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1.0 Preface
The Department of Communications (hereafter called the "Department") proposes a personnel
document, consistent with the University Mission and Goals and with UPS 210.000, which
describes the criteria for assessing faculty productivity with respect to retention, tenure, and
promotion.

2.0 Scope of Document
This document summarizes the Department’s policies and procedures with respect to a
candidate’s preparation of a prospectus and portfolio; the criteria to be used in the evaluation of
portfolios during the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process; and the selection and
function of the Department Personnel Committee.

3.0 Preparation of Prospectus
During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, probationary faculty shall write a
Prospectus for each of the following areas: teaching; scholarly and creative activities; and service.
These narratives, not to exceed 500 words each, shall describe the faculty member’s professional
goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments he or she expects to achieve in
each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet department standards for retention, tenure, and
promotion. The Prospectus will be submitted to the department chair and college dean or
equivalent, and written feedback will be provided in accordance with published University
review schedules. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio for all Full
Performance Reviews.

The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio and may be revised in
subsequent years to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during
the probationary period.

The department chair will consult with the newly appointed probationary faculty member. The
chair may encourage the faculty member to select one or more tenured faculty members as
mentor(s). 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.

4.0 Portfolio
The Portfolio is the basis for future retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. For retention
and tenure, the time under review includes all probationary years at CSUF plus any years for
which the candidate received credit for service at another institution. Associate professors
who are not probationary faculty (i.e., those with tenure) shall submit the most recent five
years of statistical data (Student Opinion Questionnaire [SOQ] summaries and all raw forms)
and information covering scholarly and creative and service activities for all years since the
last positive RTP action. Each faculty member under review for a personnel action shall
prepare a Portfolio or an abbreviated review file as detailed in UPS 210.000.

5.0 Preparation of the Portfolio or Abbreviated Review File
It shall be the responsibility of each faculty member to prepare information and/or documentation
for his or her Portfolio, based on the following areas of performance: (1) teaching performance
that advances student learning; (2) scholarly and creative activity that fosters peer/discipline

6.0 Evaluation of Portfolio

learning; and (3) professional, university, and community service that supports the advancement of the learning community. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make contributions in all three of the above areas to become a contributing citizen in our community of learners. Retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) require that increasing levels of achievement be demonstrated in these three areas.

The abbreviated review file shall be prepared as outlined in UPS 210.000:
Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their full performance reviews during year 2 or year 4 would, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit a “Review File.” The Review File comprises three items: (1) an updated curriculum vitae, (2) statistical summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review.

6.0 Performance Indicators
The role of faculty can be described in terms of the following endeavors:

- representing knowledge through teaching;
- advancing knowledge through scholarly and creative activities;
- sharing and applying knowledge through professional, university, and community service activities.

There are many activities in which faculty engage that range across these three categories. Any given activity, however, should be documented and evaluated in only one category. Faculty may exercise some discretion in making the case for which of the three categories they would like certain overlapping activities to be evaluated based on the guidelines offered in the sections below.

6.1 Teaching
Teaching effectiveness in the Department of Communications is gauged by the quality of instructional content, processes, and outcomes. As reflected in the teaching indicators in the Portfolio, candidates are judged on the quality of communication effectiveness, substance, and meaningful feedback, as well as a positive disposition toward teaching and impartial treatment of students. In seeking to meet these standards, faculty members are encouraged to consider the following.

Effective communication in teaching means that course objectives and requirements are made clear, materials are presented in an organized way, examples and illustrations are used, student interactions are encouraged, and the breadth and depth of the course content is appropriate to the level of each course.

Substantive teaching is based upon the candidate's demonstration of current field knowledge, stimulation of student thinking and the understanding of new ideas, and implementation of relevant assignments and high standards of student achievement. Meaningful feedback in teaching is based upon specific criteria, allows for new learning, is timely and addresses student questions as they occur inside and outside the classroom setting, and uses effective and fair methods of assessment.
Positive disposition in teaching is reflected in support for and encouragement of students and a clear interest in both the subject matter and teaching in general.

Impartiality in teaching relates to clearly defined, objective evaluation and unbiased treatment of students in the learning environment.

6.1.1 Indicators of Teaching Performance

6.1.1.1 Self-Assessment of Teaching Performance
1) Each faculty member shall assess his or her teaching goals and performance in no more than 1000 words in the narrative section of the Teaching Performance component of the Portfolio and explain to what degree his or her teaching has been consistent with the overall teaching expectations of the department. This narrative should address effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality.

2) Additionally, each faculty member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to maintain and improve his or her teaching effectiveness and maintain currency in the discipline. To insure proper consideration of supporting evidence, candidates should reference documentation in 6.1.1.2 in their narratives as support for their performance.

