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I. Preamble

The Department of Social Work (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality program possible. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the faculty and thus seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service to the College, University, profession, and community. Clarity in 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 as objective a statement available to them as is reasonably possible that clearly conveys the Department’s expectations. Furthermore, the Department faculty specifically affirm their position that the best interests of the University, the College, the Department, and their many students are served when the faculty represent a wide diversity of interests and activities.

II. Department Structure

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

III. Department Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Social Work at California State University, Fullerton is to educate emerging and committed professionals for social work practice with vulnerable, marginalized, and underrepresented populations. We are committed to developing competent, ethical, and effective social workers who will promote integrity in the profession and provide leadership in advancing social work knowledge, addressing social problems, and advocating for social justice. We engage communities and organizations in an effort to educate advanced social work practitioners while offering the wider community relevant expertise and assistance. We believe in the inclusion of individuals and groups from socially, culturally, and economically diverse environments, with special sensitivity to the multicultural communities of Orange County and the Southern California region. This mission is consistent with the purposes of the social work profession as defined by the Council on Social Work Education.

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called “the Committee”) shall make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to members of the Department as specified in the UPS 210.000 and 210.002.

B. Committee Structure

1. The Committee shall consist of at least three members and one alternate member. All shall be tenured faculty, and no member shall evaluate for promotion any faculty member holding a higher rank than the member does. The Committee shall consist of members from the Department unless there are not enough eligible, tenured faculty to fill the Committee. The Department can solicit outside members from other departments as long as these members meet the committee criteria. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he or she is the subject of the personnel review process.
2. The alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any circumstances in which a regular Committee member is ineligible to review a particular case or unable to complete the term. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to, the following: a) self-disqualification of a committee member; b) resignation, or leave of absence of a committee member; c) extended illness of a committee member; d) a committee member assuming an administrative position in another academic unit or the University administration; or e) a committee member becoming a member of the University Faculty Personnel Committee. Should a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty. When possible, the new alternate shall be from the same department/program as the regular Committee member who was unable to complete the term.

3. Committee members shall serve a one-year term. The term shall begin early in the Fall semester, following the election of members.

C. Election of Committee Members

1. The Chair (or a designee) shall conduct the election by the end of the third week of classes in the Fall semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot.

2. All tenured faculty who are members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B.1 above are automatically on the slate of nominees for the Committee, except the following: a) the Chair; and b) those who are being considered for a personnel action during that year. The Committee shall normally be filled with Department faculty before seeking members from related disciplines. If a department does not have the minimum number of eligible faculty required for the Committee, the department may elect one or more tenured faculty for its personnel committee from related disciplines including department chairs from other departments.

3. Each full-time tenure-track faculty member in the Department may vote for up to three eligible faculty on the ballot. The top three (3) persons receiving the largest number of votes shall be elected "regular" members of the Committee. In addition, the person with the next highest number of votes shall be the alternate. In the case of a tie, the regular member who receives the least amount of vote and the alternate shall be decided by a separate vote.

4. The Committee shall elect its Chair for the one-year term of the Committee.

D. Committee Procedures

1. The Committee shall review and evaluate in writing (i.e., typed) the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. In this evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications under each category of the criteria listed in Section VI of this document (teaching; scholarly and creative activity; professional, community, and University service).

2. All materials and deliberations are confidential and not to be discussed with those who are not part of the review process.

3. The Committee's evaluation for each area is to be based on the Portfolio according to the professional judgment of the committee members. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for describing the faculty member under review as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" with respect to each area of performance.

4. The committee will write separate evaluations and recommendations (when recommendations are warranted). Evaluations are written assessments of a faculty member’s performance. An evaluation will not include a recommendation for action. A recommendation is a position on the personnel action for which the faculty member is being considered.
5. When appropriate, the Committee shall formulate a recommendation that shall state in writing the reason for the recommendation. The recommendation and evaluation reports shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.

6. Committee members shall sign the evaluation and/or recommendation report(s) and form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.

