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I. Preamble

The Department of Human Services (hereafter called “the Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative accomplishments, professional activities, and service to the Department, College, University, and Community. Adequate communication, especially regarding personnel policies, is of utmost importance to the maintenance and enhancement of a high quality faculty and, thus, a viable university. With this objective, the Department shall institute the following procedures for assessing Portfolios for the purposes of retention, tenure and promotion. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and reviewing bodies may be aided in their respective roles by having available to them as clear and as objective a statement of the Department’s expectations as is reasonably possible. Furthermore, the Department faculty affirm their position that the best interests of the University, College, Department, and their many students are served when the faculty represents a wide diversity of interests and activities.

II. Philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development

We believe that knowledge is evolving and socially constructed and that learning is produced through an interaction of different perspectives that enable students to connect their education to their own experience. Thus, in our educational practice, we aim:

1. To create classroom communities where learning is interactive and dynamic.
2. To engage in reflective teaching and learning that draws attention to the process through which knowledge is produced and content learned.
3. To encourage all students to voice their perspectives and experiences.
4. To model various approaches to knowledge construction and learning for our students.
5. To enable students to understand the implications for their practice of differences and similarities related to culture, ethnicity, race, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, ableness, and economic status.
6. To expand learning beyond the classroom to the broader societal and institutional contexts where students will engage in their practice.
7. To empower students to shape communities that are more humane.

III. Mission and Philosophy Statements of the Department of Human Services

Mission Statement
Through the application of theory, research, and self-reflection, the Human Services Department prepares students to serve diverse individuals, families, and communities.

Philosophy Statement
As an applied paraprofessional program, the Human Services major is based on a synthesis of knowledge from the biological sciences, the social sciences, the applied methodologies of prevention, and the direct practice of interventions. It brings together a humanistic and generalist orientation through specific practical skills and methods acquired through “hands-on” experiential learning and increased self-awareness. Through the four interrelated components of the core curriculum, a graduate of the Human Services Department will: (1) understand the theoretical foundations of intervention strategies, (2) be familiar with various client populations and know the importance of cultural diversity, (3) incorporate research and evaluation in their understanding of programs, and (4) develop skills through direct experience in the field and
through exploration within oneself. It is accredited by the Council for Standards in Human Service Education, the field’s premier accrediting body.

IV. Department Structure

The Department is coordinated by a Department Chair, selected according to UPS 211.100. The Department Chair has the responsibility of communicating the standards and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion to all department faculty members (see UPS 210.000, IV.D.1.).

V. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called “the Committee”) shall review and evaluate in writing the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure or promotion and shall make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to members of the Department as specified in the UPS 210.000 (IV. E).

B. Election of committee members

1. The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the third week of classes in the fall semester each year. The election shall be by written secret ballot at a normal Departmental meeting. The Chair shall ensure that all members of this committee are familiar with their responsibility for evaluating the performance of those to be reviewed.

2. The members of the DPC shall have been granted tenure and shall not include the chair of that department. All eligible, tenured faculty members shall appear on the ballot. The DPC shall normally be filled with department faculty before seeking members from related disciplines. If the department does not have the minimum number of eligible faculty required for the DPC, the department may elect one or more tenured faculty for its personnel committee from related disciplines including department chairs from other departments.

3. The department shall elect, at the time of election of the regular DPC, at least one tenured faculty member, other than the Department Chair, to serve as alternate(s) for members of the DPC. If the department does not have enough eligible, tenured faculty to provide a suitable alternate, it may elect an alternate for its DPC from a related discipline including department chairs from other departments.

4. The Committee shall elect its Chair for the one-year term of the Committee. The Chair shall be selected by written, secret ballot among the Committee members. The Department Chair will conduct this election at a normal faculty meeting at the time the DPC is elected.

5. The Committee Chair shall ensure that all members of this committee are familiar with their responsibility for evaluating the performance of those to be considered.

C. Responsibilities of the DPC

1. To review and evaluate in writing the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion by the appropriate date. In this evaluation, the DPC shall comment upon the candidate’s qualifications based on the approved Departmental
Personnel Standards (DPS). The evaluation report shall incorporate a discussion of all points of view held by members of the committee.

2. To formulate a recommendation which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation. The recommendation and evaluation report shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the DPC and signed by the chair and all members of the DPC. The vote tabulation shall be recorded on the recommendation form.