6.1.1.2 Documentation of Teaching Performance
1) Teaching assignments for each semester of the period covered by the review, including course name, schedule number, and weighted units for each course taught, and the number of new preparations, if any, shall be included. Characteristics of each class taught (size, level, required or elective, instructional format, experimental pedagogy, etc.) shall be listed. Units for assigned time shall also be listed, along with a description of activity for which assigned time was granted.

2) A syllabus for the most recent section of each course taught during the period of review shall be included.

3) All original student opinion questionnaires for all classes taught for academic credit during the years under review shall be included. If such data are not available (e.g., due to service credit being given for teaching at another school/university prior to appointment at CSUF), a letter from the faculty member’s previous or current supervisor attesting to his or her unavailability shall be provided. Faculty are encouraged to provide a summary of comment excerpts that speak to effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality. (See sample Appendix C.1.)

4) Statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires for each individual class and the overall summaries for each semester, intersession, and summer
session taught during the period of review shall be included. If such data are not available (e.g. due to service credit being given for teaching at another school/university prior to appointment at CSUF), a letter from the faculty member’s previous or current supervisor attesting to his or her unavailability shall be provided. Faculty shall provide a summary grid of rating scores for each course/term and calculate and report their overall average rating. (See Sample Template Appendix C.2.)

5) Statistical summaries of grade distributions for all classes taught at CSUF for academic credit during the period of review shall be included. Faculty shall provide a summary grid of grade averages for each course/term and calculate and report their overall grade average. (See Sample Template Appendix C.3.)

6) Statements relating to pedagogy, curricular relevance, measures of learning outcomes and other formal means of assessment, validity of instruction or material, and other philosophical or methodological considerations shall appear separately in the teaching narrative of the Portfolio. Documentation that is representative of the faculty member’s teaching activities shall be placed in the appendix. For each course taught, supporting materials shall include the course syllabus and teaching materials, such as representative handouts, examinations, assignments, course notes, or other materials that indicate how the course was taught.

7) Academic advising assignments for each semester of the period covered by the review, for example, the number of undergraduate majors the candidate was assigned for academic advisement and the number of graduate independent studies, projects and theses advised shall be included.

8) The Portfolio may include other evidence of teaching performance, such as:

- contributions to curriculum development,
- coordination of concentrations or multi-section courses,
- unsolicited letters from students,
- descriptions of independent study projects,
- written reports of classroom visitations by chair or personnel committee members and/or other university faculty (see UPS 210.000 for details),
- letters from faculty peer professionals,
- evidence of organizing and participating in seminars on teaching,
- research related to teaching communications disciplines,
- development of new programs or courses,
- development of new approaches to teaching standard courses,
- summaries of test scores, evaluations of student projects or papers, or similar evidence of student learning,
• summaries of written student comments and/or comments by others who have taken the course,
• evidence pertaining to withdrawals, enrollment in follow-up courses, or other evidence of student interest, and
• evidence of student-faculty interaction, such as advising and counseling, which may enhance student learning.

9) Teaching activities that may overlap with scholarly and creative and/or service activities include, but are not limited to, certain types of student advising or program or curriculum development beyond assigned time, professional activities of a professional nature, or papers or presentations on pedagogy. Candidates shall exercise their discretion in making a case for whether such an activity should be evaluated as teaching, scholarly and creative or service activity. Designations should be consistent for activities of a similar nature.

6.1.2 Grade Distribution Guidelines
The department encourages the application of consistent grading practices among members of its faculty. The department will consider normal practice grade-point averages that fall within the following ranges:

• Undergraduate courses: 1.90-3.25 1.90-2.90
• Graduate courses: 2.90-3.50

Faculty members should identify and explain special circumstances that cause the assignment of grades outside these ranges of normal practice. These guidelines recognize three assumptions:

1) Graduate admission procedures will account for students in graduate courses earning higher grades than students enrolled in undergraduate courses;

2) No single class can be assured to represent perfectly the abilities and motivation levels of the general student population, but most classes will approximate those characteristics among students enrolled in similar courses at similar levels;

3) Although the application of consistent grading practices will produce some variation from class to class (e.g., class size, mode of delivery, core vs. elective), such differences will be within fairly narrow limits except when special identifiable circumstances cause a departure from normal practice. Faculty members shall justify any deviation from the department’s prescribed grade ranges.

6.1.3 Departmental Standards for Assessing Teaching Performance
Reviewers shall rate the faculty member’s teaching performance based on an evaluation of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality. Evaluations will be divided into three equally weighted categories, Student Opinion Questionnaire Numerical Scores, Student Opinion Questionnaire Comments, and Self-Assessment and Documentation of Teaching Performance, to arrive at an overall teaching performance assessment of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory across three categories.
6.1.3.1 Standards for Assessing Student Opinion Questionnaires

Department-sanctioned student opinion questionnaires have a five-point rating scale ranging from “excellent” (4) to “unsatisfactory” (0). A copy of the evaluation form is included in Appendix A. A faculty member’s student ratings for each section will be determined by averaging the ratings of all students on all items in that section. For tenure and promotion, the measure for evaluating a faculty member’s overall student opinion ratings will be the arithmetic mean for all sections taught during the period of review. The scale for evaluating this measure shall be as follows:

