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).
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 (6/8/2022 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 formally 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.
CSUF College of the Arts
School of Music Personnel Standards

I. Department Statement

The California State University, Fullerton School of Music strives to educate its music majors to be artistic, well-rounded, and well-trained musicians. Through experiences in our broad range of programs and curricula, responsive to the needs of our students, CSUF graduates shall be musically, intellectually, and technologically prepared to be artistic contributors and leaders in the communities in which they live and work. The School of Music shall also provide both academic and performance opportunities for non-music majors and shall contribute to the University and external communities through outreach and public performance.

The School of Music recognizes that the key to quality in a department shaped by many diverse programs is an instructional faculty that, both individually and collectively, meets a wide spectrum of academic and artistic needs. The School of Music seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service by attracting and supporting such a faculty in order to meet its Mission and Goals.

II. Departmental Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 and UPS 210.002

It is the position of the School of Music that the support and enhancement of high-quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the School of Music presents this Personnel Standards document, which describes the criteria for assessing productivity in a wide range of artistic and academic activities with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion, as consistent with UPS 210.000 and UPS 210.002. All faculty members subject to performance evaluation shall be responsible for reading and observing the requirements of the current UPS 210.000 and UPS 210.002, as well as this present document.

Probationary faculty members shall compile each year their evidence of performance in the Portfolio and Appendices to be reviewed by both the Department Personnel Committee (hereafter, DPC) and the Director of the School of Music (hereafter, Director). At various stages of the review process, the Dean of the College of the Arts, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President (or designee) also review the Portfolio and Appendices. The University Faculty Personnel Committee may also review the Portfolio and Appendices.

III. The Prospectus

In accordance with UPS 210.000 and UPS 210.002, 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.
The Prospectus shall be due in the office of the Director by February 28 of the first year of employment. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Director and the Dean (or equivalent) who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to May 1. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews. During subsequent years, the Prospectus may not be revised, but the Narrative Summaries will reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

IV. Mentors

Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Director will consult with the DPC and with each newly appointed probationary faculty member concerning an appropriate faculty mentor, and will designate one or more tenured faculty members to serve as mentors. In the event that the Director serves as a mentor, at least one additional mentor shall be designated. At any time thereafter, the probationary faculty member or mentor(s) may request that the Director make a change of assignment.

The primary responsibility of the mentor(s) is to provide guidance, advice, and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation of the Prospectus.

V. Election of the Department Personnel Committee

A. The DPC shall consist of three tenured faculty members and one tenured alternate. The Director cannot serve on the DPC. The DPC shall be elected by the tenured and probationary (tenure-track) faculty members. Elections shall be held no later than the end of the third week of classes in the fall semester. The names of all eligible tenured faculty shall appear on a secret ballot.

B. Members shall be elected for a one-year term.

C. The Chair of the DPC will be elected by majority vote of the three members.

VI. Evidence of Performance

A. The Portfolio and Appendices

1. The Portfolio and its Appendices are the sole basis for all Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (hereafter, RTP) evaluations, recommendations, and actions. It shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the last day before the due date of the file to the Director (September 15 for the second-year probationary review, and October 1 for all other performance reviews). In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio and its Appendices. The Portfolio and Appendices shall be submitted in hard copy and/or electronic format as defined by current Faculty Affairs and Records procedures.
For Tenured Faculty: The Portfolio and Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period since the submission of the file for promotion to Associate Professor to the last day before the due date of the file to the Chair (October 1).

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the completeness of his or her Portfolio and Appendices.

3. The Portfolio shall include the following items:

a. Table of Contents of the Portfolio (available from the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records).

b. A Table of Contents of the Appendices to the Portfolio.

c. A copy of these approved Departmental Personnel Standards.

d. The Prospectus prepared in year one, not to exceed 500 words for each area of the three areas of review (Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service).

e. Portfolio Vita that covers the faculty member’s entire academic and professional employment history and that lists accomplishments in all three areas of review (Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service). Peer-reviewed activities shall be indicated separately from non-peer-reviewed activities. Activities shall be listed in reverse chronological order.

f. Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance: a concise (1,000 words maximum) self-assessment of significant accomplishments in relation to the applicable personnel standards. This narrative shall clearly indicate where in the Portfolio or Appendices supporting documentation can be found.

g. List of Classes Taught, which shows the session, course number, course title, and weighted teaching units (WTUs) for all classes taught during the period under review.

h. A blank copy of the Student Opinion Questionnaire form(s) (hereafter, SOQ), or an inclusive list of questions from the form when the form is unavailable because of online administration, used by the School of Music in evaluating the faculty member.

i. Statistical summaries of SOQs for each class taught for which students received credit during the period of review, showing responses to all multiple-choice questions on departmental SOQ forms.

j. Narrative Summary of Scholarly and Creative Activity: a concise (1,000
words maximum) self-assessment of significant accomplishments in relation to the applicable personnel standards. This narrative shall clearly indicate where in the Appendices supporting documentation can be found.

k. Narrative Summary of University, Professional, and Community Service Activity: a concise (1,000 words maximum) self-assessment of significant accomplishments in relation to the applicable personnel standards. This narrative shall clearly indicate where in the Appendices supporting documentation can be found.

l. For probationary faculty, all evaluations, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, if any, and decisions for all previous full performance reviews (supplied by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records).

