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I. Preface
The Department of Public Health (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing high quality programs that contribute to a broad understanding of human health. Emphasis is on the examination of the entire life span from infancy through the older adult years, with special attention to improving the quality of life and the human condition in an ever-changing and diverse society. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning and to the establishment of an environment where learning and the expansion of knowledge are central to all activities. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. It is the position of the Department that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department proposes a personnel document, consistent with three University Policy Statements (UPS): (1) UPS 210.000, which describes the procedures that govern retention, promotion, and granting of tenure (RTP) for probationary faculty, and the promotion of tenured faculty; (2) UPS 210.002, which establishes minimum standards that govern retention, promotion, and granting of tenure (RTP) for probationary faculty, and the promotion of tenured faculty; and (3) UPS 210.020, which describes periodic evaluation of tenured faculty who are not concurrently applying for promotion.

II. Department Structure
The Department of Public Health is led by a Department Chair who is selected via a modified UPS 211.100 procedure approved by the President. The Department offers degree programs in Public Health (B.S., MPH, and Minor), as well as coursework, that contribute to general education, various specializations, professional credentials and certifications, and lifelong health and well-being.

III. Scope of Document
This document will summarize policies and procedures with respect to the selection and function of the Department Personnel Committee and other review committees; the preparation of a prospectus; and the preparation of portfolios. The document also will describe criteria to be used in the evaluation of portfolios during the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process, and the post-tenure review process.

IV. Department Personnel Committee and Department Post-Tenure Review Committee
A. Committee Functions
Faculty personnel reviews at the Department level are undertaken by the:

- **Department Personnel Committee**
The Department Personnel Committee shall make specific recommendations concerning retention, promotion, and granting of tenure for probationary faculty and for the promotion of tenured faculty as specified in UPS 210.000.

- **Post-Tenure Review Committee**
The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review tenured faculty who are undergoing a periodic evaluation and not concurrently applying for promotion (hereafter called a
“post-tenure periodic evaluation”), as specified in UPS 210.020. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall write a brief evaluation summary statement, but the post-tenure periodic evaluation does not result in a recommendation.

- **Department Peer Review Committee***
  The Department Peer Review Committee conducts evaluations of lecturer faculty only. As stated in UPS 210.070, the Department Personnel Committee may assume the role of the Department Peer Review Committee; or one or more separate committee may be created by the Department to conduct the evaluation of lecturer faculty.

  * Additional details about the Department Peer Review Committee are beyond the scope of this document and can be found in UPS 210.070, which governs evaluations of lecturer faculty.

**B. Committee Structure**

Committee membership has different requirements based on the type of evaluation.

1. **Department Personnel Committee**: For retention, tenure, and promotion evaluations of probationary faculty, and for promotion evaluations of tenured faculty, the Committee shall consist of three members and at least one alternate member, not including the Department Chair, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. Committee members shall have a higher rank or classification than those being evaluated. Thus, if one or more faculty members are under review for promotion to the rank of Professor, then three faculty members at the rank of Professor shall be available to evaluate those cases. One to three alternates at the rank of Professor shall be elected to replace any regular Committee members at the rank of Associate Professor on promotion-to-Professor cases, but not the other cases under review. No person shall serve as a Committee member during the year in which they are being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion action. The alternate Committee member(s) shall participate on the Committee in the event that a regular Committee member cannot complete the term or, as noted previously, is ineligible to evaluate a particular candidate. In such a case, one or more new alternate(s) shall be elected by the Department faculty.

2. **Post-Tenure Review Committee**: For post-tenure periodic evaluations, the Committee shall be comprised of the Department Chair and at least one member of the Department Personnel Committee. All members shall be tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Because the evaluation does not result in a recommendation, Committee members need not have a higher rank than those being evaluated. A faculty member undergoing post-tenure periodic evaluation may not serve on the Committee.
C. Election of Committee Members

1. Department Personnel Committee: The Department Chair will 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. All tenured faculty who meet the requirements in IV. B., above, are automatically on the slate of potential Committee members except the following: (a) the Department Chair, (b) those who are being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion action that academic year, and (c) those who will be on sabbatical or leave-of-absence during any part of that academic year. Each tenure-track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for three Committee members. The faculty members receiving the three highest numbers of votes shall be elected as “regular” Committee members. The election of alternates shall be separate, following the same process. Each tenure-track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for one to three alternate Committee members; the specific number will be announced prior to the election, depending on the need for that academic year. If one alternate is needed, the faculty member receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected as the alternate Committee member. If two alternates are needed, the faculty members receiving the two highest numbers of votes shall be elected, and similarly with the three highest numbers of votes for election of three alternates. In the case of a tie in either election, regular and alternate committee members shall be decided by random selection (e.g., the flip of a coin; or by drawing names randomly, should the tie involve more than two people), or a runoff election. The Committee shall elect its Chair for a one-year term.

2. Post-Tenure Review Committee: The Department Chair and at least one member of the Department Personnel Committee shall comprise the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair shall mutually agree on the member(s) of the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

In the present document, all subsequent mentions of review committees are hereafter referred to as the “Committee.”

D. Committee Responsibilities

1. Committee Responsibilities for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Evaluations
   The Committee shall review and evaluate portfolios of faculty members undergoing full performance reviews in the retention, tenure, and promotion process. Following a review of the portfolio, the Committee shall prepare a written composite evaluation describing the candidate’s performance (faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion) or progress (probationary faculty being reviewed for retention but not for tenure and/or promotion) under each of the evaluation areas: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service to the Department, College, University, profession, and community, as described in Section VIII of this document.

   The Committee’s evaluation for each area shall be based on information provided in the portfolio. Each Committee member shall utilize their best professional judgment in assessing how well the established evaluation criteria have been met.

   a. Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention (full performance review). The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides rationale for rating the probationary faculty member's progress in each category as excellent, good, or unsatisfactory. The evaluation statement shall represent all
points of view held by the Committee members.

b. *Probationary faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, and tenured faculty being reviewed for promotion (full performance review).* The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides rationale for rating the faculty member’s performance in each category as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VI.

For Full Performance Reviews of probationary faculty (Years 2, 4, and 6) and promotion evaluations of tenured faculty, the Committee shall state in writing a recommendation and the reasons for the recommendation relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. All actions taken by the Committee shall be approved by a simple majority vote.