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

4. To return the entire file, including evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

5. To receive the chair’s evaluation.

6. To receive the Chair’s recommendation once the file has been forwarded to the Dean.

VI. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus for first-year probationary faculty:

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments (s)he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair’s office by February 28. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department/Division Chair and the Dean (or equivalent) who will each provide written feedback prior to May 1. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each faculty member being considered for personnel action to prepare the required information and documentation for her/his Portfolio and to submit the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable.

In the Portfolio (Per UPS 210, Section III. B.3), the focus is on ‘quality over quantity’ as described in narratives and documented in appendices. Thus, the most significant accomplishments over their period of review are emphasized. Listing and discussing a limited number of high-quality accomplishments is more compelling than a compendium of all activities. Note, however, that all accomplishments should be listed in the Portfolio Vita.

Service Credit:

When prior service credit has been granted, evaluations for retention, tenure, and promotion shall include reviews of accomplishments during those specific years for which the service credit was granted. Additionally, when prior service credit has been granted, the
probationary faculty member shall include in his or her Portfolio data, materials and
documentation for the service credit period. In evaluations for retention, tenure, and
promotion, accomplishments achieved during probationary years at CSUF shall be weighted
more heavily than those during the service credit period. Accomplishments during service
credit years shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion
and/or tenure.

C. Portfolio Organization and Documentation

The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the table of
contents as specified by UPS 210.000. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately
documented. A standard curriculum vitae, using APA style wherever appropriate, including
date and page numbers, shall be used.

Portfolios shall be submitted in accordance with UPS 210.000 and the Faculty Affairs and
Records office requirements as stated in UPS 210.000 III. B. 1-8. Faculty should review this
document to ensure proper content is included.

D. Abbreviated “Review Files”

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

E. Categories for Personnel Action

The three major categories of faculty performance are as follows: teaching; scholarly and
creative accomplishments; and University and professional/community service. In promotion,
retention, and tenure decisions, performance in the categories of teaching and scholarly and
creative accomplishments shall be given primary emphasis. Secondary consideration will be
given to University, and professional/community service.

F. Faculty Responsibilities

As full-time employees of CSUF, the Department faculty members are expected to meet and
provide evidence of meeting faculty responsibilities as they apply to each of the above areas
for evaluation. These include but are not limited to: meeting classes, holding assigned office
hours at assigned times and places, participating in Department academic advising
procedures, attendance at Department meetings and completing committee and other
Department duties as assigned by the Department Chair. Evaluators shall take into
consideration in evaluating a faculty member’s performance, the extent to which the faculty
member has met her/his faculty responsibilities as documented in the Portfolio.
VII. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty: Criteria and Weighting

A. Teaching Performance

Retention during the probationary years will be based upon the individual’s self-assessment and progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. Procedures concerning service credit shall be implemented in accordance with the provisions of UPS 210.000. The philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development (CHHD) and department mission statements guide the primary responsibility of department faculty, which is teaching. Each faculty member shall establish an environment where learning is central, contribute (where appropriate) to degree and certificate programs, and provide opportunities for students to develop the skills necessary to contribute to society. A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in his or her discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn both within and outside the classroom.

1. Evaluating Teaching Performance

Evaluation of teaching performance shall include evaluations of the following: a) pedagogical approach and methods; b) student opinions of instruction; and c) ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to solicit other reviews of teaching performance to be included in the Portfolio at the time of submission. For example, classroom observations by department peers may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessments by external evaluators may also be included.

In the event, that a probationary faculty has been given assignments not directly related to teaching, such as coordinating a specialty track or writing documents for an accreditation report, this should be documented, along with a description of how this assignment has been accomplished and evidence of the “quality” of performance.

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating teaching performance:

a. Mandatory Indicators

1) Self-assessment
The self-assessment must include a reflective analysis of the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and performance as well as goals and direction of her/his future teaching. The analysis should address the faculty member’s teaching with respect to the department’s mission, the CHHD Philosophy, and to any University Mission and Goals. In addition, the faculty member is encouraged to discuss her/his contributions to student learning in the comprehensive self-assessment.

2) List of courses taught
A semester by semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review must be provided. The list must include the department name, the course name and number, and the unit value. If release time was received, the weighted teaching unit value will be listed along with an explanation of the activities for which it was granted.
3) **Course syllabi and materials**  
The file must include a representative selection of course syllabi and supplementary materials such as tests and study aids prepared by the faculty member to promote student learning and reflect pedagogy.