4. In addition to the Portfolio, the faculty member shall assemble Appendices containing supporting materials that are directly relevant to the presentation in the Portfolio. The Appendices shall only include documentation of significant activities, emphasizing quality over quantity.

a. Appendix I: Teaching

1. Table of Contents of Appendix I.

2. SOQs: Raw data for each course taught, arranged conveniently for reference by reviewers.

3. Sample syllabi and coursework: The most recent copies of syllabi for all courses taught during the review period shall be included.

4. Classroom Observations of Teaching: A minimum of one peer observation will be included for each of the academic years during the probationary period. More observations may be arranged and included in the Appendix at the discretion of the probationary faculty member. At least one of the teaching observations shall be conducted by the Department Personnel Committee, ideally in the 12-month period prior to when the full portfolio is submitted and evaluated.

5. Other relevant information.

b. Appendix II: Scholarly and Creative Activity

1. Table of Contents of Appendix II.

2. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity (possibilities listed in section VI C. below).
c. Appendix III: Service

1. Table of Contents of Appendix III.

2. Evidence of University, Professional, and Community Service (possibilities listed in section VI D., below).

B. Evidence of Teaching Performance

The School of Music requires that all faculty members shall demonstrate effective teaching at all levels of review. A self-assessment narrative not to exceed 1,000 words shall include a reflective discussion of the faculty member’s pedagogical approach and methods, student responses to instruction, expectations regarding student achievement, ongoing professional development as a teacher, and ongoing professional development in the discipline.

Although student opinion of teaching is an important means of assessing teaching effectiveness, peer evaluations and the quality of instructional materials are equally important.

The School of Music shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s performance as a teacher:

1. Mandatory Indicators of Teaching Performance:

   - List of courses taught by semester with course and schedule number, name, and unit value. Assigned time shall also be cited.
   - Representative course syllabi and materials for each course taught.
   - SOQ statistical summaries.
   - Individual SOQ student comment reports for each course.
   - Classroom Observations. There shall be at least one teaching observation conducted during each academic year taught during the probationary period. All probationary faculty are required to arrange and schedule this annual teaching observation which will be conducted and administered by a School of Music tenure-track or tenured faculty member, and using the School of Music Classroom Teaching Observation Form (see Appendix A). The probationary faculty member may choose a particular colleague no more than twice to conduct classroom observations during the entire probationary period. More than one annual observation may be arranged at the discretion of the probationary faculty member. At least one of the teaching observations shall be conducted by the Department Personnel Committee, ideally in the same 12-month period that the full Portfolio is submitted and evaluated. All these classroom observations shall be placed in Appendix I of the Portfolio, and the probationary faculty member may not decide to exclude an officially-conducted observation. Classroom observations shall be conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080, and
faculty reviewers shall use the School of Music Classroom Teaching Observation Form, which shall also include a narrative summary of the observation.

- Examples of student concert programs (from ensemble directors and applied instructors).
- Examples of student work in performance and/or composition (from private studio instruction), or research/essay/project papers (from lecture courses, seminars, independent study projects, graduate projects, and theses).
- Evidence of currency in the faculty member’s area of expertise.

2. Optional Supportive Indicators of Teaching Performance:

- Evidence of exceptional accomplishments by current and former students.
- Evidence of ongoing professional development as a teacher.
- New course/curriculum development and evidence of engagement with instructional technology.
- Evidence of participation on graduate and undergraduate student committees.
- Evidence of mentoring activities.
- Written (and signed) comments/letters by students.
- Other relevant documentation.

C. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity

School of Music tenure-track and tenured faculty are required to make contributions in the area of Scholarly and Creative Activity. In a self-assessment narrative of no more than 1,000 words, the faculty member shall discuss and evaluate his or her scholarly and creative activity during the period of review. It is essential to put scholarly and creative indicators in a well-defined and focused context, and to define the professional objectives of the accomplishments. When appropriate, discussion of efforts to involve students, to attract external support, and of the relationship between scholarly and/or creative activities and teaching are encouraged.

