionally, they are encouraged to attend College or University-wide personnel workshops and to 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 by UPS 210.000 and as provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. The contents of the appendices should represent ongoing reflection and a process of sorting and refining over time.

VII. Criteria and Weighting for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty
   The College of Education recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service as vehicles to give meaning to the essence of scholarship. It also values
colllegiality, ethical and professional behavior, and a commitment to the good and well-being of the Department. Faculty members may address in each of the following sections - teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service - the impact of cultural taxation if the faculty member feels this is relevant in the review of the file. Reviewers shall carefully address the issue of cultural taxation as it relates to the holistic and comprehensive review of the faculty member’s file. Additionally, mentoring students is a valuable form of faculty work. (See UPS.210.002, Section II.B, p. 6 for examples of mentoring roles that may be relevant for participating faculty.) Faculty members may address their mentoring roles, if the faculty member feels this is relevant in the review of their file. Reviewers shall carefully address the issue of mentorship as it relates to the wholistic and comprehensive review of the faculty member's file.

a. Teaching Performance
The primary mission of this Department’s faculty is teaching to ensure a just, equitable and inclusive education for all students. The students’ perceptions of a teacher are an important—though not decisive—means of assessing the quality of teaching. Qualitative evidence of effective teaching is more important than SOQ ratings. The faculty member’s self-assessment should explain the evidence submitted and address significant discrepancies between data from student opinion forms and qualitative indicators. The faculty member is encouraged to submit carefully selected exemplars of teaching effectiveness and reflective practice. These exemplars may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- class visitations and reviews by colleagues
- evidence of additional training in teaching
- evidence of additional assessment of instruction (such as midterm evaluations, focus groups, interviews, analysis of student work)
- audio, video, and/or digital recordings of lessons
- independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member
- documentation of service as thesis/project advisor for master’s degree students
- documentation of academic advisement, mentoring activities, and fieldwork coordination
- new course proposals that have been accepted for inclusion in the curriculum
- written and signed comments by students
- innovative teaching, such as team or collaborative teaching or teaching at a distance; and
- any other teaching related information and/or materials germane to higher education teaching effectiveness.

i. Mandatory Indicators
   1. To be placed in the Portfolio:
      a. Self-Assessment (maximum 1000-word self-assessment narrative) The faculty member shall include a written discussion of his/her teaching activities and how these promote
just, equitable and inclusive education. This shall include both a reflective review of teaching performance, including goals for student learning and instructional strategies, as well as future goals and direction of teaching. The self-assessment shall go beyond a simple description of course content and pedagogy. It must include an analysis of the statistical summaries and how trends in student written comments can contribute to an understanding of the data. The faculty member should carefully identify and discuss discrepancies in the statistical data and written comments.

b. **List of Courses Taught** A semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, and the unit value.

c. **Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires** If data are missing, a written explanation shall 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 shall be included if evaluations were conducted at the previous institution.

2. To be placed in the appendix:

a. **Workload** Faculty workload may include activities in a variety of areas in addition to teaching specific courses, for example, adjustments in workload for the preparation of substantive changes in instructional methods, course development activities, Department Chairing Committees, grant preparation, or accreditation work. The reflective narrative shall list and discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.

b. **Course Syllabi & Materials** A representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials prepared by the instructor to demonstrate his/her teaching effectiveness shall be included in the appendix. Tests, study aids, and other materials, such as advance organizers, video and/or digital technology, innovative strategies, online instructional concepts and techniques, evidence of portfolio and case study assessment, etc., may also be included in the appendix.

c. **Original Student Opinion Questionnaires including written comments** If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair.

d. **Qualitative Indicators of Effective Teaching** The faculty member shall submit carefully selected exemplars of teaching effectiveness, and reflective practice as outlined in VII. A. Teaching Performance. These materials shall be carefully
selected and revised over time to represent the enhancement of one’s teaching performance.

ii. **Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness**
All subcategories of teaching effectiveness are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of this category: student opinion questionnaires, qualitative indicators, and (when appropriate) non-instructional assigned time—all are equally valued.