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

The Committee shall submit its evaluation and recommendation statements to the Department Chair in accordance with the published timelines for the personnel action cycle.

Probationary faculty subject to an abbreviated review submit a review file instead of a full portfolio and undergo a condensed process, as described in Section VI of this document.

2. **Committee Responsibilities for Post-Tenure Periodic Evaluations**

The post-tenure periodic evaluation process and the Committee’s responsibilities are as follows:

a. The Committee shall evaluate the faculty member’s teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service during the post-tenure review period based on information provided in the periodic evaluation file (see VII.C.2 and Section X of this document).

b. The Committee shall write a brief evaluation summary statement, but the post-tenure periodic evaluation shall not result in a recommendation.

c. Committee members shall sign the evaluation summary statement in alphabetical order and provide a copy to the College Dean in accordance with the timeline set by the Provost.

d. Upon completion of the Dean’s evaluation, copies of the Committee’s and the Dean’s evaluation summary statements shall be provided to the faculty member.

e. The Dean and Department Chair, together or separately, shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation.

f. The faculty member shall have ten (10) calendar days following the meeting with the Department Chair and Dean to submit a response or rebuttal to the Dean.

g. At the end of the periodic evaluation process, the Dean shall forward to Faculty Affairs and Records all summary statements and responses or rebuttals for placement in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File.
V. Department Chair’s Responsibilities

1. Department Chair’s Responsibilities for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Evaluations

According to UPS 210.000, all Department Chairs shall meet responsibilities in a-e below. Tenured Chairs not seeking promotion shall also meet the responsibilities in f-o:

a. Communicate the standards and criteria for RTP to all Department faculty members.
b. Inform each new faculty member within two weeks after the assumption of official duties at the University of all personnel procedures including those covered by this document.
c. Provide guidance, advice, and support to assist new probationary faculty members in preparing their prospectus prior to the date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically May 1).
d. Provide each probationary faculty member with written feedback on the prospectus.
e. Request a meeting, during the spring semester, with each probationary faculty member or faculty member who is eligible for a performance review during the following fall semester to assure that the annual updating of the portfolio has been initiated and that the compilation is proceeding according to the requirements of this document.
f. To assess whether the faculty member has included all the required elements in the portfolio, and, where necessary, to counsel the faculty member concerning the contents of the portfolio. To obtain confirmation that the faculty member has reviewed and submitted the entire portfolio.
g. To evaluate the performance of the faculty member based upon the portfolio independently of the Department Personnel Committee. The Department Chair shall send a copy of this evaluation to Faculty Affairs and Records upon completion.
h. To add to the portfolio a signed evaluation by the previous Department Chair when the current Department Chair is newly appointed, and if the previous Department Chair so desires. However, the new Department Chair shall make the final recommendation.
i. To forward the portfolio to the Department Personnel Committee.
j. To receive the evaluation and recommendation of the Department Personnel Committee and then to forward to the Department Personnel Committee the Department Chair’s evaluation.
k. To show both the Department Personnel Committee’s and the Department Chair’s evaluations to the faculty member and to provide the faculty member with a copy of the Department Personnel Committee’s recommendation. At this time, the Department Chair shall ask whether the faculty member wishes to add a response or rebuttal to the Department Personnel Committee recommendation to the portfolio. If the faculty member does so wish, the portfolio shall be held by the Department Chair for ten (10) days while the faculty member does so. A copy of the response or rebuttal shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee. Whether or not the faculty member chooses to add a response or rebuttal to the file, the Department Chair shall require the faculty member to signify the option chosen by signing a signature form. Such a signature does not indicate the faculty member’s
approval of the evaluation or recommendations, but only indicates that these have been read and a copy of the Department Personnel Committee recommendation has been received.

1. To make a recommendation that shall be signed by the Department Chair and which shall include in writing the reasons for the recommendation. The Department Chair shall provide a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member and to the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee. The Department Chair shall again inform the faculty member of the option to respond to or rebut the recommendation of the Department Chair within ten (10) days and the obligation to signify the option chosen by signing the signature form. If the faculty member adds a response or rebuttal to the Department Chair’s recommendation, a copy shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee.

m. To be available for consultation to the Department Personnel Committee, though otherwise being absent from the Department Personnel Committee’s meetings during its deliberations.

n. To ensure that the Department Personnel Committee completes its review and submits it recommendation to the Department Chair by the appropriate date each year.

o. To transmit the portfolio and the recommendations and evaluations to the Dean.

2. Department Chair’s Responsibilities for Post-Tenure Periodic Evaluations

The Department Chair serves as one of at least two members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee (see IV.B.2 above), thus the Department Chair’s responsibilities for post-tenure evaluations are described together with the Committee’s responsibilities in IV.D.2, above.

VI. Abbreviated Review Files for Third and Fifth Year Probationary Faculty

Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their full performance review during year 2 or year 4 would, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit an abbreviated “review file.” The review file comprises only three items: (1) an updated curriculum vitae (CV), (2) university-generated statistical summary reports of student opinion questionnaires for each course section taught by the faculty member in the period since the last full performance review,* and (3) university-generated grade distribution reports (with GPAs) for each course section taught by the faculty in the period since the last full performance review.* When subject to a periodic review, the faculty member shall submit the review file by the date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically October 1), review of which shall be completed by a subsequent date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically March 15). The Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean shall provide a signed statement indicating that the review file was received, reviewed, and evaluated. Faculty Affairs and Records will distribute copies of the signed statements to the faculty member and keep the originals for placement in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the College Dean may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member’s progress.

* Note: Summary tables and documents written by the faculty member shall not fulfill these requirements. Statistical summary reports of student opinion questionnaires and grade distribution reports (with GPAs) shall be the official, university-generated documents. Only the summary reports for each individual course section taught by the faculty member during the review period shall be included. Summaries that combine data from all courses taught by the faculty member in a semester and summaries that combine data from all courses taught by the
VII. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus
According to UPS 210.000, 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, with a maximum of 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required, and accomplishments they expect 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 Department Chair’s office by the date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically February 28). The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean (or equivalent), who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to a date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically May 1). The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews.

B. Portfolio and Periodic Evaluation File Preparation and Submission
It is the responsibility of each faculty member undergoing full performance review in the retention, tenure, and promotion process to prepare the information required for the portfolio and to deliver the materials to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. A general timetable for submitting the portfolio is provided in UPS 210.000 Section I. K. Specific timetables for each year are prepared and distributed by the Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) office early in the fall semester.