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

V. General Guidelines

A. The Prospectus

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty 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 she or he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the Departmental Personnel Standards for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair’s office by February 28th. These narratives will have no formal approval process but will be reviewed by the Chair and the Dean who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the Colleges, but prior to May 1st. These narratives shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member’s Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure track position.

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

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each faculty member being considered for personnel action to prepare the required information and documentation for the Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the appropriate Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. The Department shall follow procedures outlined in UPS 210.000 with regard to the Prospectus.

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. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. A standard, updated curriculum vitae, shall be included. Faculty Affairs and Records provides new faculty members with access to the University-approved electronic portfolio system that they can use to create their portfolios. UPS 210.000 should be used as a guide by faculty in preparing their own Portfolios.

D. Categories for Personnel Action

The three major categories of faculty performance are as follows: (1) teaching; (2) scholarly and creative accomplishments; and (3) professional, University, and 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 professional, University, and community service.

E. Faculty Responsibilities

As full-time employees of CSUF, the Department faculty are expected to meet faculty responsibilities concerning each of the evaluation categories. In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include, but are not limited to, meeting classes, holding office hours at assigned times and places, and participating in Department academic advising procedures. In the area of scholarly and creative accomplishment, these responsibilities
include, but are not limited to, conducting original research; seeking external funding; presenting peer-reviewed presentations or posters; and publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and book chapters. In the area of service, these responsibilities include, but are not limited to, attendance at Department meetings and completing committee and other Department duties as assigned by the Chair.

VI. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty: Criteria and Weighting

A. Teaching Performance

Retention during the probationary years will be predicated upon the individual's self-assessment and progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. Procedures concerning service credit and the Prospectus shall be implemented in accordance with the provisions of UPS 210.000. 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 learn both within and outside the classroom.

1. Evaluating Teaching Performance

Evaluation of teaching performance shall include peer evaluation of the following: a) pedagogical approach and methods; b) student opinion questionnaires (SOQs); and c) ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher. The Committee's review of the Portfolio constitutes "peer evaluation" of teaching performance. 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 colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Written reports of such visits shall conform with UPS 210.080 and 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.

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating teaching performance:

a. Mandatory Indicators

1) Narrative summary of teaching performance

The comprehensive self-assessment must include a reflective review of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and performance as well as goals and direction of future teaching. It should address the faculty member's teaching with respect to the Department's mission and Goal 1 of the University Strategic Plan (i.e., "Provide a transformative educational experience and environment for all students"). In addition, the faculty member is encouraged to discuss contributions to student learning. The narrative summary of teaching performance shall not exceed 1000 words.

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 course syllabi and a representative selection of course supplemental materials such as tests and study aids prepared by the faculty member to promote student learning.

4) Statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires (SOQs)

The University-provided statistical summaries of SOQs for all courses during the period of review must be included. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and
verified by an appropriate administrator/supervisor. For faculty entering the Department with service credit, statistical summaries of SOQ data for all of the years for which service credit is given should be included, if available. If such data are not available, a letter from the faculty member's previous supervisor attesting to their unavailability should be provided. SOQs contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not be used by any level of evaluation as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness.

5) **Student opinion questionnaire forms**

The student-completed SOQ forms (i.e., raw data) 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 an appropriate administrator/supervisor. For faculty entering the Department with service credit, SOQ 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.

6) **Statistical summaries of grade distributions**

The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution and mean grade point average for each course taught during the period of review.

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 coordination, academic advisement, or mentoring activities.
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 VI.B.1.b.
9) Evidence of additional training in teaching.
10) Evidence of collaborative teaching activities.
11) Video of lessons taught.
12) Independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member.
13) Documentation of service as MSW project advisors for advanced-year students.

c. **Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance**

A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is arrived at based on three factors defined below:

Each of these factors is equally weighted to arrive at a total evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

1) **Pedagogical approach and methods**

Pedagogical approach and methods include a self-assessment of the faculty member as a teacher. Self-assessments shall address the faculty member’s pedagogical approach, philosophy of teaching, and teaching performance highlighting strengths and areas for growth in teaching. Methods, goals, and direction of future teaching shall also be discussed.