1. **Student Opinion Questionnaires:** The student opinion form consists of items rated on a five-point Likert scale. University-provided statistical summaries of all ratings for all classes for each semester shall be used. The following scale shall be used to evaluate a faculty member’s effectiveness based on statistical summaries. The assessment of ratings is based on cumulative percentage of ratings over the full period of review. The evaluation may also take into consideration recent trends in the ratings (for example if there is a steady rise upward).

   - **Results from statistical summaries:**
   - Excellent 90% or more A and B ratings
   - Good 80%-89% A and B ratings
   - Needs Improvement 70%-79% A and B ratings
   - Inadequate Fewer than 70% A and B ratings.

   **Note:** The reviewers shall note the wide range of scores possible within each University-provided statistical summary. For example, it should be noted that a faculty member with 69% A and B scores would be classified as an inadequate teacher, as would a faculty member with only 50% A and B ratings. Faculty members who feel their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching should
carefully explain their scores and explain discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be noted by the reviewers.

Reviewers shall also consider student comments as well as the faculty member’s explanation of the ratings in the teaching narrative when assigning a rating for this category.

2. **Rating** The reviewers shall rate the Qualitative Indicators and render a rating of: **excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate**, according to the guidelines below.

3. **Notes**
   a. In the self-assessment statement in the Portfolio, faculty are encouraged to synthesize both mandatory and additional indicators of performance as demonstrating teaching effectiveness.
   b. Special consideration may be extended when unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (nature and difficulty of courses, etc.) that affect SOQ’s are addressed in the Portfolio with specific documentation.
   c. Improvements and/or trends in teaching performance shall be discussed in the Portfolio.
   d. Non-Instructional Assigned Time: Non-instructional assigned time shall be assessed on qualitative indicators documenting performance effectiveness according to the elements of the agreed job description. A minimum of one indicator of high-quality evidence per element, yearly, is required for a rating of Excellent. The proportionality of evidence required for demonstration of effectiveness shall be considered commensurate to the ratio of assigned time to teaching load (i.e., a position that requires 6 units of assigned time and 6 units of teaching shall be evaluated 50% on each; a position that requires 3 units of assigned time and 9 units of teaching shall be evaluated 25% on assigned time and 75% on teaching time). The exception is the release time provided to new faculty—this time is not considered part of teaching performance.

The table below is intended to help faculty and reviewers determine what effective teaching looks like in the department. As is evident in the table, the composite rating of teaching effectiveness is determined through a holistic assessment of both qualitative and quantitative indicators, with the qualitative indicators proving more substantial than the quantitative indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. Student Opinion Questionnaire Data

1a. SOQ Quantitative Data
- 90% or more A and B ratings
- 80%-89% A and B ratings
- 70%-79% A and B ratings
- Below 70% A and B ratings

1b. SOQ Qualitative Data (written comments)
- The pattern of student responses shows clear, consistent evidence of positive student opinion of the faculty member’s teaching.
- The pattern of student responses shows some evidence of positive student opinion of the faculty member’s teaching.
- The pattern of responses shows one or more areas of concern with respect to positive student opinion of the faculty member’s teaching.
- The pattern of responses shows a great deal of concern with few or no examples of positive student opinion of the faculty member’s teachings.

2 - 7. Qualitative Data

At least six sources of high-quality evidence must be submitted for each year under review, with a minimum of one source per category. Faculty may submit multiple iterations of artifacts (from different years) to illustrate how their teaching practice has evolved over time.

2. Establishment of an

*Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence: syllabi, course announcements, emails, student feedback, course activities*
### Environment conducive to learning

- Faculty provides coherent structure for course meetings that is easily understood by students.
- Faculty ensures a just, equitable, and inclusive classroom culture by positively affirming students of all genders, races, ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations, and political affiliations.
- Faculty communicates course expectations clearly.
- Faculty is open and available for student questions/advising on a regular basis (office hours, emails).
- Instructional interactions and learning activities allow the instructor to get to know their students.

☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Needs Improvement  ☐ Inadequate

### 3. Creation of a course linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes

**Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence:** syllabi, student feedback, course communication, sample lessons and assessments, student work samples.