- Excellent: 3.50-4.00
- Satisfactory: 2.90-3.49
- Unsatisfactory: 0.00-2.89

Generally, it is expected that a faculty member’s overall numerical student opinion ratings for the review period will be no lower than satisfactory in order for her or him to receive a rating of satisfactory or higher for her or his overall teaching performance. If a faculty member’s overall student opinion ratings fall below satisfactory and he or she presents other significant evidence related to teaching performance (i.e., self-assessment of teaching goals and performance, evidence of teaching activities) that addresses the problems identified in the student evaluation of instruction, an overall teaching rating of satisfactory (2.90) may be given. This should be particularly true in cases where a faculty member has shown steady improvement in overall student opinion ratings over time. Such evidence shall not be considered for any purpose related to student opinion ratings other than in support of raising an evaluation to meet the minimum satisfactory evaluation (2.90).

6.1.3.2 Standards for Assessing Student Comments

Comments on the Student Opinion Questionnaires shall be assessed on the following scale:

- Excellent (4.00). To achieve a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student opinion questionnaire comments shall include overwhelmingly more positive than negative evaluations of high quality teaching effectiveness overall. In evaluating each of the key areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality, no area shall be judged to include more negative than positive comments.

- Satisfactory (3.00). To achieve a rating of satisfactory, the faculty member’s student opinion questionnaire comments shall include on balance more positive than negative evaluations of high quality teaching effectiveness overall. In evaluating each of the key areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive
disposition, and impartiality, a majority of areas shall be judged to include more positive than negative comments.

**Marginal** (2.00). To achieve a rating of *marginal*, the faculty member’s student opinion questionnaire comments shall include on balance as many positive as negative evaluations of teaching effectiveness overall. In evaluating each of the key areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality, and at least one area shall be judged to include more positive than negative comments.

**Unsatisfactory** (1.00). To achieve a rating of *unsatisfactory*, the faculty member’s student opinion questionnaire comments shall include more negative than positive evaluations of teaching effectiveness overall. There is little or no evidence of teaching effectiveness in areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality.

**6.1.3.3 Standards for Assessing Self-Assessment and Documentation of Teaching Performance**

The faculty member’s Self-Assessment (6.1.1.1) and Documentation of Teaching Performance (6.1.1.2. Indicators 1-2 and 5-8) shall be evaluated as follows:

**Excellent** (4.00). To achieve a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member’s self-assessment and documentation of teaching performance shall demonstrate evidence of teaching effectiveness in all areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality.

**Satisfactory** (3.00). To achieve a rating of *satisfactory*, the faculty member’s self-assessment and documentation of teaching performance shall demonstrate evidence of teaching effectiveness in a majority of areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, and impartiality.

**Marginal** (2.00). To achieve a rating of *marginal*, faculty member’s self-assessment and documentation of teaching performance shall demonstrate evidence of teaching effectiveness in more than one area of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, impartiality, and progress toward minimal effectiveness of teaching in these areas.

**Unsatisfactory** (1.00). To achieve a rating of *unsatisfactory* the faculty member’s self-assessment and documentation of teaching performance demonstrate little to no
evidence of teaching effectiveness in areas of effective communication, substantive teaching, meaningful feedback, positive disposition, impartiality, and progress toward effectiveness of teaching in these areas is not evident.

6.1.3.4 Overall Evaluation for Teaching Performance
For tenure and promotion, the committee will provide an overall evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching performance in terms of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory based on an average of the three categories: Student Opinion Questionnaire Numerical Scores, Student Opinion Questionnaire Comments, and Self-Assessment and Documentation of Teaching Performance. For example, a faculty member with an overall student opinion questionnaire numerical average of 3.50, a student opinion questionnaire comment evaluation of satisfactory (3), and a self-assessment and documentation of teaching performance evaluation of satisfactory (3), would have an overall score of \( 3.17 = (3.5 + 3 + 3)/3 \).

For each retention review prior to tenure and promotion, the rating criteria for overall evaluation for teaching performance shall be as follows:

**Excellent:** To achieve a rating of excellent, a faculty member shall have an overall score of 3.50 or higher.

**Satisfactory:** To achieve a rating of satisfactory, a faculty member shall have an overall score between 2.90 and 3.49.

**Unsatisfactory:** To achieve a rating of unsatisfactory, a faculty member shall have an overall score of less than 2.90.

Rating criteria for overall evaluation for teaching performance for tenure and promotion shall be as follows:

**Excellent:** To achieve a rating of excellent, a faculty member shall have an overall score of 3.50 or higher.

**Satisfactory:** To achieve a rating of satisfactory, a faculty member shall have an overall score between 2.90 and 3.49.