Among the School of Music indicators are activities that by their very nature establish a form of peer review. Evaluation of scholarly and creative accomplishments, preferably by off-campus sources, should be included.

Scholarly and creative activities vary widely in nature within the School of Music. They include but are not limited to:

- Regional, national, or international solo performances, performances in small or large ensembles (including conducting ensembles).
- Recordings of solo performances, performances in small or large ensembles (including conducting ensembles), or recording of original compositions or arrangements.
- Composition of solo, small-ensemble, large-ensemble, digital, or electroacoustic works.
- Arranging and editing of music.
- Performances of compositions of solo, small-ensemble, large-ensemble, digital, or electroacoustic works at the regional, national, or international level.
- Commissions, grants, or awards.
- Peer-reviewed research books, book chapters, and journal articles in musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory and analysis, music technology, and/or music education and pedagogy for publication.
- Peer-reviewed research/creative papers/presentations presented at scholarly/creative conferences at the regional, national, or international level.
- Participating as a moderator, discussant, or respondent at professional meetings.
- Reviewing or editing manuscripts, articles, or books for professional journals or publishers.
- Writing of grant proposals.
- Writing of program notes and recording liner notes at the regional, national, or international level.
- Guest artist residencies at clinics, festivals, workshops, or professional meetings.
- Work reviewed or discussed and/or reproduced in off-campus publications.
- Letters of validation by off-campus peers in reference to specific creative and/or scholarly accomplishments.
- Consulting or advising academic or professional music organizations.
- Other scholarly or creative accomplishments appropriate to the field.

In the area of scholarly and creative activity, a faculty member may have accomplishments in any of the areas listed above—in performance, composition, and/or scholarship—or any combination thereof. Documentation of scholarly and creative accomplishments may take the form of published works, programs, reviews, video or audio recording, and other appropriate forms.

CSUF ensemble performances conducted as an outgrowth of classroom teaching must be included in the category of “teaching,” except in the case of ensemble performances at regional, national, and international conferences and conventions that result from peer-reviewed auditions, which may be considered under “scholarly and/or creative activity.”

D. Evidence of University, Professional, and Community Service

School of Music tenure-track and tenured faculty are required to provide service to the University, Profession, and Community. In a narrative of no more than 1,000 words, the faculty member shall discuss his or her contributions to the University, Profession, and Community, through different service activities that encourage mutually beneficial working partnerships; serve the needs of the University,
profession, and community; enhance the campus’ role as a regional center; and/or lead to student opportunities and learning.

The School of Music shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s contributions to the University, Profession, and Community through professional and service activities.

- Organizing symposiums, professional meetings, clinics, workshops, and masterclasses.
- Organizing special events.
- Membership in professional societies, including the holding of offices.
- Adjudicating festivals or competitions.
- Chair of CSU System, University, College, or Departmental committees.
- Member of CSU System, University or College committees, or member of DPC.
- Member of Academic Senate.
- Member of School of Music committees other than DPC.
- Planning and directing School of Music outreach and recruitment activities.
- Lectures, concerts, or other presentations to community groups.
- Arts advocacy in the community.
- Faculty adviser of student clubs.
- Evidence of participation on graduate and undergraduate student committees.
- Evidence of mentoring activities.
- Other appropriate activities.

VII. Evaluation of Evidence of Performance

All tenure-track faculty members, and tenured faculty seeking promotion, will be evaluated within three areas: Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activity; and University, Professional, and Community Service. In support of the preeminence of learning mission of the university and in compliance with UPS 210.000, the primary emphasis in the RTP process shall be on teaching.

A. The materials contained in the Portfolio and Appendices are the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. Therefore, the Portfolio and Appendices must contain all relevant evidence. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to be aware of all deadlines and criteria affecting RTP and to submit the complete Portfolio and Appendices by the due date.

B. The DPC and Director shall make evaluations and recommendations based solely on the documented evidence contained in the Portfolio and Appendices.

C. All categories of review shall be evaluated on the following scale: Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.

D. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
Teaching is the most important area under review. The DPC and Director shall review the mandatory and supportive indicators of teaching, and shall take into consideration the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, the level and types of classes taught, and the quality of the faculty member’s performance as a teacher. The DPC shall complete the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form that appears in Appendix A at the end of this document in evaluating the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness for each full performance review, and the Director shall consider these completed forms in their evaluations.

1. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs)

The School of Music has separate SOQ forms for ensemble classes, applied instruction, and academic courses. In organizing and reviewing SOQ data, the School further subdivides academic classes into general education classes and music major academic courses.

Thus, although the DPC and Director will use statistical summaries of SOQs and student comments on instruction as important sources of information about the teaching effectiveness of faculty members under review, the DPC may assign more weight to trends in SOQs rather than to overall means. The DPC may also assign greater weight to consistent patterns of student comments as well as the statistical summaries of SOQ’s.