Grade distributions contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. A faculty member’s grade distributions should accurately reflect student performance within each course taught. Peer evaluation of teaching performance shall address any concerns related to the appropriateness of a faculty member’s grade distributions. Patterns across various semesters shall also be considered in evaluating the appropriateness of grade distributions.
In order for the DPC to accurately evaluate the appropriateness of a faculty member’s grade distribution for each course, grade distributions shall be discussed by the faculty member in the narrative summary of teaching performance. Rationales and explanations for grade distributions that deviate significantly from the departmental average should be addressed. The Department recognizes that grade distributions in some courses may be higher than the departmental average due to the implementation of a specific pedagogical philosophy or expectations related to higher student performance standards. Assessment of grade distribution deviations from departmental averages may aid in evaluating a faculty member’s pedagogical practices and philosophies (i.e., teaching performance).

The Committee shall rate pedagogical approach and methods as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent** -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and the effectiveness and fairness of evaluation approaches applied to student work, including testing, and course grading procedures.

**Good** -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and the effectiveness and fairness of evaluation approaches applied to student work, including testing, and course grading procedures.

**Fair** -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate marginal teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and the effectiveness and fairness of evaluation approaches applied to student work, including testing, and course grading procedures.

**Poor** -- Self-assessment and course materials demonstrate unacceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and the effectiveness and fairness of evaluation approaches applied to student work, including testing, and course grading procedures.

2) **Student opinion questionnaires (SOQs)**

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

- **Very high** -- 85% or more A and B ratings
- **High** -- 75 to 84.9% A and B ratings
- **Adequate** -- 60 to 74.9% A and B ratings
- **Inadequate** -- Less than 60% A and B ratings

Peer evaluation of teaching performance (i.e., Committee review) shall address those student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student evaluation forms and contained in written comments on these forms. Each course shall be rated separately and the overall teaching performance evaluation shall take into consideration factors
such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to
the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elec-
tive, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account
the faculty member's overall level of experience and efforts to improve teaching performance.

The Committee shall rate student response to instruction as "excellent," "good," "fair," or
"poor" according to the following scale:

**Excellent** -- A rating of at least "very high" on the statistical summaries combined
with a majority of positive student comments in the SOQs.

**Good** -- A rating of at least "high" on the statistical summaries combined with a ma-
ajority of positive student comments in the SOQs.

**Fair** -- A rating of at least "adequate" on the statistical summaries combined with a
majority of negative student comments in the SOQs.

**Poor** -- A rating of "inadequate" on the statistical summaries combined with a major-
ity of negative student comments in the SOQs.

3) Ongoing professional development as a teacher
All faculty are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by conference participation
and/or other interaction with their colleagues. It is expected that scholarly and creative ac-
complishments will be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and student participa-
tion in collaborative research and creative undertakings. Each faculty member is expected to
show evidence of an ongoing professional development 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 spe-
cific weaknesses have been identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include
in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these weaknesses.

The Committee shall rate ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher
as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria.

**Excellent** -- Self-assessment and a minimum of three teaching-related materials in the
Portfolio demonstrate outstanding commitment to professional development as a
teacher.

**Good** -- Self-assessment and a minimum of two teaching-related materials in the Port-
folio demonstrate clearly acceptable commitment to professional development as a
teacher.

**Fair** -- Self-assessment and a minimum of one teaching-related materials in the Port-
folio demonstrate marginal commitment to professional development as a teacher.

**Poor** -- Self-assessment and no teaching-related materials in the Portfolio demonstrate
unacceptable commitment to professional development as a teacher.
2. 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: "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor".

**Excellent** – At least two scores of Excellent and one score of Good are considered outstanding teaching performance.

**Good** – At least three scores of Good, two scores of Good and one score of Excellent, or two scores of Excellent and one Fair are considered clearly acceptable teaching performance.