4) **Statistical summaries of grade distributions**  
The university-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester of the period of review must be provided. To provide statistical summary grade distributions, faculty shall use the form provided in Appendix A. Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught. The evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught. GPAs shall be discussed by the faculty member in the self-assessment on teaching in order for the DPC to evaluate the appropriateness of the GPA for each course. Assessment of any deviations from departmental averages may assist evaluators in incorporating this data when evaluating pedagogical practices.

5) **Statistical summaries of student opinion forms**  
The university-provided statistical summaries for all courses during the period of review must be included. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair Statistical summaries of student opinion data for all of the years for which service credit is given should be included, if available. To provide the statistical summary of student opinions, use the form provided in Appendix A. The student opinion questionnaire (SOQ) data shall be accessed through the University website and provided electronically. This includes the objective data and student comments. SOQs shall be discussed by the faculty member in the self-assessment on teaching in order for the DPC to evaluate the appropriateness of the SOQ for each course.

6) **Original student opinion of teaching forms**  
The original student-completed student opinion forms for each course taught at CSUF for academic credit during the period of review must be provided (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair). Student opinion data for all the years for which service credit is given should be included. If such data are not available, a letter from the faculty member’s previous supervisor attesting to their unavailability should be provided.

b. **Additional Indicators**  
The faculty member may submit other evidence that demonstrates teaching effectiveness and contributions to student learning, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1) Peer review of teaching following classroom visitations, lectures, or seminars.
2) Documentation and evaluation of teaching activities in colleagues’ classes.
3) Documentation of fieldwork or track coordination.
4) Development of new course proposals which have been approved for inclusion in the curriculum.
5) Development of instructional technology strategies to enhance student learning.
6) Development of portfolio and case study assignments.
8) Publications about teaching that do not qualify for inclusion in section VII.B.1.b.
9) Evidence of additional training in teaching.
10) Evidence of collaborative teaching activities.
11) Video or audiotapes of lessons taught.
12) Independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member.
13) Documentation of service as thesis advisor for graduate students.
14) Evidence of actively seeking mentoring for purposes of enhanced teaching practices.

c. Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance
A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is arrived at based on three factors defined below:

1) Pedagogical approach and methods
   According to the following criteria, the Committee shall rate pedagogical approach and methods as **Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations**.

   **Exceeds Expectations** – Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding teaching effectiveness as judged by complex breadth and considerable depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered as evidenced by use of literature and other materials dated within the last 3-5 years, relevancy of assignments to the texts and community needs, and effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment and grading procedures as evidenced by objective and thoughtful protocols and other reliable measurement tools.

   **Meets Expectations** – Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by good breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered as evidenced by the use of materials that are mostly dated within the last 5 years, relevancy of assignments, and effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment and grading procedures as evidenced by mostly objective protocols and reliable measurement tools.

   **Fails to Meet Expectations** – Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio fail to demonstrate acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by lack of breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, lack of currency in topics covered as evidenced by the use of materials that are mostly dated more than 5 years, lack of relevancy of assignments, and lack of evidence in effectiveness and fairness in testing.

2) **Student opinion of instruction**
   Student opinions of instruction contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. They shall not be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written
comments obtained in different courses and delivery modalities over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments. In general, the following scale shall be applied when rating the statistical summaries of student opinions:

**Exceeds Expectations:**
In addition to meeting the criteria under *meets expectations*, the faculty member’s:
Quantitative/Numerical SOQ Summaries include 85% or more A and B ratings with at least 50% A’s across section (cumulative percentage) taught during the period of review; AND Qualitative/Written SOQ Comments, if present, include predominantly positive statements; AND Narrative addresses SOQ patterns and identifies strategies used to achieve successful teaching outcomes; strategies are clearly aligned with course learning goals.

**Meets Expectations:**
Quantitative/Numerical SOQ Summaries include 75-84% A and B ratings across sections (cumulative percentage) taught during the period of review; AND

If ratings in all other areas of teaching meet expectations, a variance in this guideline may be applied in extenuating circumstances (e.g., small class size, new class preparation, new class format). In this context, 72.5-74.9% A and B ratings across sections (cumulative percentage) taught during the period will qualify as meeting expectations.

Qualitative/Written SOQ Comments, if present, include patterns of positive statements; negative comments, if present, are directly addressed through explanation or remediation as applicable; AND Narrative addresses SOQ patterns and efforts to improve teaching performance; contextual features may also be addressed (new/relatively new course preparation, new/relatively new pedagogical format, courses typically identified as challenging within the department, large courses, online courses, online SOQ administration, etc.).