The faculty member’s student opinion rating should normally be determined by the responses on all student opinion forms. 85% or higher "A" and "B" SOQ ratings will be rated as “Excellent,” and 70%-84.9% "A" and "B" SOQ Ratings will be rated as “Good,” and 60%-69.9% "A" and "B" SOQ Ratings will be rated as “Needs Improvement,” and Below 60% "A" and "B" SOQ Ratings will be rated as “Unsatisfactory.” The final analysis of SOQ ranges should also take into account unique characteristics of courses such as level, class size, format, content, etc. Faculty members who believe their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching are encouraged to carefully explain their scores and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be noted by the reviewers.

To increase the anonymity of responses, SOQs for applied instruction will be aggregated across all levels of 191-592.

2. Classroom Teaching Observations, and Evaluation of Pedagogical Approach and Methods, Course Materials, and Self-Assessment of Teaching

Although SOQs and student comments on instruction are important measures of teaching effectiveness, together they represent only one measure. Therefore, the DPC and Director shall give significant weighting to other measures of teaching effectiveness, including classroom observations of teaching by faculty peers in the
School of Music, the quality of pedagogical approach and methods and course materials, and the self-assessment teaching narrative in the Portfolio.

3. Ratings of Teaching Performance

Ratings of teaching performance shall be assigned as follows:

- Excellent

The faculty member is deemed Excellent in Teaching when the School of Music DPC’s ratings in Categories 2 (SOQ Ratings), 4 (Pedagogical Approach and Methods), and 6 (Classroom Observations) are Excellent on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form given in Appendix A of this document, and Categories 1 (Self-Assessment), 3 (SOQ Comments), and 5 (Professional Development) are rated at least Good on that form.

- Good

The faculty member is deemed Good in Teaching when the School of Music DPC’s ratings in Categories 2 (SOQ Ratings), 4 (Pedagogical Approach and Methods), and 6 (Classroom Observations) are a combination of Excellent and Good, or exclusively Good, on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form given in Appendix A of this document, and Categories 1 (Self-Assessment), 3 (SOQ Comments), and 5 (Professional Development) are rated at least Needs Improvement on that form.

- Needs Improvement

The faculty member is deemed Needs Improvement in Teaching when the School of Music DPC determines that any one category on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form given in Appendix A of this document is Unsatisfactory, or when the criteria for Good listed on this form are not met.

- Unsatisfactory

The faculty member is deemed Unsatisfactory in Teaching when the School of Music DPC determines that two or more categories on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form given in Appendix A of this document are Unsatisfactory.

E. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity

In Scholarly and Creative Activity, a faculty member may have accomplishments in any one area—performance, composition, and/or scholarship—or any combination thereof. The evaluation of a faculty member shall not be prejudiced by the fact that scholarly and/or creative activities are either narrowly focused or broad in scope.
Among the School of Music indicators are activities that result from a form of peer review. There is a selective and highly competitive process involved in the participation in recitals and concerts, in the selection for publication by publishers and professional journals, and in the according of awards, commissions, and grants. A common definition of “peer review” for the RTP process shall be: substantiation of the quality of faculty member’s scholarly and/or creative activities by qualified individuals, institutions, organizations, publications, or societies off-campus. Evidence of performance for scholarly and/or creative accomplishments will be evaluated on quality as well as quantity, appropriateness, status of venue or forum, contribution of the individual (particularly within an ensemble performance), recognition (international, national, regional levels), relative merit, and evidence of ongoing growth. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide such evidence to the reviewers in the Portfolio and Appendices, wherever appropriate.

Because the nature and broad range of creative activities in the musical arts can vary widely, careful attention must be given by the reviewers to the listed activities to determine the relative level and scholarly/artistic contribution of each. To aid in this evaluation, the faculty member shall complete the “Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form” (See Appendix B) to aid the DPC and outside evaluators who may not be familiar with the relative rigor of non-published activities such as concert performances, compositions and arrangements, and other creative activities specific to the discipline. Each member of the DPC, with their knowledge and expertise in the discipline, will assign a relative ranking based on the activities summarized on the form as follows:

1. **Minimal**: Relatively few activities that meet the criteria for scholarly/creative activities in the musical arts (as outlined in section 6C of this document).
2. **Satisfactory**: An acceptable number of activities that meet the criteria for scholarly/creative activities in the musical arts (as outlined in section 6C of this document).
3. **Outstanding**: An exemplary number of activities that meet and perhaps exceed the criteria for scholarly/creative activities in the musical arts (as outlined in section 6C of this document).