- Student learning outcomes (SLO’s) are clearly defined and made available to students.
- Learning activities and assessments are linked to student learning goals.
- Student learning outcomes and assessments encompass the tenets of just, equitable, and inclusive education.
- The link between student learning outcomes and assessments is evident.

☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Needs Improvement  ☐ Inadequate

### 4. Effective use of instructional methods

**Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence:** course activities and assignments, student work samples, student feedback, faculty observation reports, audio, video, and/or digital recordings of lessons.
- Faculty demonstrates substantial knowledge of subject-specific pedagogy
- Course is designed to support students in the application of new and research-based knowledge and skills
- Students are empowered to participate actively in class discussions without fear or favor
- Faculty utilizes educational technology as appropriate to the content and format of the course
- Instructional methods encompass culturally and linguistically sustaining practices
- Faculty empower students to demonstrate their funds of knowledge and linguistic assets in innovative, equitable and inclusive ways

☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Needs Improvement  ☐ Inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline</th>
<th>Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence: assignment directions and scoring guides/rubrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Activities, assignments, and assessments are inclusive, and procedures exhibit academic rigor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activities, assignments, and assessments are aligned with current standards of the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activities, assignments, and assessments are aligned with the goals of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Needs Improvement  ☐ Inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline and</th>
<th>Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence: FDC trainings, webinars, peer coaching, professional conferences, self-help trainings, copies of relevant professional development materials, research articles, SOQ progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pedagogical developments as related to reaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Current educational research is used to enrich and/or redesign courses to improve access, center marginalized students, and promote success for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Faculty uses student feedback to rethink and redesign courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Course redesign and delivery shows improvement of teaching practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Faculty purposefully incorporates innovative approaches to teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● New forms of technology are utilized to enhance instruction and ensure access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ Excellent
- □ Good
- □ Needs Improvement
- □ Inadequate

---

### 7. Compliance with university, college, and department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in UPS documents

*Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence: course syllabi, screenshots of course format in Canvas, attendance records*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible, but not limited to, sources of evidence: course syllabi, screenshots of course format in Canvas, attendance records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Course syllabi are developed according to university and department standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Course syllabi are ATI compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Faculty hold course meetings in accordance with the days, times and format indicated in the university course schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Teaching duties as required by the department are met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ Excellent
- □ Good
- □ Needs Improvement
- □ Inadequate
Overall Teaching Performance

| Overall Teaching Performance | The faculty member is deemed Excellent in Teaching when ratings in all seven categories, including SOQ data, are Excellent, or are mostly Excellent (Excellent in 4 or more areas and Good in the remaining areas) | The faculty member is deemed Good in Teaching when ratings across all seven categories are all Good or Excellent AND rating for SOQ data is at least “Good” | The faculty member is deemed Needs Improvement in Teaching when the criteria for Good are not met, including SOQ data, and no more than 2 categories are Inadequate. | The faculty member is deemed Inadequate in Teaching when three or more categories are Inadequate, including SOQ data. |

b. **Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activities generates benefits for the faculty member as well as the University. Such activities may: (a) complement teaching; (b) contribute to the advancement of the field and/or extend the meaning or application of existing knowledge, and, more broadly, contribute to human achievement; (c) promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and the 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, and the University; (g) enhance the reputation of the University; and (h) enhance collaborative scholarship.

- **Note #1**: The term “scholarly and creative activity” as used here relates primarily to the Carnegie Foundations report by Ernest Boyer regarding the “scholarship of discovery” and the “scholarship of integration” – i.e., to the production of new knowledge and/or to the extension or application of existing knowledge. The Department recognizes and strongly values multiple types of scholarship including the “scholarship of teaching” and the “scholarship of application/professional service” (to use Boyer terminology), with all areas addressed in their own respective sections of UPS 210.000 and in the Department of Secondary Education Standards.