**Fails to Meet Expectations:**
Faculty fails to provide evidence that meet expectations such as SOQ ratings consistently below 72% and mostly negative comments. Narrative fails to adequately addresses SOQ patterns and identify strategies used to achieve successful teaching outcomes; strategies are not clearly aligned with course learning goals.

*For Retention up to, but not including Year 4 Review: If the overall cumulative SOQ ratings fall below 75% A and B ratings, specific professional development opportunities and instructional strategies designed to address ratings must be discussed in the narrative; Faculty must demonstrate a pattern of improvement that will lead to achieving the required Meets Expectation rating for tenuring and promotion.*
3) Ongoing professional development

As a teacher:
Each faculty member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to maintain and improve teaching effectiveness. This program should include self-assessment of teaching objectives and methods and student achievement, participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, and familiarity with the pedagogical literature in the faculty member’s discipline. When specific weaknesses have been identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these weaknesses.

In the discipline:
All faculty members are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by serving in clinical practice roles or participating in conferences. Scholarly and creative accomplishments are expected to be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and student participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings. When specific weaknesses have been identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these weaknesses.

Faculty will be rated one of the following in regards to ongoing professional development: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectation or Fails to Meet Expectations.

**Exceeds Expectations:**
Self-assessment and teaching-related materials in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Meets Expectations:**
Self-assessment and teaching-related materials in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Fails to Meet Expectations:**
Self-assessment and teaching-related materials in the Portfolio fail to demonstrate acceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

d. Composite Rating of Teaching Effectiveness
Based on a composite of the ratings of the three factors described above, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching effectiveness as one of the following: Exceed expectations; Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations.

- A composite rating of Exceeds Expectations shall be given for meeting the criteria for Exceeds Expectations for at least one factor, and Meets Expectations for other factors.
- A composite rating of Meets Expectations shall be given for meeting the criteria for Meets Expectations for all three factors.
- A composite rating of Fails to Meet Expectations shall be given if the criteria for Meets Expectations are not met.
B. Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activity generates benefits for the faculty member as well as for the University. Such activity may: a) complement teaching; b) contribute to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement; c) promote currency in the 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, College, and the University; g) advance the reputation of the University; and h) enhance collaborative scholarship.

1. Indicators
The following indicators shall be used in evaluating scholarly and creative accomplishments.

a. Self-assessment (mandatory)
   The self-assessment must include a reflective analysis of the faculty member’s scholarly and creative accomplishments and her/his future goals and direction with reference to the benefits listed above and applicability to the faculty member’s Prospectus. The statement shall emphasize the scholarly accomplishments of the faculty member since her/his appointment at CSUF, including any service credit years, and should be documented by supporting evidence whenever possible. See section VI. B. for guidelines when prior service credit has been granted.

b. Acceptable High Quality Publications
   1) Articles published or accepted without further revision in professionally recognized, externally peer-reviewed journals. Documentation must include evidence of peer review and one of the following: (1) the letter of acceptance and commitment to publish the article or (2) a reprint of the published article.
   2) Books, including textbooks, or chapters in edited books, either published or accepted for publication by a process of external review. Documentation must include one of the following: (1) the letter of acceptance of the completed manuscript from the publisher; (2) the final printed version of the galley page proofs; or (3) a copy of the publication in the final printed version.

c. Acceptable High Quality Applied Scholarship
   1) External grants accepted/funded by government or private agencies.
   2) Internal grants funded/accepted by the University.
   3) Applied scholarship activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the faculty member and are carried out through consultation, policy analysis, program evaluation, the creation of a new program related to Human Services, the creation of a widely disseminated media (e.g. video, blog, social media, etc.) In documenting applied work, faculty should include their own written record of the project, and, where possible, the evaluations by those who received the service. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products, are encouraged in this category.

d. Acceptable High Quality Scholarly Presentations
   Scholarly papers, posters, workshops, seminars, or Keynote Addresses given or accepted to be given, with the name, date and location and modality (webinar, academically moderated social media discussions, etc.) of the presentation. Peer review is one indicator of quality for this category of scholarship. Additionally, the
level of audience (nationwide, state, county, city, university) participating in the presentation shall be considered when assessing quality for this category of scholarship.