**Unsatisfactory:** To achieve a rating of unsatisfactory, a faculty member shall have an overall score of less than 2.90.

6.2 Scholarly and Creative Activities
Advancement of knowledge in the field of communications is the basis of evaluating scholarship and/or creative work in the Department of Communications. Whether a faculty member is pursuing scholarship, creative work, or both, it is expected that the work will be subject to peer or juried review and will demonstrate high standards of relevance, continuity, significance, and productivity. A candidate is expected to describe how his or
her work meets these criteria and shall provide documentation of peer or juried review in the Portfolio. Faculty members may combine scholarly and creative activities, but normally at least some scholarly activity is expected in a candidate’s portfolio.

Relevance in scholarly and creative endeavors means that the work should be related to the department’s curriculum or the candidate’s academic training, teaching area, professional activities, or service.

Continuity in scholarly and creative achievement is based upon the identification of an intellectual focus and clear agenda for research or creative activity, as well as evidence of growth and consistency of effort.

Significance shall be assessed on the basis of such things as a publication’s quality, including its review competitiveness, acceptance rate, and/or circulation; membership composition of the sponsoring organization; and attendance at or geographic scope of conferences, exhibits, or similar venues.

Productivity in advancing knowledge will be assessed and weighted on the basis of scholarly and creative activities that are presented or published in the forms specified in section 6.2.2 of this document.

6.2.1 Indicators of Scholarly and Creative Performance
1) Self-assessment of scholarly and creative performance. Faculty members shall in no more than 1000 words discuss their accomplishments and overall level of performance, and demonstrate regular activities that result (or, in the case of second and third year probationary faculty, are judged likely to result) in high quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications, creative works, or exhibits. This assessment should include a listing of all scholarly or creative activities, and it should address the relevance, continuity, significance, and productivity of these activities.

2) Documentation of scholarly and creative work. Documentation of all scholarly and creative work is required and must include a copy of each work accepted for publication or exhibition for the period under review. For works presented in a medium other than print, the copy may be in the form of photographs, CDs, DVDs, web links, or other appropriate media. All works must include a complete citation (publication and publication date). In addition, the faculty member shall distinguish between scholarly and creative work that was subject to peer-review or a jurying process from work that was not subject to a peer review or a jurying process. In all cases, the basis for selection shall be fully documented, and acceptance rates shall be provided for juried work. Recognizing the value of collaboration, work with multiple authors or creative collaborators will be judged on the basis of the faculty member’s contribution to the work as documented in the Co-Authorship Disclosure Form (Appendix B).
Scholarly and creative works, as well as successful grant proposals, that have been subject to peer-review or a jurying process and have been accepted for future publication or production shall be documented. Documentation shall include letters of acceptance from the appropriate publication or agency.

In addition, scholarly and creative works in progress, which are indicators of a continuing research agenda, may be documented. Documentation shall include grant proposals, abstracts of papers presented at professional meetings, papers currently being reviewed for publication, and/or copies of manuscripts in preparation. Works in progress, however, shall not contribute to the total points for scholarly and creative activity. Care should be taken to distinguish work in progress from that already completed.

Professional activity of a scholarly or creative nature for which funding or assigned time is awarded may be evaluated as scholarly and creative activity. Pro-bono professional activity of a scholarly or creative nature may be evaluated as scholarly and creative activity or service activity, but not both. Professional activities of an educational nature may be evaluated as teaching, scholarly and creative, or service activity. Papers or presentations on pedagogy may be evaluated as teaching, scholarly and creative, or service activity.

6.2.2 Indicators of Productivity in Scholarly and Creative Activities
Faculty members shall demonstrate the advancement of knowledge through scholarly and/or creative activities. Indicators of scholarly productivity include activities in high quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications or other scholarly forums. Each faculty member is expected to describe the reputation and importance in the field of a publication or forum, document its approximate acceptance rate, and in the case of publications or forums for disciplines outside the department, their relevance to the field of communications. Recognizing that there are many outlets for communications scholarship, it is nonetheless recommended that faculty members consult sources that provide information on journal quality, such as Cabell’s Directory of Publishing Opportunities, or other appropriate references.

Indicators of creative activity include programs of critical commentary on professional practices and/or continuing programs of work that represent the highest standards of performance in the field. In the same way that a music or fine arts professor, for example, is expected to perform or exhibit, a communications professor shall be rewarded for engagement in public practice. Each of the following shall be pertinent if the activity is in any discipline encompassed by the department:

1) creative work such as radio, television, film productions, or newspaper and magazine articles in the mass media;

2) photographic, graphic arts, or digital design publication, presentation, or exhibition;
3) publication of commentaries and critical reviews about the field and related subjects in popular media, including television and radio, magazines, major newspapers, trade publications, and journalism reviews;

4) creative writing, designing, or producing, including scripts, documentary narratives, opinion columns or editorials, investigative reports, news features or analyses, websites, and advertising and public relations campaigns;

5) creative work of a demanding nature in responsible positions with the media, entertainment or travel, and tourism industries, such as directing, producing, managing, editing, or collecting research for special production projects or programs; and

6) primary involvement in the production of a program of work accepted for exhibition, electronic publication, distribution, or acceptance by archives.