Each DPC member shall assign their individual ranking on a copy of the first page only of the "Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form (Cover Sheet, Appendix B)."

Scholarly and Creative Activity shall be deemed Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory as determined by the following ratings:

- **Excellent**

A rating of “Excellent” shall be designated when all the DPC members assign a ranking of “Outstanding,” or when a combination of one “Satisfactory” and two
“Outstanding” are assigned on the “Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form.”

- **Good**

A rating of “Good” shall be designated when all the DPC members assign a ranking of “Satisfactory,” or when a combination of two “Satisfactory” and one “Outstanding” are assigned on the “Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form.”

- **Needs Improvement**

A rating of “Needs Improvement” shall be designated when any single member of the DPC assigns a ranking of “Minimal” on the “Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form.”

- **Unsatisfactory**

A rating of “Unsatisfactory” shall be designated when two or more DPC members assign a ranking of “Minimal” on the “Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form.”

**F. Evaluation of Service Activities**

The School of Music requires faculty members to be actively involved in professional, University, College, Department, and community service activities. Faculty should clearly define objectives for their involvement in each service activity (e.g., organizing academic and special events, adjudicating festivals or competitions, membership and leadership in professional organizations or societies, leadership and membership on CSU committees, recruitment of new students, as well as other broad and varied activities in the faculty member’s specific area of expertise.

Service shall be rated Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory as determined by the following criteria

- **Excellent**

This rating results from an active (meaning very recent) and ongoing (meaning likely to continue into the future within the service agenda of the teacher) service record that may include a broad and varied number of activities such as organizing academic and special events, adjudicating festivals or competitions, membership and leadership in professional societies, leadership and membership on CSU committees, planning and directing School of Music outreach and recruitment activities, as well as other activities as outlined in section VI. D. (above).
• **Good**

This rating results from an active and ongoing service record that may include a good but otherwise modest number of activities such as organizing academic and special events, adjudicating festivals or competitions, membership and leadership in professional societies, leadership and membership on CSU committees, planning and directing School of Music outreach and recruitment activities, as well as other activities as outlined in section VI. D.

• **Needs Improvement**

This rating results from a service record that includes some, but relatively few, activities such as organizing academic and special events, adjudicating festivals or competitions, membership and leadership in professional societies, leadership and membership on CSU committees, planning and directing School of Music outreach and recruitment activities, as well as other activities as outlined in section VI. D.

• **Unsatisfactory**

This rating results from a service record that includes very little, if any, evidence of activities such as organizing academic and special events, adjudicating festivals or competitions, membership and leadership in professional societies, leadership and membership on CSU committees, planning and directing School of Music outreach and recruitment activities, as well as other activities as outlined in section VI. D.

**VIII. Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

**A. Requirements for Retention**

The goal of the RTP process is to promote faculty members who qualify for tenure after their probationary period of 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 appear likely to be met.

Because CSUF recognizes that teaching is the most important activity for its faculty, the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching shall be used (see Appendix A).
In the area of Teaching, the indicator that serious weaknesses have been identified shall be when any one category on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form is “Unsatisfactory” or when the criteria for “Good” listed on this form are not met. Furthermore, when either of the areas of Service or Scholarly Activity are evaluated to be “Unsatisfactory” during the review period, the faculty member may receive a decision to not be retained.

Per UPS 210.000, a Full Performance Review may be requested for any probationary faculty member at any level of review for probationary years three or five when, typically, only an Abbreviated Review would be required. This request will be initiated by the School of Music DPC when any one category on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form is “Unsatisfactory” or when the criteria for “Good” listed on this form are not met and/or when either of the areas of Service or Scholarly Activity are evaluated to be “Unsatisfactory” during the review period. The faculty member under review may also request a Full Performance Review when doing so would better clarify progress in the three areas affecting the decision to retain during the probationary period. The request for a Full Performance Review must be made to the School of Music Director by June 1st for a review that will take place during the following Fall semester.

**B. Requirements for Tenure**

The tenure decision, usually rendered in the sixth probationary year, is designated by UPS 210.000 as the most significant personnel decision. However, the faculty member’s overall performance during the entire probationary retention period will be evaluated by the DPC and the Director, with a cumulative overall rating awarded in each of the three areas of review (Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, Service). To be recommended for tenure, the faculty member’s performance in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service shall receive a cumulative rating of at least Good.

**C. Requirements for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

**D. Requirements for Promotion to Professor**

Within the three areas of review (Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, Service), documentation of activities, beginning the day after the faculty member submits their tenure and promotion portfolio for the last full review, shall be required of each faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor. Tenured faculty members seeking promotion shall demonstrate a record of performance across all three categories that show a sustained commitment to these Departmental Standards.