2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

These lists are not in rank order of importance. The faculty member under review is responsible to demonstrate how her/his scholarly and creative accomplishments address some or all of the criteria listed below and the particular objectives identified in the faculty member’s Prospectus.

a. The Department employs traditional criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative accomplishments. Faculty shall highlight as many as the following items as possible and/or discuss in the narrative on scholarly and creative activities using as many of the following criteria as possible:
   1) external peer reviews
   2) contribution to the discipline or to interdisciplinary scholarship
   3) quality and variety of the forum in which the work appears
   4) clarity of conceptualization
   5) originality of scholarship
   6) impact on scholarship in the field (faculty should document the number of citations for each publication) and;
   7) when a publication is co-authored, the unique and specific contributions of each author.

b. In addition, in light of the mission of the department and the CHHD philosophy, the Department may evaluate scholarly and creative accomplishments based on the degree to which they:
   1) complement teaching;
   2) contribute to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement;
   3) promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike;
   4) increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines;
   5) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University;
   6) enhance the professional growth of the faculty member;
   7) advance the reputation of the University; and
   8) enhance collaborative scholarship

3. Guidelines for Rating Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going program of scholarly work. Scholarly publications that stem from a sustained program of work over the entire period are required to achieve tenure. Based upon the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member’s overall scholarly and creative accomplishments as either: Exceeds Expectations; Meets Expectations; or Fails to Meet Expectations.

- A rating of Exceeds Expectations shall be given for a comprehensive self-assessment and outstanding performance in depth or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of six items of high quality scholarship are required to be rated Exceeds Expectations. Three of these items must be peer reviewed journal articles (“in press” or published). An externally reviewed, disciplinary related book, monograph, or technical report, can substitute for one peer reviewed journal article. The other three
items may be from the scholarly category of Scholarly Presentations or Applied Scholarship.

- A rating of **Meets Expectations** shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment and clearly acceptable progress toward achievement of the standards set forth here and in the Prospectus (if the faculty is in the probationary period years 1-5). For the faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion, a total of four items of high-quality scholarship are expected for a rating of **Meets Expectations**. Two of these items must be peer reviewed journal articles (in press or published). An externally reviewed, disciplinary related book, monograph, or technical report, can substitute for 1 peer reviewed journal article. The other two items may be from the scholarly category of Scholarly Presentations or Applied Scholarship.

- A rating of **Fails to Meet Expectations** shall be rendered for a marginally acceptable self-assessment and marginally acceptable progress toward achievement of the standards set forth here and in the Prospectus (if the faculty is in the probationary period years 1-5). A rating of **Fails to Meet Expectations** will be given if a faculty member, in his or her fourth or later probationary year, only provides evidence of two or fewer items of high quality scholarship or only one peer reviewed journal article in press or published. An externally reviewed, disciplinary related book, monograph, or technical report, can substitute for 1 peer reviewed journal article. The other item may be from the scholarly category of Scholarly Presentations or Applied Scholarship.

**C. Service Activities**

Each faculty member shall contribute to their department, college, university, profession, and community through appropriate service activities. Such activities may develop mutually beneficial working partnerships, serve the needs of the profession or external community, enhance the campus’ role as a regional center, or strengthen institutional effectiveness and collegial governance.

A successful faculty member is collegial (participates fully, productively, and collaboratively in the collective efforts and functions of the Department, College, and University) and actively involved in professional and community services with clearly defined objectives for that involvement.

Untenured faculty members shall present, in the Prospectus, service objectives related to two areas of service: 1) Within CSUF (service to the department, college, and/or university); and 2) Outside CSUF (service to the profession and/or to the community).

1. **Indicators**

   The following indicators shall be used in evaluating service.

   **a. Self-assessment** (mandatory)

   The self-assessment must include a reflective analysis of the faculty member’s service and their future goals and direction with reference to the benefits listed above and applicability to the faculty member’s Prospectus. The statement shall emphasize the service of the faculty member since their appointment at CSUF, including any service credit years, and should be documented by supporting evidence whenever possible.
b. Service to the Department, College, and/or University
All Department faculty members are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of the Department, College, and/or University. At a minimum, a faculty member is expected to keep office hours, attend meetings of the Department on a regular basis, participate in College and University faculty events, and be actively involved in service activities as outlined in C.2 below. Contributions that exceed minimal expectations (e.g., participating on numerous committees or in activities of a more demanding nature, or assuming positions of leadership in such tasks) will enhance the faculty member’s rating for service.

c. Service to the Profession and/or to the Community
Examples of service activities in this category may include: assuming professional leadership roles; consultations relevant to the field: editing professional journals; reviewing abstracts and manuscripts for book proposals, professional journals or conferences; reviewing grant proposals; providing additional professional training to others; attending professional conferences or maintaining a professional license; and engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the profession/community and in support of the University’s Mission and Goals.