Creative roles may include, but are not limited to: writer, designer, planner, manager, researcher, editor, producer, director, photographer, videographer or editor of content and/or design for newspapers, magazines, websites, public displays, live events or performances, films, videos, audio projects, interactive, digital, and other media.

Relevant creative activities are normally works in areas related to the department’s curriculum and the candidate’s academic training and/or teaching area. It would be both relevant and appropriate for a photography professor, for example, to pursue exhibition and publication of her or his photographs; whereas, such exhibitions would not likely be relevant for a colleague whose training and teaching assignment is in law or history. Publication points are measures of quality and are guidelines for evaluators to use in assigning the productivity level of creative activities and are not intended to be absolute.

Faculty members shall demonstrate continuing, regular activities in high-quality venues. Regardless of the quantity of scholarly and creative indicators, the case made for quality remains the primary concern. The lesser the quantity of work, the stronger is the need for evidence of substance, coherence, high quality, and impact. Specific indicators of quality include the reputation of the publisher or exhibiting space; the scope and impact of the venue (national, regional, or local); the peer-review or competitive nature of the work; published reviews of the work; reputation of the funding agencies; and related indicators.

The following sections stipulate the criteria and point system for the evaluation of indicators of scholarly and creative activity. In all cases, the normally prescribed value of a work may only be lowered for a defined set of circumstances. If the work was published or presented in an outlet or forum that is unrecognized or unsubstantiated and/or that has a liberal or undocumented review process or acceptance rate, reviewers may value it at less than the prescribed value.

Discounted credit may also be assigned for co-authored work under limited circumstances. If a faculty member’s contribution is equal to or greater than that of other co-authors, it will normally be credited in the same fashion as single-authored work. Credit will be
discounted in cases where a candidate's contribution is proportionately less than that of his or her co-authors and/or where the number of authors is high relative to the scope of the work. To aid in the assessment of co-authored work, the faculty member shall submit a signed Co-Authorship Disclosure Form (Appendix B) and clearly state his or her unique contribution to the work relative to that of any co-authors along with statements from any co-authors.

Specific criteria for work may need to be explicated on a case-by-case basis due to the potential breadth and variation of the many potential scholarly and creative indicators. If points awarded deviate from normally proscribed values, the reviewers shall provide written justification for their evaluation.

6.2.2.1 Primary Indicators of Scholarly Activity

1. **Referred Journal Articles, Monographs, or Scholarly Books**
   (Up to 1.50 points each.) Normally, an accepted refereed journal article or article in an accredited law review shall receive no more than 1.00 points. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.50 points for work in a highly respected publication and documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards. Normally, a monograph or scholarly book shall receive 1.50 points.

2. **Referred or Reviewed Text Books**
   (Up to 1.50 points each). Normally, an accepted textbook shall receive no more than 1.00 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.50 points for a work based upon it being a first edition, particularly strong reputations of the reviewers, and/or documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

3. **Referred Scholarly Book Chapters**
   (Up to 1.50 points each). Normally, an accepted refereed book chapter shall receive no more than 1.00 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.50 points for a work in a highly respected publication, high reputation of the reviewers, and documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.2.2.2 Primary Indicators of Creative Activity

1. **Referred National or International Creative Exhibitions, Distributions, Placements, Festivals, or Commercially Significant or Award Winning Works**
   (Up to 1.50 points each.) Work (including, but not limited to, the types specified in the secondary creative activity indicator categories below) recognized as deserving of exceptional merit by an appropriate national or international peer or expert review, such as selection for or placement in a festival or exhibition, receiving a top nomination or award in a national or international scholarly or professional competition, being optioned for production, or securing significant commercial or public distribution or placement, such as screenings, broadcasts, publications or postings. Documentation must be provided that indicates the significance of each work and the rigor of the review and selection process. When possible, the faculty member must provide the ratio of acceptance for such work.

Normally, a significant creative work shall receive no more than 1.00 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.50 points for a larger or longer work, a
work for which the faculty member held multiple creative positions, a work in a highly respected national or international venue, and/or documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

2. **Refereed Local or Regional Creative Exhibitions, Distributions, Placements, Festivals, or Commercially Produced or Award Nominated Works**
   (Up to 1.50 points each.) Work (including, but not limited to, the types specified in the secondary creative activity indicator categories below) recognized as deserving of significant merit by an appropriate local or regional peer or expert review, such as selection for or placement in a festival or exhibition, receiving a top nomination or award in a local or regional professional competition, or securing limited commercial or public distribution or placement, such as screenings, broadcasts, publications, or postings. Documentation must be provided that indicates the significance of each work and the rigor of the review process. When possible, the faculty member must provide the ratio of acceptance for entries in a juried competition.