**Fair** – At least three scores of Fair, or two scores of Fair and one score of Good or Excellent, or two scores of Good and one of Fair is considered marginal teaching performance.

**Poor** – Anything less than three scores of Fair is considered unacceptable teaching performance.

B. Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activity generates the following benefits for the faculty member and students, as well as for the University: 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) enhance collaborative scholarship; e) increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines; f) enhance the professional growth of the faculty member; g) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University; and, h) advance the reputation of the University.

1. Indicators

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating scholarly and creative activity:

a. **Narrative Summary of Scholarly and Creative Activities**

The self-assessment must include both a reflective review of the faculty member's scholarly and creative activity and 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 appointment at CSUF or since the last action and should be documented by supporting evidence whenever possible. Scholarly accomplishments include, but are not limited to peer-reviewed and invited publications, reports, white papers, internal and external grants, and scholarly presentations and workshops. The narrative of scholarly and creative activities shall not exceed 1000 words.

b. **Publications**

- Articles published or accepted in high quality, professionally recognized, externally peer-reviewed journals (publications related to teaching that meet this standard shall be included in this category). 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.

- Books, including textbooks, or chapters in edited books, either published or accepted for publication. 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. **Applied Scholarship**

- External grants funded by government agencies and/or private foundations. Grants which have been awarded but not yet funded may be presented.
• Adopted or published treatment or intervention manuals.

d. Scholarly Presentations
• A professional conference presentation or workshop given or accepted to be given, with the name, date, and location of the presentation. Also include the presentation abstract, PowerPoint slides, or electronic poster, if applicable.

e. Supplemental Scholarship
• These are types of publications and scholarly work that can supplement the portfolio but are not considered high-quality items. It is up to the faculty member to place the scholarship in the appropriate professional context for evaluation and make the case for how this work should be evaluated and considered. Supplemental scholarship may include, but is not limited to:
  • Reports for government agencies
  • Reports for community organizations
  • White papers
  • Policy analyses
  • Published training manuals or curricula

• Internal grants are not considered as a high-quality indicator of scholarly and creative activity; however, the Department encourages faculty members to pursue internal funding as a means toward achieving other items of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, external funding, scholarly presentations).

2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activity
These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how 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 work, including:
1) Clarity of conceptualization
2) Originality of scholarship
3) Contribution to the faculty member’s discipline and/or to interdisciplinary scholarship
4) Impact on scholarship in the field
5) Quality of the forum in which the work appears (e.g., impact score and acceptance rates of journal)

b. In addition, the Department evaluates scholarly and creative activities 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) Enhance collaborative scholarship
5) Increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines
6) Enhance the professional growth of the faculty member
7) Contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University
8) Advance the reputation of the University

c. The Department requires that faculty document and describe their involvement in collaborative projects
Faculty are required to document their contributions in collaborative projects through the co-author disclosure form available from the Faculty Affairs Office.
3. Guidelines for Rating Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going program of scholarly work. With regard to the ratings below, which reflect the expected outcome in the final year of probation, it is the expectation that faculty will make reasonable and ongoing progress in interim evaluation years toward these outcomes. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of work over the entire period is 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 "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" as follows:

1. A rating of "excellent" shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment and outstanding performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of eight items are required over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period: six must be high-quality publications and/or applied scholarship, at least three of which must be peer-reviewed journal articles; in addition, one of the three peer-reviewed journal articles must be a first- or sole-authored publication. Two of the eight items may be professional conference presentations or workshops. No more than two of the items may be external grants.

2. A rating of "good" shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment and clearly acceptable performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of six items are required over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period: four must be high-quality publications and/or applied scholarship, at least two of which must be peer-reviewed journal articles; in addition, one of the two peer-reviewed journal articles must be a first- or sole-authored publication. Two of the six items may be professional conference presentations or workshops. No more than two of the items may be external grants.