At the start of the academic year,* Faculty Affairs and Records shall inform the Department Chair and faculty members whose post-tenure periodic evaluations are due during the upcoming year. The portfolio shall be due by the date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically October 1).

* Note: “The start of the academic year,” when Faculty Affairs and Records informs the Department Chair and faculty members of pending post-tenure reviews, is determined by Faculty Affairs and Records. It is possible that the exact date will vary from year to year. Faculty are advised to keep track of the time elapsed since their last RTP evaluation or post-tenure evaluation so they know in advance the academic year in which their current post-tenure review will be due. Faculty members can check with Faculty Affairs and Records to confirm this timing.

C. Portfolio and Periodic Evaluation File Contents and Organization

1. Portfolio for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Evaluations
The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is that portion of the Personnel Action File (PAF) used during the time of Abbreviated Reviews or Full Performance Reviews. According to UPS 210.000, probationary faculty subject to Full Performance Review and tenured faculty applying for promotion shall prepare a portfolio with appendices. The Portfolio and appendices are the functional equivalent of the WPAF and the basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. The Portfolio summarizes the evidence for any RTP decision in the three areas of evaluation: Teaching, Scholarly and Creative
Activities, and Service. The appendices to the Portfolio provide the documentation for the materials referred to in the Portfolio. The portfolio and appendices shall be submitted in the format defined by current Faculty Affairs and Records procedures. At the time of this writing, the format is an online submission of all files.

For Probationary Faculty, the Portfolio and its Appendices 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 Department Chair. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio and its Appendices.

For Tenured Faculty, the Portfolio and its 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 Department Chair.

In the Portfolio and Appendices, faculty members shall describe and document significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the period under review. Activities occurring outside the period of review shall not be submitted or evaluated. Quality over quantity shall be emphasized. Note, however, that all accomplishments shall be listed in the Portfolio CV (described in Section II. B. of UPS 210.000). A clear connection among the narratives, the Table of Contents of the Appendix, the Portfolio, and the documents or artifacts in the Appendix shall be established. The Portfolio and accompanying Appendices shall be prepared following guidelines provided by the Faculty Affairs and Records office and organized as directed in UPS 210.000 Section II. B. 4.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the completeness of the Portfolio and Appendices.

2. Periodic Evaluation File for Post-Tenure Periodic Evaluations
Tenured faculty undergoing post-tenure periodic evaluation shall submit a Periodic Evaluation File that briefly describes their work in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service during the most recent post-tenure review period. The post-tenure review period is defined as five years since the last RTP evaluation or post-tenure evaluation, whichever was last. Faculty in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to submit a post-tenure review file unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed or the Dean requests that the faculty member be reviewed. Tenured faculty shall not be subject to a post-tenure periodic evaluation while on sabbatical or approved leave-of-absence; these files will be evaluated in the next academic year. The Periodic Evaluation File shall be submitted in the format defined by current Faculty Affairs and Records procedures. At the time of this writing, the format is an online submission. The Periodic Evaluation File shall contain the following elements:

a. A current CV that includes information about teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. The CV shall indicate clearly which activities were completed during the post-tenure review period (e.g., by including dates and highlighting or different colored font).

b. A brief narrative (two pages maximum) that states the faculty member’s most significant achievements during the period of review and the faculty member’s goals regarding teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the next five
years.

c. University-generated statistical summary reports of student opinion questionnaires (SOQs) and SOQ comments for all courses taught during the post-tenure review period.*

The faculty member shall not submit documentation of activities and accomplishments reported in the Periodic Evaluation File. Only the required elements listed above (VII.C.2.a-c) shall be submitted.

* Note: Summary tables and documents written by the faculty member shall not fulfill these requirements. Statistical summary reports of student opinion questionnaires shall be the official, university-generated documents. Only the summary reports for each, individual course section taught by the faculty member during the review period shall be included. Summaries that combine data from all courses taught by the faculty member in a semester and summaries that combine data from all courses taught by the entire Department shall not fulfill these requirements.

VIII. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

All tenure-track and tenured faculty undergoing RTP evaluation shall be evaluated in three performance categories: (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activities, and (3) service to the Department, College, University, profession, and community. High quality performance is expected of each faculty member in all three areas. However, in support of the centrality of “advancement of learning” to the mission of the University, and in compliance with UPS 210.002, the primary emphasis in the retention, tenure, and promotion process shall be on teaching performance. Scholarly and creative activities, also an essential part of faculty activity, is the second most important performance category.

A. Teaching Performance

The Department expects that each faculty member shall demonstrate effective teaching (both in and outside of the classroom) at all levels of review. Students’ opinions of teaching are an important (though not decisive) means of assessing the quality of teaching. Of at least equal importance are self-assessment in the narrative summary of teaching performance; peer evaluations; quality of pedagogical approach, instructional materials, and course content; documentation of student learning; effective methods of maintaining appropriate levels of rigor, evaluating, and grading students; and evidence of ongoing professional development with respect both to maintaining currency in the field and to pedagogical growth. In all cases, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to describe the quality of the teaching performance.

As stated in UPS 210.002, each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio and Appendices according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple indicators of teaching performance. These shall include mandatory indicators, academic grading standards, and additional indicators demonstrated in the portfolio.
The following indicators and criteria are used in evaluating teaching performance.

1. **Mandatory Indicators**

   To be included in the Portfolio:

   a. **Table of contents of the Portfolio** (refer to UPS 210.000).

   b. **Table of contents of the Appendix to Portfolio** (refer to UPS 210.000).

   c. **Approved Departmental Personnel Standards** (i.e., a copy of this document).

   d. **Prospectus** – A copy of the same narrative that was prepared in Year 1.

   e. **Portfolio CV** (refer to UPS 210.000).

   f. **Self-assessment in the teaching narrative** (limited to 1000 words) – The narrative summary of teaching performance shall include a reflective self-assessment discussing the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and performance, as well as future goals and directions. The teaching narrative also may include a discussion of teaching objectives, methods, and evaluation procedures (including grading distributions relative to academic standards). Additionally, it shall address ongoing professional activities with respect to development both within the discipline (e.g., professional conferences) and pedagogical development (e.g., trainings and workshops). When areas of concern have been identified in previous RTP evaluations, the faculty member shall include in the teaching narrative a discussion of specific strategies that have been used to address these concerns.

   g. **List of courses taught** – This list shall include a semester-by-semester listing of all course sections taught during the review period. The listing shall include the semester, year, course number, title, and unit value. If assigned time was received, the weighted teaching unit value shall be listed along with an explanation of the assigned-time activity.

   h. **A blank copy of the Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) form** – The version used by the Department during the period of review.

   i. **Statistical summary reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires** – Student opinion questionnaires (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. University-generated statistical summary reports and compiled reports of qualitative comments for each course section taught by the faculty member during the period of review shall be included in the main portfolio. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data shall also be provided for all service-credit years. If not available, a written explanation, verified by the faculty member’s former supervisor, shall be included.