   Normally, a local or regional creative work shall receive no more than 1.00 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.50 points for a larger or longer work, a work for which the faculty member held multiple creative positions, a work in a highly respected local or regional venue, and/or documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

3. **Artists’ Grants, Fellowships, and Commissions of Significant Merit**
   (Up to 1.50 points each.) Normally, an artist’s grant, fellowship, or commission shall receive no more than 1.00 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.50 points for a larger or longer work, a work for which the faculty member held multiple creative positions, a work in a highly respected local or regional venue, and/or documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.2.2.3 **Secondary Indicators of Productivity in Scholarly Activities**

1. **Non-Refereed and Invited Journal Articles, Scholarly Books, or Scholarly Book Chapter**
   (Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally, a non-refereed article, book or chapter shall receive no more than .50 points. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point for a work in a highly respected journal or book and documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

2. **Refereed Paper Presentations**
   (Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally, an accepted conference paper or presentation shall receive no more than .50 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point for a work in a highly respected conference (with the highest for those with an acceptance rate of below 20 percent) and documented importance in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

3. **Research Grants and Contracts**
   (Up to 1.50 points each.) Normally, an accepted research grant proposal or research contract shall receive no more than .50 point. However, reviewers may assign up to
1.50 points for being the principal investigator on an external grant with a monetary amount of $100,000 or more and documented importance in the field.

4. **Scholarly Research Articles or Broadcasts in Trade or Popular Media, Such as Television, Radio, Major News Outlets, Online Publications, and Journalism Reviews**
   (Up to .50 point each.) Normally, trade or popular media research pieces shall receive no more than .25 point for each work accepted. However, reviewers may assign up to .50 point each for prominent pieces in more respected outlets and/or documented importance of the piece in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

5. **Invited Scholarly Papers, Presentations, and Speaking Engagements**
   (Up to .50 point each.) Normally, invited scholarly papers, presentations, and speaking engagements shall receive no more than .25 points for each accepted presentation. However, reviewers may assign up to .50 point based on the national/international reputation of the organization and documented importance in the field.

6.2.2.4 Secondary Indicators of Productivity in Creative Activities

1. **Non-Refereed, Invited or Limited Creative Audio-Visual Work, Such as Graphic Design, Photography, Videography, Radio, Television, and Film Productions, Website, Digital Platform, Forum and Content Development, Addition to Permanent Collections, or Curatorial Work**
   (Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally, work within these media shall receive no more than .50 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point based on the scope of the work, the media or public forum in which the work has been featured, and/or documented importance of the piece in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

2. **Non-Refereed, Invited, or Limited Creative or Critical Writing, Designing, or Producing, Including Scripts, Documentary Narratives, Opinion Columns/Editorials, Investigative Reports, News Features/Analyses, Book Reviews, or Communication Plans/Executions**
   (Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally, work within these media shall receive no more than .50 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point on the scope of the work, the media or public forum in which the work has been featured, and/or documented importance of the piece in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

3. **Non-Refereed, Invited or Limited Creative Work in Responsible Positions within Media, Arts, Entertainment, or Travel and Tourism Industries, Such as Managing, Producing, Researching, Evaluating, or Editing Special Projects or Programs**
   (Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally, this work shall receive no more than .50 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point based on the scope of the work, the media or public forum in which the work has been featured,
and/or documented importance of the work in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

4. Primary Involvement in Producing or Curating a Program of Work Accepted for Exhibition, Electronic Publication Distribution, or Acceptance by Archives
(Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally, work within these media shall receive no more than .50 point. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point for a work in a highly respected venue, and/or documented importance of the piece in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

5. Invited Creative Presentations and Speaking Engagements
(Up to 1.00 point each.) Normally a creative presentation or speaking engagement, such as, but not limited to, those related to the activities outlined above shall receive no more than .50 points. However, reviewers may assign up to 1.00 point for a work in a highly respected venue or and/or documented importance of the piece in the field that includes citations, reviews, and/or awards.

6.2.3 Departmental Standards for Assessing Scholarly and Creative Activities
Scholarly and creative achievement of a candidate will be assessed in the following manner. Each indicator of scholarly and creative achievement (sections 6.2.2) will be assigned points according to the indications provided above based on the following criteria: relevance, continuity, significance, and productivity. Based upon the sum of the points and a qualitative evaluation of all scholarly and creative activities, the Department Personnel Committee will provide an assessment of a faculty member's productivity and overall assessment level for scholarly and creative activities in terms of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The overall assessment level shall normally be equivalent to the value of the points earned. To aid in this evaluation, a personnel review worksheet for scholarly and creative activity is provided in Appendix D. If the level is not the same, the reviewers shall provide written justification for the overall assessment.