- **Note #2**: Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many, including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research and meta-analysis, and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and
program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.

i. Indicators
   1. Self-Assessment (mandatory) is a written discussion of the faculty member’s performance in scholarly and creative activities. It shall include a discussion of the faculty member’s research agenda, which should be a focused, well defined, on-going body of work; and, a reflective review of the faculty member’s scholarly and creative activities, documented by supporting evidence. The self-assessment narrative is limited to 1000 words.
   2. Publications consist of the dissemination of externally reviewed scholarly works that appear in journals, books, and other forms of publication. Documentation shall include one of the following: (1) letter of acceptance and commitment to publish (for unpublished works), (2) reprint of published works, or (3) a copy of the publication of a book in final printed version. Peer review comments and documentation of quality shall be included whenever possible. See “Notes” section on pp. 14-15, Section VII.B.4., for additional information about documentation requirements, particularly for co-authored publications.
   3. Pragmatic Scholarship consists of grants awarded, engaged scholarship projects, consultancies, policy analysis, program evaluation, service as a member of a research project, contracts/consultancies that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field, public press articles, books, and other non-peer-reviewed materials prepared for the “lay” or “practitioner” audience, and other comparable scholarly activities 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 also external reviewers’ comments and the identifiable benefits to the field, when available. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products (e.g., summary reports, program evaluation, and recordings), are encouraged in this category.
   4. Scholarly Presentations are papers and presentations given or accepted to be given at professional meetings, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or convocations. They may consist of featured presentations, keynote addresses, poster sessions, panel discussions, and other forms of work, all of which shall be peer-reviewed or invited presentations of a substantive nature and based on a theoretical or conceptual framework.

ii. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activities
   These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how his or her work addresses some
or all of these criteria and the importance of the specific criteria in evaluating each scholarly or creative work.

1. The Department employs the following criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work, including:
   a. clarity of conceptualization
   b. originality of scholarship
   c. external peer reviews
   d. publication in peer-reviewed journals, externally reviewed books, or media
   e. professionally recognized scholarly presentations and/or invitations at the state, national, or international levels.

2. In addition, considering our philosophy, we also evaluate scholarly and creative activities based on whether the activity meets one or more of the following criteria:
   a. complements teaching
   b. contributes to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement
   c. contributes to the overall quality of the Department, the College, and the University
   d. enhances the professional growth of the faculty member
   e. advances the reputation of the University.

3. High-quality scholarly work includes all of the following:
   a. work that has a conceptual or theoretical basis; (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work showing what has been done in the past and a rationale as to why additional work is needed.
   b. work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge. Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research and meta-analysis, and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.
   c. work that is externally reviewed by peers, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. One of the best ways of providing such documentation, especially for publications that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments.
   d. other types of activities/indicators that add strength to a faculty member’s scholarly record (but that do not replace...
the requirement for scholarly publications) include: grants awarded (except as specified in section VII.b.iii below); peer-reviewed or invited scholarly presentations/posters; contracts/consultantships that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field; public press articles, books, and other non-peer-reviewed materials prepared for the “lay” or “practitioner” audience; and other comparable scholarly activities.

iii. Guidelines for Ratings
It is expected that the faculty member shall demonstrate an on-going, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the entire review process leading to tenure and promotion. Based on the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member’s overall scholarly and creative activity as excellent, good, needs improvement, or inadequate.

1. A rating of excellent shall be rendered for extensive, focused, and in-depth scholarly activity including (a) one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) per year, after the first year of service (or for faculty going from associate to full, from the first year in rank); AND (b) one presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly. In lieu of b, a faculty member may have two high-quality peer-reviewed publications (published or in press) per year, after the first year of service. A large, high-quality, externally funded grant, and/or a meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined per the guidelines that follow, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities.

A large, high-quality, externally funded grant includes all of the following criteria:
- multi-year funding, operating on a 2 year or greater grant cycle with total award of $50,000 or more; and
- a proposal that has a conceptual or theoretical basis; (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing knowledge).

Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area.
- a proposal that is externally reviewed by peers, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. The peer review process should reflect the competitiveness of the grant. One of the best ways of providing such documentation,
especially for grants that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments provided with the text of the grant.

- evidence that the impact of the grant shall be substantial (e.g., number of candidates impacted, number of partner districts impacted, evidence of university and/or prek-12 collaboration, letters of support).

**Note about pursuing externally funded grants:**
External grant writing is something generally not undertaken by junior faculty members. Instead, external funding opportunities should generally be sought by tenured faculty who have already established themselves as strong researchers. Faculty are advised that they shall still need to establish themselves as researchers primarily through peer-reviewed publications. While a substantial grant adds strength to a faculty member’s scholarly record, it does not replace the requirement for scholarly publications.