   Evaluations of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to questions on SOQs and contained in written comments on
these forms. The evaluations shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, the characteristics of the classes taught (e.g., size, level, content, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, face-to-face vs. online vs. hybrid vs. other format). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance.

j. Statistical summary reports of grade distributions and grade point averages* – Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught. The University-generated statistical summary reports of the grade distribution for each course section taught by the faculty member, including grade point average (GPA), shall be provided. If (and only if) the University-generated reports are not available, the faculty member shall calculate and provide these statistics. The evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades assigned in each course section taught. Grade point averages for course sections shall range between 2.0 - 3.2 for lower division courses (i.e., 100- and 200-level courses), 2.3 - 3.3 for upper division courses (i.e., 300- and 400-level courses), and 3.2 - 3.8 for graduate courses (i.e., 500-level courses and higher). If a course section has lower or higher grade distributions than Department standards, the faculty member shall provide an explanation and include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy the problem.

Credit/No Credit grades do not affect students’ individual GPA or a course section’s overall GPA. Therefore, for classes with Credit/No Credit Only grading, the proportion of students with Credit grades versus No Credit grades shall not be considered in the evaluation of a faculty member’s academic standards. Instead, the faculty member’s course syllabi, instructional materials, and self-assessment of academic rigor in the teaching narrative shall be weighted more heavily in evaluating rigor in Credit/No Credit Only courses.

Likewise, GPAs shall not be considered in evaluation of academic standards in supervision classes (e.g., PUBH 494, 495, 499, 595, 597, 598, 599), honors classes (e.g., PUBH 497), and other supervision courses. Instead, the faculty member’s course syllabi, instructional materials, and self-assessment of academic rigor in the teaching narrative shall be weighted more heavily in evaluating rigor in supervision courses.

*Note: Summary tables and documents written by the faculty member shall not fulfill these requirements. Statistical summary reports of student opinion questionnaires and grade distribution reports (with GPAs) shall be the official, university-generated documents. Only the summary reports for each, individual course section taught by the faculty member during the review period shall be included. Summaries that combine data from all courses taught by the faculty member in a semester and summaries that combine data from all courses taught by the entire Department shall not fulfill these requirements.
To be included in the Appendix:

k. **Course syllabi and instructional materials** – For each course taught during the review period, syllabi and instructional materials shall be included for one section of each format. An example would be a faculty member who taught two different courses during the review period. All sections of Course 1 were taught in a face-to-face format for the entire review period, so materials from one section of that course would be required. For Course 2, several sections were taught fully online during the review period, while several other sections were taught face-to-face. Thus, for Course 2, materials from one fully online section and materials from one face-to-face section would be required. In addition to a syllabus, submitted teaching materials for a course section shall include examples of lecture documents (or equivalent), directions for assignments, directions for class activities, rubrics (if used), quizzes, and exams, as appropriate to the course content described in each class syllabus.

l. **Individual Student Opinion Questionnaires** – The original, student-completed SOQ forms for each course section shall be provided. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data, if available, shall also be provided for all service-credit years. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses and course sections over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.

2. **Additional Indicators**

Not all of the following indicators (a - e) are mandatory. Refer to Criteria for Assignment of Ratings for Teaching, below, to gauge how many indicators need to be demonstrated to merit ratings of excellent, good, or unsatisfactory.

a. **Pedagogical Approach and Methods**

The primary objective of pedagogy is to help students learn. Evaluation of teaching performance shall address those factors that contribute to effective pedagogy, including the following: the appropriateness of the breadth, depth, and quality of course content to the level of each course taught; the currency of the topics and relevancy of the assignments; and the effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures. Faculty members may contribute to student learning by such activities as: 1) academic advising, 2) development of new courses/curricula or revisions to current courses/curricula, 3) use of innovative approaches for teaching, fostering, and/or assessing student learning, such as development or refinement of teaching techniques, class activities, assignments, means of student assessment, or instructional technologies, 4) mentoring and/or supervision of internships and independent studies, 5) mentoring and/or supervision of student scholar programs (e.g., McNair, Sally Casanova programs), 6) supervision of student theses/projects/comprehensive exams, or 7) other similar activities supporting teaching effectiveness.

b. **Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**

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

c. **Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline**
All faculty members are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by conference participation and/or other professional interaction with their colleagues. Scholarly and creative activities are expected to be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and in student participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings.

d. **Classroom Visitations**
Classroom visitations (i.e., peer evaluations) by Department colleagues, if included, shall 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. Assessment shall be in the context of the level and objectives of the course. Assessments by external evaluators may be included.

e. **Honors or Awards Recognizing Outstanding Teaching**
Honors or awards recognizing teaching excellence, presented to faculty by CSUF, other universities, government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, professional organizations, or community-based organizations or other community groups relevant to the faculty member’s area of work, shall be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness.

**Rating Criteria**

The overall rating for teaching performance shall be based on a combination of: 1) self-assessment in the narrative summary of teaching performance; 2) student opinion questionnaires, 3) course grade point averages, 4) course syllabi and instructional materials, and 5) additional indicators of teaching effectiveness. Based upon the total evidence provided, the reviewers will rate the faculty member’s overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. It shall be noted that a faculty member’s teaching performance generally is rated according to the same criteria across all ranks. Reviewers shall use their professional judgment in evaluating the quality of all performance indicators. Course content and materials should broadly comply with Department, College, and University policies and guidelines (e.g., syllabus content requirements, established course learning objectives, relevant University Policy Statements). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member’s overall level of experience, progress made over time, and their efforts to improve teaching performance, as well as details and rationale provided in the narrative that may explain exceptions that stand apart from the overall pattern of teaching performance or that may lend support for a particular rating.
Criteria for Assignment of Ratings for Teaching:

“Excellent” Appropriate rating when a faculty member has achieved the following: 1) clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; 2) a weighted average of 85% or more of student opinion questionnaires at A and B ratings*; 3) a pattern of mostly positive qualitative comments in student opinion questionnaires; 4) grade distributions, as measured by grade point averages, that fall within the Department guidelines; 5) documented evidence of high quality course syllabi and instructional materials; and 6) documented evidence of excellence in at least three additional and different indicators of teaching effectiveness (VI.A.2.a-e) by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.