To be recommended for promotion to Professor, the faculty member's performance in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service shall receive a cumulative
rating of at least Good by both the DPC and the Director. Additionally, to be
recommended for promotion to Professor, the faculty member’s performance in either
Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activity shall receive a cumulative rating of
Excellent by both the DPC and the Director.

E. Requirements for Early Tenure and Early Promotion

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. Early tenure and early promotion require that all
expectations for the entire probationary period have been met, that a rating of
Excellent has been awarded in each of the three areas, and that the faculty member’s
performance for the entire probationary period meets or exceeds the standards as
stated in UPS 210.002 and in these Departmental Standards.

F. Requirements for Early Promotion to Professor

Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed
excellence and sustained commitment to 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 Excellent.

Approved by the School of Music Faculty on 2022-05-10
APPENDIX A

Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching
Rubric Grading Summary

DPC Marks an “X” for the various evaluations from the Composite Measure Rubrics
E = Excellent, G = Good, NI = Needs Improvement, US = Unsatisfactory

FACULTY MEMBER:______________________________________
DATE:____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quantitative SOQ Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SOQ Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pedagogical Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings on teaching performance are assigned as follows:

**Excellent**

The faculty member is deemed Excellent in Teaching when the School of Music DPC’s ratings in Categories 2 (SOQ ratings), 4 (Pedagogical Approach and Methods), and 6 (Classroom Observations) are Excellent on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form (this document), and Categories 1 (Self-Assessment), 3 (SOQ Comments), and 5 (Professional Development) are rated at least Good on the form.

**Good**

The faculty member is deemed Good in Teaching when the School of Music DPC’s ratings in Categories 2 (SOQ ratings), 4 (Pedagogical Approach and Methods), and 6 (Classroom Observations) are a combination of Excellent and Good, or exclusively Good, on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form (this document), and Categories 1 (Self-Assessment), 3 (SOQ Comments), and 5 (Professional Development) are rated at least Needs Improvement on that form.

**Needs Improvement**

The faculty member is deemed Needs Improvement in Teaching when the School of Music DPC determines that any one category on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form (this document) is Unsatisfactory, or when the criteria for Good listed on this form are not met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The faculty member is deemed Unsatisfactory in Teaching when the School of Music DPC determines that two or more categories on the Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching form (this document) are Unsatisfactory.

### Composite Measure for Evaluation of Teaching Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Narrative Self-Assessment from Portfolio** | • Evidence of significant accomplishments  
• Clearly written self-assessment  
• Activities align with Departmental Standards | • Evidence of mostly significant accomplishments  
• Some clarification needed in self-assessment  
• Activities align with Departmental Standards | • Evidence of few significant accomplishments  
• Self-assessment lacks clarity and/or has grammatical errors  
• Activities may not align with Departmental Standards | • Evidence of few or no significant accomplishments  
• Self-assessment is unclear and/or unfocused  
• Activities may not align with Departmental Standards |
| **2. Quantitative SOQ Ratings** | 85% or higher "A" and "B" SOQ ratings | 70%-84.9% "A" and "B" SOQ Ratings | 60%-69.9% "A" and "B" SOQ Ratings | Below 60% "A" and "B" SOQ Ratings |
| **3. SOQ Comments** | • Very positive comments about teaching environment  
• Very few or no negative comments about course organization  
• Comments indicate excellent teaching effectiveness | • Generally positive comments about teaching environment  
• A few negative comments about course organization  
• Comments indicate good teaching effectiveness | • Mixed comments about teaching environment  
• A number of negative comments about course organization  
• Comments indicate teaching effectiveness needs improvement | • Primarily negative comments about teaching environment  
• Many negative comments regarding course organization  
• Comments indicate unsatisfactory teaching effectiveness |
### 4. Pedagogical Approach and Methods, Including Course Materials

| Clear syllabi that align with UPS | Mostly clear syllabi that align with UPS | Unclear syllabi that may not align with UPS | Unclear syllabi that do not align with UPS |
| Self-assessment of teaching reflected in course materials | Self-assessment of teaching mostly reflected in course materials | Self-assessment of teaching unevenly reflected in course materials | Self-assessment of teaching poorly reflected in course materials |
| Course requirements and objectives appropriate for level of course | Course requirements, and objectives appropriate for level of course | Course requirements and objectives may be inappropriate for level of course | Course requirements and objectives are often inappropriate for level of course |
| Evidence of exemplary student work | Evidence of good student work | Evidence of inconsistent student work | Evidence of weak student work |