**Engaged Scholarship:** A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined per the criteria established by the College of Education, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. Engaged scholarship cannot be used to achieve a rating of good or lower.

**Criteria:** A meaningful, high-quality, engaged scholarship project includes all of the following five criteria (faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence):

- A clear rationale of the need for the work addressed and for the strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out (the plan must be supported by evidence-based practices).
- Work should have a conceptual or theoretical basis; (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing peer-reviewed knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area.
- Multiple forms of evidence shall be provided by the faculty member that demonstrate both the quantitative and qualitative impact of the project. A clear impact on a district/community partner is required. These could include a letter from partners, data collected, etc.
● A description of the evaluation process and outcomes that includes research questions informed by and situated within the literature; an analysis of findings that are contextualized within the particular community/district/school/classroom needs and the discipline; implications that illustrate the practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the better; and directions for future work. Evaluation results and implemented changes based on this evaluation must be completed and disseminated before the faculty member can submit this work for the RTP process.

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

2. A rating of good shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly activity including (a) one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) every two years, three (3) publications during a five-year review cycle; AND (b) one refereed presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly.

3. A rating of needs improvement shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly activity including (a) one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) every 2.5 years, two (2) publications during a five-year review cycle; AND (b) one refereed presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly.

4. A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for needs improvement.

The progress chart below is intended to serve a useful guide for faculty. However, it is not meant to serve as a strict illustration of the progression required to earn tenure and promotion. The department recognizes that once a faculty member submits a manuscript for external/peer review that the review process and associated timelines are not controlled by the faculty member. As such, a faculty member may have a period of seemingly low productivity because several manuscripts have been submitted and are under review. And it is possible for a faculty member to later have a surge in productivity once manuscripts under review have been peer reviewed and are moved to the status of accepted for publication. The reviewers are aware of this point and will take this into consideration when reviewing a faculty member’s overall productivity as a researcher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. Quality, quantity, and the impact of the faculty member’s contributions shall be considered in light of prevailing professional standards.
2. All scholarly and creative activities shall be properly documented with a complete APA citation. Additionally, letters of acceptance, documentation of peer review, letters of invitation, galley pages, copies of final printed versions of publications, and letters of review and evaluation of performances are expected, depending on whether the activity is unpublished or published.
   a. A detailed statement shall be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author, signed by each co-author. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Records has a form that may be used, and when used this form shall be signed by each co-author.
3. Documentation also shall provide for scholarly and creative work in progress. Care shall be taken to distinguish work in progress from that already completed.
4. The impact of scholarly and creative activities is measured by its overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or to benefit students. It is incumbent upon the faculty member under review to clearly delineate such evidence in the Portfolio.
5. Once tenure and promotion are earned, a faculty member may concentrate his/her scholarly energies in areas other than the publication of peer-reviewed articles. For example, rather than publishing peer reviewed articles, a tenured faculty member may instead choose to publish a scholarly book that contributes substantially to the field. The faculty member shall demonstrate that his/her work has undergone a rigorous review process. Whichever scholarly path is chosen, the faculty member shall demonstrate a sustained and focused scholarly agenda, regardless of whether that
focus results in peer-reviewed articles, scholarly books/book chapters/edited books, or some combination thereof

c. **Professional, University, and Community Service**
We are a College of Education, and we are dedicated to the enhancement of the education of teachers. Our mission is to provide an exemplary level of education of teachers consistent with the mandates of the State of California, the University, and the recommendations of appropriate professional bodies governing the education of all students. Our emphasis is one that is founded on service to the educational community at large with a special emphasis on dynamic interaction with the schools and districts within our service area and region. All College faculty are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of our students and the educational communities within our region.

i. **Indicators**
Evidence of service shall be recognized and evaluated by such indicators as listed below. These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how the work addresses some or all of these indicators.