“Good” Appropriate rating when a faculty member has achieved the following: 1) clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; 2) a weighted average of 70-84.9% of student opinion questionnaires at A and B ratings*; 3) a pattern of mostly positive qualitative comments in student opinion questionnaires; 4) grade distributions, as measured by grade point averages, that fall within the Department guidelines; 5) documented evidence of high quality course syllabi and instructional materials; and 6) documented evidence of good quality in at least two additional and different indicators of teaching effectiveness (VI.A.2.a-e) by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.

“Unsatisfactory” Appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either an “Excellent” or “Good” rating as outlined above.

*Weighted by the number of completed student evaluations in each course section.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities

Faculty members at every level are expected to engage in focused, ongoing scholarly and creative activity. It is the position of the University and this Department that such activity enhances the professional growth and teaching effectiveness of the individual faculty member, contributes to the advancement of the field, provides increased learning opportunities for students, and enhances the overall reputation of the Department and the University. The faculty member shall provide a 1000-word self-evaluation in the narrative summary of scholarly and creative activities describing their: (1) scholarly and creative agenda, (2) accomplishments during the period of review, (3) work in progress, and (4) future plans. The self-assessment shall be supported by appropriate documentation, with any collaborative work clearly described in terms of individual contributions in the narrative.

Scholarly and creative activities shall be rated at three hierarchical levels. In general, Level I includes evidence of work in progress and ongoing activity. Level II includes accomplishments that are an important part of one’s scholarly agenda, such as scholarly presentations and lectures, article and book reviews, and minor grants and contracts, but generally are one step below that of Level III. Level III includes the publication of one’s work in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, and in scholarly books, chapters, edited volumes, or other comparable outlets as well as obtaining major external grants and
contracts.

For all coauthored publications, documentation of the unique and specific contribution of each author to the work shall be included. The documentation requirement differs according to the faculty member’s type of authorship. Publications on which the faculty member was a major author should be accompanied by a co-author form (available from the FAR office) signed by at least the first author and the corresponding author on the publication (these may be the same person) and the faculty member. An email or letter from the first author and corresponding author clearly describing the faculty member’s role in the publication may be substituted for a signed co-author form. In rare cases when the first author and corresponding author do not respond to repeated requests from the faculty member to provide such documentation, this should be discussed in the narrative and accompanied by documentation (e.g., emails) of faculty requests.

Publications on which the faculty member was the first author or a minor author do not require a co-author form, letter, or email. Instead, the faculty member shall write and submit a separate document (typically one page maximum) describing the faculty member’s and all other coauthors’ contributions. This document shall include a complete list of all coauthors, including the faculty member; the type of authorship for the faculty member (i.e., first author or minor author) and for each coauthor (i.e., first author, corresponding author, major author, minor author); and a specific description of the faculty member’s and each coauthor’s contributions to the publication. This document does not require any signatures.

Publications on which the faculty member was the solo author do not require any documentation related to coauthorship.

Shared first authorship shall not meet the requirement for first authorship.

The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activities may be evidenced through: (1) creation of new knowledge, (2) integration of knowledge, and/or (3) dissemination of knowledge. It is expected that over the period of review faculty members’ scholarly and creative activities shall result in high quality, peer-reviewed pieces of work – i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles or other comparable works. The Department recognizes that although book chapters, books, and edited volumes typically undergo a different process from that of peer-reviewed journal articles, in many cases they can represent high-level scholarly activity that also may include important contributions to the field. Therefore, books authored by the faculty member, edited volumes, and invited book chapters also shall be rated as Level III publications if they are of high quality, comprise significant scholarly contributions, and are published or in press with a scholarly publisher. (Note: tenure and/or promotion requires a minimum of three high-quality peer-reviewed journal articles.) The Committee will determine whether a scholarly work is high quality, comprises significant scholarly contributions, and is published or in press with a scholarly publisher based upon documentation provided by the faculty member in the Portfolio. Examples of indicators of quality and significant scholarly contributions include, but are not limited to, journal acceptance records, publication distribution figures, journal impact factors and other measures of citation frequency by other authors, the scope of the publication (regional, national, or international), the quality of the editorial board and review process (blind vs. non-blind), and the extent of the faculty member’s contribution in the case of co-authored work. Examples of scholarly publishers include, but are not limited to, university presses, government agencies, reputable nongovernmental and international agencies, and presses
with a documented record of publishing high quality scholarly works (e.g., SAGE, Elsevier, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Jones & Bartlett). Grants submitted, especially those awarded, shall strengthen performance in this category. These may be parent grants, competitive supplements, or other competitive formats. Other indicators adding support to the faculty member’s scholarly and creative accomplishments are works in progress and other non-peer-reviewed publications and achievements.

The quality of the scholarly and creative work shall be the primary consideration in the evaluation process. Quantity of output also will be considered, mainly as it pertains to meeting or exceeding minimum counts at different levels of performance. In rare cases when a scholarly or creative activity is of a particularly high level of quality, comprises an especially large amount of content, or has made an exceptionally major impact on the discipline or on professional practice, it may be appropriate to assign additional weight to it (e.g., to assign a single activity the weight and equivalent count of two or more activities). Note, however, that even in rare cases when a scholarly or creative activity is counted as two or more activities, the three-peer-reviewed-journal-article minimum requirement for tenure and/or promotion shall be met only by publishing three separate articles during the review period. In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document the importance of their work, their contributions in the case of co-authored works, as well as the quality of their publications and the outlets where their work appears.