For each retention review prior to tenure and promotion, scholarly and creative achievement will be assessed on the basis of the average of points earned during each year under review. The scale shall be as follows:

- Excellent: > 1.25
- Satisfactory: .75-1.25
- Unsatisfactory: < .75

For tenure and/or promotion, faculty members must have at least 4.00 points with a minimum of 2.00 points from the first (1) scholarly and/or creative primary indicator categories (6.2.2.1 Indicator #1 and/or 6.2.2.2 Indicator #1) plus an additional 1.00 point from any of the primary indicator categories (6.2.2.1. Indicators #1-3 and/or 6.2.2.2 Indicators #1-3). A maximum of 3.00 points may be from indicators other than the first primary indicator categories (6.2.2.1 Indicator #1 and 6.2.2.2 Indicator #1). Because of the subjective nature of the content and the ever-increasing variety of outlets for scholarly and creative activity, it is recognized that evaluations may need to be explicated on a case-
by-case basis. Work that is published in separate venues, but which is substantially the same (e.g., a conference paper that is subsequently published in a research journal), shall be counted only once.

The scale for tenure and promotion shall be as follows:

- Excellent: > 6.00
- Satisfactory: 4.00-6.00
- Unsatisfactory < 4.00

6.3 Professional, University, and Community Service

The Department of Communications curriculum is focused upon professional education. Faculty members are expected to share their knowledge within local, state, national, and/or international academic and professional arenas. All faculty members shall contribute to faculty governance and participate in academic and/or professional activities.

To maintain and improve the quality of the learning environment, the department, college, university, community, and profession are highly dependent upon active participation by faculty members in various organizational and governance tasks. Communications faculty members are expected to take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the department, college, university, community, and/or profession through the application of their expertise in the field of communications.

In all cases, achievement in professional and service activity will be judged to be more important than participation alone. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate high standards of relevance, continuity, significance, and productivity in their professional, university, and community service activities. In seeking to meet these standards, faculty members are encouraged to consider the following.

**Relevance** in professional, university, and community service activities means that the work should be related to the department’s curriculum or the candidate’s academic or professional training or expertise.

**Continuity** in professional, university, and community service activities is based upon clear identification of one or more professional interest areas in which evidence of continuous involvement and growth can be shown and the demonstration of clear contributions to the university and community during each regular semester a faculty member is employed.

**Significance** of professional, university, and community service activities within or on behalf of an organization may be assessed on the basis of such things as that organization’s size, stature, membership, or its geographic scope. Significant contributions are indicated by the value of the effort to the organization, institution, or public for which it is performed and the degree to which that effort enhances the overall learning environment. Significant contributions may involve leadership, direction, program development, or other efforts clearly beyond normal attendance and participation.
Productivity in professional, university, and community service activities may be assessed on the basis of the indicators listed in section 6.3.1 of this document.

6.3.1 Indicators of Professional, University, and Community Service Performance

1) Self-assessment of performance in professional, university, and community service activities is required. Faculty members shall in no more than 1000 words discuss their accomplishments and overall level of performance addressing the relevance, continuity, significance, and productivity of their service activity.

2) Documentation of professional and service activities is required. This documentation should include a listing of service activities that details a faculty member’s role and individual contributions as well as the larger committee or service function accomplishments. Documentation shall include evidence of each activity with an assessment of its relevance and significance. Such assessment should include, when appropriate, peer and/or external evaluation.

Pro-bono professional activity of a scholarly or creative nature may be evaluated as scholarly and creative or service activity, but not both. Professional activity of a scholarly or creative nature for which full funding, assigned time, or course buy-out was awarded will not be evaluated in the service category. If appropriate, it may be documented and evaluated under either teaching or scholarly and creative activity. Papers or presentations on pedagogy may be evaluated as teaching, scholarly and creative, or service activity. Professional activities of an educational nature may be evaluated as teaching, scholarly and creative, or service activity.

6.3.2. Indicators of Professional, University and Community Service Activities

Indicators of service activities in the department, college, university, university-system, professional organizations, and in the community may include, but are not limited to:

1. participation on a standing or ad hoc committee, special task force or board, including collective bargaining;

2. preparing program accomplishment, assessment, accreditation, or other reports or reviews;

3. creating, reviewing, and updating policies and procedures;

4. performing administrative functions, such as staffing or scheduling;

5. creating and implementing special programs;
6. advising co-curricular student groups or activities, colleagues, organizations, community members, or other individuals or groups on academic, department, university, or field-related matters;

7. organizing, administering, or participating in meetings, seminars, forums, workshops, conferences, or ceremonies;

8. receiving non-research grants, professional honors, or awards;

9. providing consulting, advising, or service functions relevant to an individual’s area of expertise;

10. testifying before government committees or participating in regulatory proceedings;

11. giving invited lectures, presentations, or interviews;

12. reviewing books and manuscripts for book proposals, professional journals, conferences, or media reviews;

13. serving as a moderator or discussant on an academic or professional panel;

14. participating in grant writing, fund raising, or promotional activities;

15. mentoring students or colleagues;

16. serving in a leadership capacity as an officer, committee chair, or other lead on service activities including, but not limited to, those listed above.