3. A rating of "fair" shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment with marginal performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity: four to five items over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period, two of which are high-quality publications and/or applied scholarship, at least one of which is a peer-reviewed journal article. Two of the four items may be professional conference presentations or workshops. No more than two of the items may be external grants.

4. A rating of "poor" shall be rendered for unacceptable performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity, as evidenced by fewer items than required to achieve a "fair" rating.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

1. Narrative of Professional, University, and Community Service Activities

Each faculty member shall provide a self-assessment related to service contributions. The self-assessment must include both a reflective review of the faculty member's professional, community, and University service activity and future goals and direction. The self-assessment shall emphasize the service contributions of the faculty member since appointment at CSUF or since the last action and should be documented by supporting evidence, whenever possible. The narrative of professional, University, and community service activities must not exceed 1000 words.

2. Professional and Community Service

Faculty in applied fields such as those in the Department are required not only to make original scholarly contributions in the form of written material, but also to communicate and implement knowledge by means of presentations and consultations. The benefits of professional and community service are many, including

a. Complements teaching by allowing the teacher to draw from applied experience
b. Promotes the discipline in the context to which it is applied
c. Promotes currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike
d. Enhances the professional growth of the faculty member
e. Contributes to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University
f. Advances the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.

For the purpose of professional maintenance and growth, each faculty member is encouraged and expected to engage actively in the discipline and related professions as follows: assuming professional leadership roles; attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops; acquiring professional licenses; earning credentials and certificates; editing professional journals; reviewing manuscripts for book proposals; presenting at and/or attending professional conferences; providing consultation relevant to the field; reviewing grant proposals; receiving professional training or providing additional professional training to others; and engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the profession/community and in support of the University Strategic Plan. On-going, active involvement in a minimum of one professional and one community service activity over the entire period of review is required for achievement of tenure in the Department.

3. University Service

The success of any University or Department is partially dependent on the active participation of its faculty members in the various organizational and governance tasks. In the case of the Department, an unusually heavy demand for involvement in Department activities, such as advisement, curriculum development, Department review for accreditation purposes, etc., fall upon relatively few full-time faculty. All Department faculty are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of their Department, as well as those of the College and University. At a minimum, a faculty member is expected to, attend meetings of the Department on a regular basis, participate in College and University faculty events, and serve on at least two committees or perform comparable tasks over the entire period of review for tenure. 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.

4. Evaluating Service

The Committee evaluates the quality, quantity, and impact of a faculty member's service contributions in the context of the potential benefits to the profession, community, and University, and in light of prevailing professional standards.

- A rating of "excellent" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in three or more professional/community service activities and active, quality involvement in three or more Department, College and/or University service activities.
- A rating of "good" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least two professional/community service activities and active, quality involvement in at least two Department, College, and/or University service activities.
- A rating of "fair" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least one professional/community service activity or active, quality involvement in at least one Department, College, or University active.
- A rating of "poor" will be given for a record of service that fails to include active, quality involvement in professional/community service or in service to the Department, College, and/or University.

Though the first two evaluation criteria, teaching and scholarly and creative accomplishments, are of primary importance and more heavily weighted, the other criterion, professional, University, and community service, is highly valued. The expectation is that probationary faculty members will engage in service throughout the entire probationary period.
D. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1. Retention of Probationary Faculty
The goal of the RTP process, as contained in UPS 210.000, is to produce members who qualify for tenure after their probationary employment. To be retained during the probationary period, a faculty member is required to demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely. A probationary faculty member is required to show appropriate accomplishments, growth, and promise in each of the three areas of assessment. Moreover, when weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement. The decision to retain (reappoint) a probationary faculty member is an affirmation that satisfactory progress is being made toward tenure; therefore, a probationary faculty member shall not be retained if the cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure are likely to be met.

Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual's progress in meeting the criteria for tenure. By the Year 4 review, in order to be retained, the probationary faculty member must be rated at a minimum:

- "good" in two areas, one of which must be teaching
- "fair" or better in the other area, with demonstrable progress toward "good"

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:

- "good" or "excellent" in teaching performance and scholarly and creative accomplishments, one of which must be "excellent." (NOTE: It is not expected that each faculty member will have been rated "good" or "excellent" over the entire period of review for tenure; what is important is attainment of a rating of "good" or "excellent" by the end of the review period)
- "good" or "excellent" in professional, University, and community service

3. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
Because the professoriate entails continual growth and reassessment, the University expects that tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in all three areas of performance, and that successful faculty members will display accomplishments, growth, and future potential throughout their careers. Therefore, the decision to grant promotion to the rank of Full Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described above.

In order to be granted promotion to Full Professor, the faculty member must be rated:

- "excellent" in two areas
- "good" or "excellent" in the other area

VII. Early Tenure and Early Promotion

A. Eligibility
In order to be considered for early tenure or early promotion, the eligible faculty member shall apply in writing to Faculty Affairs and Records no later than the end of the second week of the Fall semester.
The granting of early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or early promotion to Full Professor, will be considered in cases of outstanding achievement and excellence. Successful early promotion or tenure requires evidence of sustained excellence that exceeds the standards across teaching performance; scholarly and creative activity; and professional, community, and university service.

B. Criteria
In all cases, the faculty member must satisfy, on an accelerated schedule, the requirements for promotion and/or tenure delineated in earlier sections. Additional special requirements are described below.

1. Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion to Associate Professor
For early tenure and/or early promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must be rated as "excellent" in overall teaching performance utilizing the criteria found in Section VI.A, "excellent" in scholarly and creative accomplishments, and "good" (or higher) in professional, community, and University service.

2. Early Promotion to Full Professor
For early promotion to Full Professor, the faculty member must be rated as "excellent" in overall teaching performance utilizing the criteria found in Section VI.A, "excellent" in scholarly and creative accomplishments, and "excellent" in professional, University, and community service. The faculty member must have a rating of "excellent" in all three categories.
1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

Your thoughtful rating on the questions will be used in the faculty tenure and promotion decision-making process, for other personnel decisions, and to provide ongoing information on teaching effectiveness in California State University, Fullerton. Your response is anonymous. The summary of your responses will be given to the instructor only after the final grades have been submitted.

Rate each of the statements below using following 5-point scale: A = very high, B = high, C = adequate, D = inadequate, E = very inadequate

1.1 I rate the professor’s knowledge of the subject matter for this course as:

1.2 I rate the professor’s demonstrated interest in students as:

1.3 I rate the professor’s preparation for class meetings as:

1.4 I rate the professor’s availability to students for consultation as:

1.5 I rate the clarity, consistency, and fairness of grading criteria in this course as:

1.6 I rate the helpfulness and utility of the professor’s feedback as:

1.7 I rate the professor’s openness to differences of opinion as:

1.8 I rate the clarity of the professor’s communication of the course expectations and objectives as:

1.9 Overall, I rate this course as:

1.10 Overall, I rate the professor’s teaching in this course as:

PLEASE WRITE COMMENTS ON THE NEXT PAGE. Do not write in the space below.
2. Comments

2.1 Please write any comments you would like to add in the box below.
1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>satisfactory</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>very weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>I rate the degree to which the instructor accepts and respects me as a person as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>I rate the usefulness of the feedback as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>I rate the degree to which the instructor provides suggestions for developing my social work skills as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>I rate this course's contribution to my development as a practitioner as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>I rate the degree to which the instructor helps me to define and achieve specific concrete goals for myself during the practicum experience as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>I rate the degree to which the instructor helps me define and maintain ethical behavior as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>I rate the clarity of the instructor's explanation of her/his criteria for evaluation as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>I rate the fairness with which the instructor applies her/his criteria in evaluating my performance as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>I rate this course contribution to my level of awareness of professional issues as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>I rate the degree to which the instructor offers resource information when I request or need it as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Overall, I rate the instructor's teaching in this course as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE WRITE ANY COMMENTS ON THE NEXT PAGE. Do not write in the space below.
2. Comments

2.1 Please write any comments in the box below.