1. **Self-assessment** (mandatory) that discusses the impact of the contributions on the profession, the field, and the individual. There is a 1000-word limit for the self-assessment narrative.
2. **Professional Service**, including but not limited to the following:
   - assuming professional leadership roles
   - attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops that may not be peer-reviewed or theoretical in nature
   - acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates
   - editing professional journals
   - reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals or conferences
   - providing private practice or consultations relevant to the field
   - reviewing grant proposals
   - providing professional training to others
   - receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition
   - participating as an invited member on state or national policy committees and forums
   - engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community.
3. **University Service**, including but not limited to the following
   - active participation in Department, College, University, and/or System-wide Committees and activities
   - special services to the community (e.g. lectures)
• participation in community groups, such as involvement with public school programs
• active involvement as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups
• formulation of, or participation in, programs or institutes
• active membership on advisory boards within the University or community
• lecture/staff development given to university audiences and other university classes

4. Community Service, including service valuable to school districts and the wider community and region

ii. Rating Criteria for Service Activities

1. A rating of excellent shall be rendered for service that reflects a high degree of involvement (5 or more yearly) involving two or more levels of service (Professional, University, and Community).

2. A rating of good shall be rendered if there are considerable quality service activities (4 yearly) involving two or more levels of service (Professional, University, and Community).

3. A rating of needs improvement shall be rendered if there are quality service activities (3 yearly) involving two or more levels of service (Professional, University, and Community).

4. A rating of inadequate shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for needs improvement.

VIII. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

a. Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty

Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual’s progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. “When weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement.”

If service credit was granted, candidates “shall include documentation of accomplishments during those specific years for which the service credit was granted.” And “accomplishments during service credit years shall be weighed in reasonable proportion… (and) …shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion and/or tenure.”

In order to be retained and granted an abbreviated review the next year, the probationary faculty member shall be rated:

- Good or excellent in Teaching, Good or excellent in Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Good or excellent in Service.

If the probationary faculty has a rating of “Needs Improvement” in not more than one area and good or excellent in the other two areas, they will be retained and required to submit a full review the next year.
b. Criteria for Granting of Tenure

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure and promotion after completing five probationary years.

In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member shall be rated:

i. Excellent in either Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities and at least good in two other areas.

ii. In order to receive tenure, a faculty member shall have received a doctorate in an appropriate field of study from an accredited university. If the dissertation is listed in the Portfolio as a published document, it should be included in the appendix section. If the dissertation is listed as an unpublished document, it need not be included in the Portfolio appendix.

iii. Early Promotion and Early Tenure: In order to be awarded early tenure and promotion to associate, the faculty member shall exceed the standards in VIII.b.i by receiving a rating of excellent in all three areas: Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.

“Early tenure may be granted in cases when a faculty member demonstrates a record of distinction in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all three areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.”

c. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires that the faculty member request promotion via the university-approved form and according to university timelines. For faculty requesting consideration for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, four years in rank is the standard time frame, unless the faculty member is requesting an early consideration for promotion to Full Professor.

Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor. The WPAF shall be submitted by October 1 of the sixth probationary year for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Therefore, the review period for promotion to professor begins October 2 of the sixth probationary year. Any materials added to the WPAF during the review process (i.e., after October 2) for promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.
There is no time limit for promotion to full professor. A faculty member may
decide, for example, to wait until 8-10 years before submitting a file for
promotion to full professor. When doing so, faculty will be required to submit a
post-tenure review file at least once every five years.

If a faculty member waits more than the minimum four years to submit a file for
promotion to full professor, the number of publications required will NOT exceed
that needed for four years in rank. For Teaching and Service, this does not apply.

In order to be granted promotion to full professor, the faculty member shall be
rated, at minimum:

i. **Excellent** in two areas (one of which must be Teaching) and at least **good** in
   the third area.

ii. **Early Promotion:** In order to be awarded early promotion to Professor,
    the faculty member shall have a sustained record of excellence in all three
    areas since the last promotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure and Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Promotion to Professor</th>
<th>Early Promotion to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong> or <strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong> in Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities and at least <strong>Good</strong> in two other areas.</td>
<td><strong>Sustained Excellence</strong> in all three areas.</td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong> in two areas and at least <strong>Good</strong> in the third area.</td>
<td><strong>Sustained Excellence</strong> in all three areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>