### 5. Professional Development

| Evidence of excellent professional development as a teacher | Evidence of good professional development as a teacher | Some evidence of professional development as a teacher | Little evidence of professional development as a teacher |
| Evidence of outstanding currency in field of expertise | Evidence of good currency in field of expertise | Some evidence of currency in field of expertise | Little evidence of currency in field of expertise |
| Evidence of curricular development | Evidence of curricular development | Some evidence of curricular development | Little evidence of curricular development |
| Evidence of engagement with technology | Evidence of engagement with technology | Some evidence of engagement with technology | Little evidence of engagement with technology |

### 6. Classroom Observations

| Mostly “Excellent” and possibly some “Good” indicators on the observation form. Peer reviews indicate an excellent classroom teaching environment. | Mostly “Good” and some “Excellent” indicators on the observation form. Peer reviews indicate a good classroom teaching environment. | Includes “Needs Improvement” but no “Unsatisfactory” indicators on the observation form. Peer reviews indicate a classroom teaching environment that needs improvement. | Includes various ratings as well as “Unsatisfactory” indicators on the observation form. Peer reviews indicate a lack of a positive classroom teaching environment. |

18
California State University, Fullerton  
School of Music  
Class/Lesson/Rehearsal Observation Form  
(10-2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor:</th>
<th>Peer Observer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>Hour:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Total time of visit:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent Peer observation indicates an excellent teaching environment</th>
<th>Good Peer observation indicates a good teaching environment</th>
<th>Needs Improvement Peer observation indicates a teaching environment that needs improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory Peer observation indicates a lack of a positive teaching environment</th>
<th>Not applicable Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity and organization of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Verbal communication skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Musical skills, ability to model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positive attitude and enthusiastic approach to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engages students in meaningful activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adapts for individual differences in students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Appropriate level of rigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ongoing assessment of student progress/performance and specific feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Effective use of instructional time; appropriate pacing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative summary of the peer observation (required). Refer to the “Classroom Observation Exemplars for Determining Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness” to help inform your narrative. Use back of this form if needed or attach additional document(s) as necessary:
Classroom Observation Exemplars for Determining Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness

Excellence in teaching is a result of many and varied behaviors of the teacher as they interact with students. Some observable behaviors that may make help determine excellent ratings of teaching may include, but are not limited to, some of the following:

Conducting Ensembles:
1. Rehearsal begins and ends on time.
2. Rehearsal plan has been prepared in advance.
3. Rehearsal plan is clearly communicated to students.
4. Conductor establishes a positive and professional learning environment.
   a. Students exhibit professional, on-task behavior.
   b. Student behavior is consistent with active, musical engagement.
   c. Students exhibit clear focus – conductor positively commands attention.
5. Conductor demonstrates mastery of the score.
   a. Demonstrates a clear and artistic gesture.
   b. Tempi are consistent.
   c. Exhibits clear preparation of entrances.
   d. Detects errors accurately and gives corrections clearly.
   e. Encourages artistic achievement beyond basic accuracy.
   f. Demonstrates musical concepts with accuracy and artistry.
6. Conductor provides clear and consistent feedback to students.
   a. Instructions address corrections clearly and succinctly.
   b. Addresses ensemble with respect and professional rapport.
   c. Balances constructive criticism with positive reinforcement

Applied Lessons:
1. Lesson begins and ends on time.
2. Lesson plan has been prepared in advance.
3. Lesson plan is clearly communicated to student.
4. Instructor establishes a positive and professional learning environment.
   a. Student exhibits professional, on-task behavior.
   b. Student behavior is consistent with active, musical engagement.
   c. Student exhibits behavior consistent with artistic achievement.
   d. Demonstrates qualities of intentional listening and assessment.
      i. Feedback reveals intuitive, focused understanding of professional technique.
      ii. Makes frequent inquiries to assess student comprehension.
      iii. Inquiries reveal student-centered approach.
5. Instructor demonstrates mastery of the literature.
   a. Demonstrates musical concepts clearly and artistically with superb musicianship.
   b. Detects errors accurately and gives corrections clearly.
   c. Encourages artistic achievement beyond basic accuracy.
   d. Stresses musical excellence via intensively positive pedagogical tactics.
6. Instructor provides clear and consistent feedback to students.
   a. Instructions address corrections clearly and succinctly.
b. Addresses student with respect and professional rapport.
c. Balances constructive criticism with positive reinforcement.