It is the position of the Department that collaborative research/scholarly and creative efforts are of benefit to the institution as well as to the individual. For tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and creative category shall include at least three high-quality peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be first or solo author, and the other two at least major author. Books, edited volumes, or invited book chapters published or in press with a scholarly publisher, on which the faculty member had at least major authorship (or major editor, only for edited volumes), shall be rated as Level III publications, but shall not count toward the minimum three-journal-article requirement for tenure and/or promotion. However, books, edited volumes, and invited book chapters shall be counted in determining the level of scholarly performance – i.e., “Excellent” vs. “Good” vs. “Unsatisfactory.” A major author is defined as a co-author who made major contributions to key aspects of the scholarly activity documented in the publication (e.g., research study, evaluation, review, project) and wrote a major portion of the publication itself. If all criteria in this definition are met and sufficiently documented, a major author can be listed in various positions in the actual order of authorship on a publication. A major editor (edited volumes only) is defined as an editor or co-editor of a book or volume that contains several chapters by different authors, and whose work included at least conceptualizing the volume, inviting authors, organizing the volume, writing a section that synthesizes content from multiple authors, and ushering the volume through publication. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document major contributions to the publication (e.g., formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the study design, planning or conducting the data analysis, interpreting the results, writing a major portion of the publication).
The following hierarchical categorization of activities presents typical examples of performance indicators at Levels I, II, and III.

**Level I**
- Research studies or other scholarly projects in progress
- Papers, books, chapters, or edited volumes submitted for publication
- Abstracts or papers submitted for presentation at professional conferences or meetings
- Presentations in CSUF research seminars
- Grant proposals submitted
- Participation in research professional development (e.g., research trainings and workshops)
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level II**
- Peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences or meetings
- Invited/commissioned scholarly papers, reports, professional documents, presentations, and lectures
- Tutorials, guidelines, other professional or community training materials
- Published peer-reviewed abstracts or papers published in conference proceedings
- Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)
- Short communications, brief articles, research briefs, and other short-form (i.e., non-full-length) journal articles.
- Commentaries, letters to the editor, editorials, and other journal pieces that are non-peer-reviewed.
- Published book reviews
- Chapters, books, edited volumes (non-scholarly publishers)
- Other articles, reports (non-peer-reviewed)
- Peer-reviewed manuscripts accepted for publication with required changes pending (as first, solo, or major author)
- Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)
- Significant contributions to minor grants and contracts received, including intramural grants *
- Honors or awards recognizing outstanding scholarly activity, presented to faculty by CSUF, other universities, government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, professional organizations, or community-based organizations or other community groups relevant to the faculty member’s area of work
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level III**
- High-quality articles published or in press (as first or solo author, or major author) in major peer-reviewed scholarly journals
- High quality books, edited volumes, and invited book chapters, published or in press (as first or solo author/editor or major author/editor) with scholarly publishers, that comprise significant scholarly contributions
- Significant contributions to major, externally funded grants and contracts awarded; or two or more minor grants that together are equivalent to the level of a major grant or contract (e.g., as Principal Investigator, Co-PI, or equivalent role)*
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

* A major, externally funded grant or contract is defined as funding awarded by an agency
external to CSUF that has a total value of at least $100,000, or has a high level of prestige, or was highly competitive, as determined by the Committee based upon faculty explanation in the narrative and supporting documentation. All other grants shall be considered minor. If the grant or contract is a multi-institution grant with the CSUF faculty member as a sub-contractor, then the total grant award amount to all institutions may be taken into account. A combination of two or more minor grants or contracts to which the faculty member has provided significant contributions that together are equivalent to the level of a major grant or contract, in terms of dollar amount, level of prestige, or level of competitiveness, shall be equivalent to a major grant or contract, as determined by the Committee based upon faculty explanation in the narrative and supporting documentation.

Although multiple indicators are listed in Level III, it shall be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly and creative work in the field and, thus, are expected to be part of a faculty member’s accomplishments at each level of review.

Criteria for Assignment of Ratings for Scholarly and Creative Activity:

“Excellent”  Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least one high quality indicator in Level I, five or more high quality indicators in Level II and four or more high quality indicators in Level III, thus surpassing the requirements for a rating of “Good.” Note that for tenure and/or promotion, a faculty member shall have at least three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be first or solo author, and the other two at least major author.

“Good”  Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least one high quality indicator in Level I, at least three high quality indicators in Level II, and at least three high quality indicators in Level III. Note that for tenure and/or promotion, a faculty member shall have at least three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be first or solo author, and the other two at least major author.

“Unsatisfactory”  Appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either “Excellent” or “Good” ratings outlined above.

Notes: (1) Exceptions to the above ratings are possible, but rare. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration should be given. (2) The list of scholarly activity examples above is not exhaustive. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe scholarly activities not listed here and provide rationale for the level of scholarly and creative activity that they propose. The documentation of such exceptions will be considered and evaluated by the Committee during Portfolio reviews. (3) Faculty undergoing RTP evaluations should be aware that it is possible (although not typical) for a specific activity to be categorized at different levels (i.e., Level I, II, III) by different Committees in different years of evaluation. Therefore, for each full review, it is especially important for faculty to explain activities for which they expect a rating at Level III in the narrative and provide sufficient documentation in the appropriate appendix to support that level.
C. Department, College, University, Professional, and Community Service

All faculty members are expected to participate in appropriate Department, College, University, professional, and community service activities. Faculty members are expected to actively serve the needs of the Department, College, University, profession, and community by participating in a broad range of campus activities and in external activities in the profession and community. All faculty members, after their first probationary year, are expected to make noteworthy contributions towards the work of the Department, College, and University as they conduct their business and serve the community. In the area of professional service, such activity is expected to surpass that of simply belonging to relevant organizations and attending conferences. As faculty members progress through their careers, it is expected that they will engage significantly in professional activities such as serving on professional committees, assuming leadership positions, serving as program planners, conducting seminars and workshops, and serving as professional consultants, on editorial boards, and/or as reviewers of scholarly/professional materials. Faculty shall describe their service accomplishments in the narrative summary of professional, university, and community service activities (1000 words maximum). Service shall be rated at three hierarchical levels. **Level III** denotes major leadership roles. These typically involve sustained activities, a large scope of work, high level of effort, and large impact; however, the key aspect of Level III activities is serving as the primary leader in a defined area of service. **Level II** denotes minor leadership roles, active membership on committees and other work groups, and a broad range of significant service work that does not meet the threshold of major leadership roles at Level III. **Level I** denotes minor service work that is of relatively limited duration; involves infrequent activities or meetings; has a small scope of work or low level of effort; or involves membership on committees or in organizations, or attendance at conferences and professional meetings, but does not include the significant work activities associated with Level II. The following represents a sample breakdown of typical service activities into these three hierarchical categories.