2. Evaluating Service
Based upon the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate probationary faculty’s overall service as: Meets Expectations; Exceeds Expectations; or Fails to Meet Expectations.
- A rating of Exceeds Expectations will be given for a record of service that includes active, high quality involvement in at least four service activities per year with at least two activities at the Department, College, or University level. Faculty must provide evidence via documentation and description in the narrative indicating quality and level of commitment/activity.
- A rating of Meets Expectations will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least three service activities per year of good quality with at least one activity at the Department, College, or University level. Faculty must provide evidence via documentation and description in the narrative indicating quality and level of commitment/activity.
- A rating of Fails to Meet Expectations will be given for a record of service that does not satisfy the Meets Expectations requirements. Faculty must provide evidence via documentation and description in the narrative indicating quality and level of commitment/activity.

The probationary faculty member is reminded that the first two criteria, teaching and scholarly and creative accomplishments are of primary importance and must be developed in the probationary years. The other criterion, University and professional/community service, needs to be developed, but is less heavily weighted for probationary faculty. During years 1-3, if probationary faculty receive the rating Fails to Meet Expectations in service, their progress toward meeting expectations should be addressed in the narrative.

Tenured faculty seeking promotion to Professor are expected to and will be evaluated by their evidence of providing leadership at the Department and College levels and by demonstrating on-going active, high quality participation in service. Evidence of mentoring another faculty member will be considered as high quality service in addition to the criteria mentioned in C.1.b.
D. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1. Retention of Probationary Faculty
Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual’s progress in meeting the criteria for tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member must be rated at a minimum:

- **Meets Expectations** in two areas, one of which must be teaching
- **Fails to Meet Expectations** or better in the other area, with progress toward meeting expectations.

2. Criteria for Granting of Tenure
Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure. In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member must be rated, at a minimum:

- **Exceeds Expectations** in either teaching performance or scholarly and creative accomplishments, with **Meets Expectations** in the other. (NOTE: It is not expected that each faculty member will have been rated **Meets** or **Exceeds Expectations** over the entire period of review for tenure; what is important is attainment of those ratings by the end of the review period).
- At least **Meets Expectations** in service.

3. Early Promotion to Associate Professor
To be considered for early promotion to Associate Professor and early tenure, the faculty member must demonstrate exemplary and extraordinary accomplishments in all three areas. The faculty member shall provide evidence of having exceeded the expectations required for normal tenure and promotion. For early tenure, the faculty member must be rated as **Exceeds Expectations** in all three categories and have demonstrated contributions to the field beyond that of what would be expected for on-time tenure review. In order to be considered for early promotion, the eligible faculty member shall apply in writing to Faculty Affairs and Record on or before the prescribed date.

4. Criteria for Promotion to Professor
Because the professoriate entails continual growth and reassessment, the University expects that the tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Promotion to Professor requires that the tenured faculty member has displayed accomplishments and growth throughout his or her time as Associate Professor. The decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described herein. At least one area of review must be rated **Exceeds Expectations** as stated in the above mentioned criteria, and all three areas must be at least **Meets Expectations**.

Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor. In cases where there has been a lengthy period since promotion to Associate Professor, the most recent five years of evidence shall normally
be emphasized in evaluating a record of continuing performance, but shall not exclude consideration of total productivity over the entire Associate period.

5. Early Promotion to Professor

Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of **Exceeds Expectations**.
APPENDIX A

CSUF DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION
SUMMARY REPORT

NAME: _______ Period of Review: _____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Course Title</th>
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1. Student Rating Of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 I rate the professor's preparation for this class as:</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 I rate the clarity and comprehensibility of the professor's explanations, demonstrations; and presentations as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 I rate the organization of the professor's lecture as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 I rate the professor's use of examples and illustrations as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 I rate the professor's active, personal interest in the class as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 I rate the professor's specificity of course objectives as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 I rate the degree to which the professor's grading system was fair and based on sufficient evidence as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 I rate the degree to which examinations or assignments covered the subject of the course as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 I rate the professor's communications of information about my performance on tests, papers, and so forth as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 I rate the professor's willingness to answer questions as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 I rate the professor's availability outside of class as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 I rate the degree to which the professor was concerned with student needs and interests as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 I rate the degree to which the assigned reading materials contributed to the course as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 I rate my present knowledge about the subject of the course, as compared with my knowledge about the subject matter before taking the course, as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Overall, I rate this course as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16 Overall, I rate the professor's teaching in this course as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue on Page 2
2. Written Comments

2.1 What are the major strengths of the instructor of this course?

2.2 How can the instructor improve the quality of this course?