Composition:
1. Lesson begins and ends on time.
2. Lesson plan is clearly communicated to student.
3. Instructor establishes a positive and professional learning environment.
   a. Student exhibits professional, on-task behavior consistent with artistic curiosity.
   b. Student behavior is consistent with active, musical engagement.
   c. Student exhibits behavior consistent with artistic achievement.
4. Instructor demonstrates mastery of the myriad musical stylistic practice.
   a. Demonstrates musical concepts clearly and artistically.
   b. Detects errors accurately and gives corrections clearly.
   c. Encourages artistic achievement beyond basic musical constructs.
   d. Stresses musical excellence via intensively positive pedagogical tactics.
5. Instructor provides clear and consistent feedback to students.
   a. Instructions address corrections clearly and succinctly.
   b. Addresses student with respect and professional rapport.
   c. Balances constructive criticism with positive reinforcement.
   d. Allows student to interact collaboratively with pedagogical sequence.
      i. Student exhibits rapport consistent with self-reflection.
      ii. Addresses student’s concerns directly and positively.
      iii. Makes frequent inquiries to determine student’s level of comprehension.

Classroom Instruction:
1. Class begins and ends on time.
2. Lesson plan has been prepared in advance.
3. Lesson plan is clearly communicated to students.
4. Instructor establishes a positive and professional learning environment.
   a. Students exhibit professional, on-task behavior.
   b. Student behavior is consistent with active engagement and curiosity.
   c. Students exhibit behavior consistent with academic achievement.
   d. Provides visual and aural material to accentuate presentation of material.
   e. Demonstrates qualities of intentional listening and assessment.
      i. Feedback reveals intuitive, focused understanding of subject matter.
      ii. Makes frequent inquiries to assess student comprehension.
      iii. Inquiries reveal student-centered approach.
      iv. Engages in several pedagogical tactics to address all learning styles.
5. Instructor demonstrates mastery of the subject matter.
   a. Communicates concepts clearly and creatively with superb pedagogical skill.
   b. Encourages active student engagement.
   c. Addresses myriad learning styles with pedagogical approach.
6. Instructor provides clear and consistent feedback to students.
   a. Address student inquiries clearly and succinctly.
   b. Address students with respect and professional rapport.
   c. Balances constructive criticism with positive reinforcement.
APPENDIX B

Scholarly and Creative Activities Summary Form (Cover Sheet)
Activities to be documented by the faculty member with evidence included in the portfolio

FACULTY MEMBER: ___________________________ DATE: ___________________________

DPC Evaluator NAME: ___________________________

DPC Evaluator Ranking: MINIMAL SATISFACTORY OUTSTANDING

NOTE: Refer to the Index of Scholarly/Creative Activities in the CSUF School of Music form for the reference numbers associated with the TYPE of activity.

Activity Name: ___________________________
Activity Reference Number ________ Completion date (or expected completion) __________ month/year
Briefly describe the activity: ___________________________
This scope of the activity is primarily: REGIONAL NATIONAL INTERNATIONAL 
(circle one)

Activity Name: ___________________________
Activity Reference Number ________ Completion date (or expected completion) __________ month/year
Briefly describe the activity: ___________________________
This scope of the activity is primarily: REGIONAL NATIONAL INTERNATIONAL 
(circle one)

Activity Name: ___________________________
Activity Reference Number ________ Completion date (or expected completion) __________ month/year
Briefly describe the activity: ___________________________
This scope of the activity is primarily: REGIONAL NATIONAL INTERNATIONAL 
(circle one)

Duplicate the next page as needed to include each activity to be considered in the review. Number each page as “2 of 5”, “3 of 5”, etc.

1 of ___
Index of Scholarly/Creative Activities in the CSUF School of Music

*Use these reference numbers to identify the TYPE of activity*

1. Regional, national, or international solo performances, performances in small or large ensembles (including conducting ensembles).
2. Recordings of solo performances, performances in small or large ensembles (including conducting ensembles) or recording of original compositions or arrangements.
3. Composition of solo, small-ensemble, large-ensemble, digital, or electroacoustic works.
4. Arranging and editing of music.
5. Performances of compositions of solo, small-ensemble, large-ensemble, digital, or electroacoustic works at the regional, national, or international level.
6. Commissions, grants, or awards.
7. Peer-reviewed research books, book chapters, and journal articles in musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory and analysis, music technology, and/or music education and pedagogy for publication.
8. Peer-reviewed research/creative papers/presentations presented at scholarly/creative conferences at the regional, national, or international level.
9. Participating as a moderator, discussant, or respondent at professional meetings.
10. Reviewing or editing manuscripts, articles, or books for professional journals or publishers.
11. Writing of grant proposals.
12. Writing of program notes and recording liner notes at the regional, national, or international level.
13. Guest artist residencies at clinics, festivals, workshops, or professional meetings.
14. Work reviewed or discussed and/or reproduced in off-campus publications.
15. Letters of validation by off-campus peers in reference to specific creative and/or scholarly accomplishments.
16. Consulting or advising academic or professional music organizations.
17. **Other** scholarly or creative accomplishments appropriate to the field.