**Level I**
- Membership in professional organizations
- Membership on minor Department, College, or University committees (i.e., relatively limited duration within an academic year, infrequent activities or meetings, small scope of work, low level of effort)
- Attendance at conferences, professional meetings, workshops (i.e., separate from conferences at which the faculty member’s presentations are made)
- Media interviews
- Minor guest lectures (i.e., relatively short preparation time, low level of effort)
- Minor pro bono consultant activities (i.e., relatively short preparation time, low level of effort)
- Honors or awards recognizing outstanding service presented to faculty by student groups
- Other service judged by peers to be of comparable significance

**Level II**
- Active membership on or co-chair of major Department, College, or University committees (i.e., relatively long duration within an academic year, frequent meetings or activities, large scope of work, high level of effort)
- Active membership on professional committees
- Course lead in Department
• Chair of minor Department, College, or University committees (i.e., leadership of committee with relatively limited duration within an academic year, infrequent activities or meetings, small scope of work, low level of effort)
• Co-director of center or lab
• Reviewer of professional journals, conference papers/abstracts, or books
• Ad hoc membership on grant or contract proposal review panels for government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, foundations, universities (including CSUF), and other grant-making organizations (i.e., one time; not sustained over time)
• Session organizer/moderator/chair at professional conferences
• Conference/workshop presentations (separate from research/scholarly presentations – e.g., delivering pedagogical presentations, continuing education courses/workshops)
• Organizer of minor functions/workshops/seminars/panels/events in university (including CSUF), professional, or community settings
• Major pro bono consultant activities (i.e., relatively long preparation, high level of effort)
• Participation/discussant on advisory boards, professional/community panels
• Participation in professional, government, non-governmental, or community efforts/events related to policy change
• Major guest lectures, presentations, and trainings (i.e., relatively long preparation, high level of effort)
• Agency supervisor/preceptor for student internships (separate from student interns assisting with faculty scholarly activities)
• Faculty advisor for campus student organization or equivalent
• Planning, accompanying, advising, and/or mentoring students in educational programs (e.g., study abroad programs, domestic educational trips)
• Honors or awards recognizing outstanding service presented to faculty by CSUF, other universities, government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, professional organizations, or community based organizations or other community groups relevant to the faculty member’s area of service
• Other service judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Level III
• Chair of major Department, College, or University committee (i.e., leadership of committee with relatively long duration within an academic year, frequent activities or meetings, large scope of work, high level of effort)
• Major academic program coordinator (e.g., coordinator of Department undergraduate program, coordinator of MPH program)
• Department internship program coordinator (undergraduate or graduate levels)
• Center or lab director
• Concentration lead in Department
• Elected or appointed office or service position in national or regional professional association with major leadership role
• Active membership on the editorial board or section editor of a professional journal
• Program Chair or equal Program co-Chair of a major conference of a professional organization
• Chair or sustained leadership role on major grant or contract proposal review panels for government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, foundations, universities (including CSUF), and other grant-making organizations (i.e., sustained over time)
• Organizer of major functions/workshops/seminars/events in university (including
CSUF), professional, or community settings (i.e., major leadership role with relatively long preparation, high level of effort, large impact, or reaching a significant number of people)

- Major leadership role in political, advocacy, community organizing, professional engagement, communicating with policymakers, or other equivalent leadership that has led demonstratively to health-related policy change or provision of services at the local, regional, national, or international level
- Other major service activities judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Notes: (1) For faculty undergoing evaluation with retention, tenure, and promotion actions, sufficient documentation of each service activity is required. At minimum, documents submitted to support a service activity shall include an official listing of the faculty member’s name, dates within the review period, and written evidence of activities clearly commensurate with the role claimed and level (III, II, I) expected. (2) The list of service examples above is not exhaustive. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe service activities not listed here and provide rationale for the level of service that they propose. It is the responsibility of the Committee to consider and evaluate such contributions. (3) Faculty undergoing RTP evaluations should be aware that it is possible (although not typical) for a specific activity to be categorized at different levels (i.e., Level I, II, III) by different Committees in different years of evaluation. Therefore, it is especially important for faculty to explain in the narrative the leadership roles in service activities for which they expect a rating at Level III, and to provide sufficient documentation in the appropriate appendix to support that level.

Definitions of Professional, University, and Community Service Indicators:

For most service work, a single indicator is defined as a discrete service activity, irrespective of its duration. For example, chairing a major Department committee for three years typically would count as a single indicator of service at Level III, and active membership on two major Department committees for one year each would count as two Level II indicators.*

For some service activities, the number of indicators will depend on a reasonable assessment of the type of work output. For example, five manuscript peer reviews completed for journals typically would count as five Level II indicators; however, 10 abstracts reviewed for a professional conference typically would count as one Level II indicator.

*Note: there are minimum durations of Level III service activities that are required for ratings of “Excellent” and “Good” (see section below on ratings).

Criteria for assignment of ratings for Professional, University, and Community Service:

“Excellent” Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least three high quality indicators in Level I; 10 or more high quality indicators in Level II, at least four of which shall be in the Department; and three or more separate, high quality indicators in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of “Good” by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion. A minimum total of five years of service in Level III activities is required to be rated as “Excellent.” The five years may be combined from two or more Level III service activities. At least two of the Level III service activities shall each include a minimum of two years of service. At least one service activity in the profession, one service activity in the college or university (i.e.,
separate from department service requirement), and one service activity in the community are required to be rated as “Excellent”; these can be at any level (Level I – III), as long as the other requirements are met.

“Good” Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least two high quality indicators in Level I; seven high quality indicators in Level II, at least three of which shall be in the Department; and at least two high quality indicators in Level III by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion. A minimum total of three years of service in Level III activities is required to be rated as “Good.” The three years may be combined from two or more Level III service activities. At least one of the Level III service activities shall include a minimum of two years of service. At least one service activity in the profession, one service activity in the college or university (i.e., separate from department service requirement), and one service activity in the community are required to be rated as “Good”; these can be at any level (Level I – III), as long as the other requirements are met.

“Unsatisfactory” Appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either “Excellent” or “Good” ratings outlined above.

Note: Exceptions to the above ratings are possible, but rare. For example, in rare cases, it is possible that any one indicator of service may be so important (qualitatively or quantitatively) that it deserves as much weight as two or three indicators normally would. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such possible exceptions and to document why special consideration should be given.

IX. Guidelines for Applying Evaluation Criteria in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions

A. Retention during Probationary Years
   A recommendation for retention is contingent upon making sufficient progress toward the requirements for tenure and promotion in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. For teaching, sufficient progress for second-year faculty means submission of required materials in the portfolio, a clear and reasonable teaching philosophy, and a thoughtful strategy for improvement based on self-assessment in the teaching narrative. For third-year faculty, sufficient progress in teaching includes the same criteria for second-year faculty, plus demonstrating any needed improvements in grade distributions, SOQ scores, and instructional materials; and for fourth- and fifth-year faculty, it includes the same criteria as second- and third-year faculty, plus at least one additional indicator of teaching effectiveness (VIII.A.2.a-e). For scholarly and creative activities, sufficient progress for second- and third-year faculty means achieving at least one Level II indicator; and for fourth- and fifth-year faculty, it means achieving at least three Level II indicators and one Level III indicator. For service, sufficient progress for second-year faculty means achieving at least two Level I indicators; for third-year faculty, it means achieving at least three Level II indicators; and for fourth- and fifth-year faculty, it means achieving at least five Level II indicators and one Level III indicator.
B. **Tenure Requirements**
   A person recommended for tenure shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in either teaching or scholarly and creative activities, with no less than a “Good” rating in the other two categories. This applies both to faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor and to those hired at the rank of Probationary (Untenured) Associate Professor.

C. **Promotion to Associate Professor**
   For faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor, promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

D. **Concurrent Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor**
   Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member who was hired at the rank of Assistant Professor may be considered for concurrent early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF. A person so recommended shall have met the expectations for “Excellent” in all three categories: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. A faculty member applying for concurrent early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor shall submit the appropriate declaration form(s) to FAR by the established deadline at the beginning of the fall semester.

E. **Promotion of Tenured Faculty to Professor**
   According to UPS 210.002, promotion of a tenured faculty member to Professor shall normally be considered during their fifth year in rank as an Associate Professor (i.e., after having completed four years in rank), with promotion taking effect at the beginning of the sixth year. By the due date established by Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) at the beginning of the fifth year (typically the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester), a tenured faculty member shall submit a promotion declaration form (available on the FAR website) indicating whether they (1) do not want to be considered for promotion, (2) want to be considered for normative-time promotion, or (3) want to be considered for early promotion. Tenured faculty members seeking promotion to Professor shall submit a Portfolio to the Department for full review. Tenured faculty members who declare that they do not seek promotion to Professor in the fifth year will undergo post-tenure review and may request promotion consideration in a future academic year by submitting a new promotion declaration form to FAR by the established deadline at the beginning of the fall semester.

According to FAR, the first year in rank is counted from the date the faculty member received official notice of tenure, promotion, or tenure and promotion. Therefore, the period between *submission* of Portfolio materials to be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion (i.e., from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor) and *official receipt of tenure and/or promotion* is effectively “Year Zero.” All teaching, scholarly, and service activities completed by the faculty member after submission of Portfolio materials for tenure and/or promotion to the current rank (i.e., Associate Professor), including those completed during “Year Zero,” shall be counted toward promotion to Professor.
There is no time limit for tenured faculty to submit a Portfolio to be considered for promotion to Professor. According to UPS 210.002, in cases where there has been more than six years since the most recent performance review (granting of tenure, promotion, or tenure and promotion), the most recent five years of evidence should normally be emphasized in evaluating a record of continuing performance, but shall not exclude consideration of total productivity over the entire period.

The decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record of sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all categories, using the same evaluation criteria for levels of performance as those for tenure (noted above). At a minimum, a person recommended for promotion to Professor shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in two categories with no less than “Good” in the third category.

F. Early Promotion of Tenured Faculty to Professor

According to UPS 210.000, promotion consideration of a tenured faculty member prior to having completed four years in rank shall be defined as “early.’” A faculty member applying for early promotion to Professor shall submit a promotion declaration form to FAR by the established deadline (typically the end of the second week of classes of the fall semester). The same evaluation criteria for levels of performance as those for tenure (noted above) shall be used. According to UPS 210.002, early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of “Excellent.”

G. Concurrent Tenure and Promotion of a Probationary Associate Professor to Professor

A faculty member who was hired at the rank of probationary (untenured) Associate Professor can be recommended for promotion to Professor only concurrently with a recommendation for tenure. This dual personnel action normally shall be considered at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. At a minimum, a probationary (untenured) Associate Professor recommended for concurrent tenure and promotion to Professor shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in two categories with no less than “Good” in the third category.

H. Concurrent Early Tenure and Early Promotion of a Probationary Associate Professor to Professor

Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member who was hired at the rank of probationary (untenured) Associate Professor may be considered for concurrent early tenure and early promotion to Professor after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF. A person so recommended shall have met the expectations for “Excellent” in all three categories: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. A probationary (untenured) Associate Professor applying for concurrent early tenure and early promotion to Professor shall submit the appropriate declaration form to FAR by the established deadline at the beginning of the fall semester.

X. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

The purpose of post-tenure periodic evaluations is to encourage and maintain excellent performance in a tenured faculty member’s work. Such periodic evaluation shall be conducted within the confines of the protections of tenure with special care and consideration to the principle of academic freedom. Moreover, the periodic evaluation is intended to be an occasion for consultation with colleagues, whose aim should be the encouragement and maintenance of excellence; an acknowledgment of positive contributions made by tenured faculty; and a time to
reflect on opportunities for professional development.

As noted previously in this document, post-tenure periodic evaluations do not result in a recommendation for personnel action. However, at the end of the periodic evaluation process, the Dean shall forward to Faculty Affairs and Records all summary statements and responses or rebuttals for placement in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File.
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1. Student's Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>I attended class regularly (or logged on to Blackboard regularly for online course).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>I participated in class regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>My work for this class represented my best efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>I enjoyed the material covered in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Evaluation of Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The instructor presented the subject matter effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The instructor seemed up-to-date in his/her knowledge of the subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The instructor presented the requirements of the course clearly (e.g. assignment, grading scale/criteria, attendance, readings, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The instructor demonstrated interest in student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Examinations covered subject matter adequately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>The instructor provided feedback regarding assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Overall, this was a valuable learning experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3. Comments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td>What did the instructor do that you found particularly helpful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
<td>What could the instructor do to have improved the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td>Other comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>