For professional, university, and public service activities to be judged satisfactory, faculty must demonstrate continuous and productive involvement appropriate to rank. As a professor progresses in the profession, there is an assumption that there will be greater involvement in the life of the university, profession, and the community. Thus, an assistant professor need only to show that significant service has been provided at the department and college levels with some involvement at the university level, in disciplinary organizations, and/or in the community. An associate professor approaching promotion (and, if applicable, tenure) shall demonstrate leadership and significant participation in the activity of departmental, college, or university committees or decision-making groups, significant contributions to at least one organization beyond a local level, and other service contributions within and beyond the university community.

The three categories of service and general point guidelines are outlined below:

1. **Department/College Service** (.10-.75 points). Typically, one regular, year-long committee/service assignment will receive .50 points. Leadership roles will typically be awarded an additional .25 points. Special service assignments might range from
.10 for brief, one-time service functions to .75 depending upon the scope of the service.

2. **University/System-Wide Service** (.10-.75 points). Typically, one regular committee/service assignment will receive .5 points. Leadership roles will typically be awarded an additional .25 points. Special assignments might range from .10 for brief, one-time service functions to .75 depending upon the scope of the service.

3. **Professional & Community Service** (.10-.50 points). Typically, one regular committee/project assignment will receive .25 points. Leadership roles will typically be awarded an additional .25 points. Special assignments might range from .10 for brief, one-time service functions to .50 depending upon the scope of the service.

### 6.3.3 Departmental Standards for Assessing Professional, University, and Community Service

In evaluating service achievements, a candidate will be assessed in the following manner. Each indicator of service achievement (sections 6.3.2) will be assigned points according to the indications provided above based on the following criteria: relevance, continuity, significance, and productivity.

Based upon the sum of the points and a qualitative evaluation of all service activities, the Department Personnel Committee will provide an assessment of a faculty member’s productivity and overall assessment level for Professional, University, and Community Service in terms of **excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory**.

For each retention review prior to tenure and promotion, Professional, University, and Community Service will be assessed on the basis of the average of points earned during each year under review. The scale shall be as follows:

- **Excellent:**  \( > 1.25 \)
- **Satisfactory:** \( .75-1.25 \)
- **Unsatisfactory:** \( < .75 \)

For evaluations for tenure and promotion, the overall assessment level shall normally be equivalent to the value of the points earned. To aid in this evaluation, a personnel review worksheet for professional, university, and community service activities is provided in Appendix E. If the level is not the same, the reviewers shall provide written justification for the overall assessment.

- **Excellent:**  \( > 6.00 \)
- **Satisfactory:** \( 4.00-6.00 \)
- **Unsatisfactory:** \( < 4.00 \)

For tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, faculty members must have a minimum **satisfactory** score of at least 4.00 points including a minimum of 2.00 points of
Department/College Service and a minimum of .50 points as a combined total for University, Professional, and/or Community Service.

For tenure and/or promotion to full professor, faculty members must have a minimum satisfactory score of at least 4.00 points including a minimum of 2.00 points of Department/College Service and a minimum of .50 in Professional and Community Service. For tenure and/or promotion to full professor, a faculty member's service must also include a minimum of 1 point of service at the University/System level and two leadership roles (typically .50 points).

7.0 Personnel Actions and Criteria
The Department of Communications shall evaluate faculty performance as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in teaching; scholarly and creative activity; and professional, university, and community service.

7.1 Retention of Probationary Faculty
The purpose of retention reviews is to determine if the faculty member’s performance meets the expectations for a tenure-track appointment at the candidate’s rank and if he or she is making excellent or satisfactory progress toward promotion and tenure or whether improvement is needed. Candidates will be evaluated in the three areas of teaching performance, scholarly and creative activity, and service. In particular, problem areas should be identified in order for the faculty member to develop a program of improvement. The faculty member is responsible for developing such a program and documenting the improvements that remedy the area of concern.

7.2 Tenure and Promotion
Tenure consideration emphasizes contributions over several years and patterns of performance over time in the designated areas of teaching, creative and scholarly, and service activity. The granting of tenure implies a long-term commitment on the part of the university and is consequently the most critical decision made regarding a faculty member. Such commitments shall be limited to persons who are judged most likely to remain as assets to the department, college, and university and as productive teachers and scholars for the rest of their careers. Therefore, a positive tenure decision requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that meet the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and the Department Standards. Evaluations after promotion and tenure will reflect the individual’s continuing productivity.

7.2.1 Tenure
To be considered for tenure, candidates shall be judged to have satisfactory teaching (as indicated in 6.1.3), scholarly and creative activities (as indicated in 6.2.3) and professional, university, and community service (as indicated in 6.3.3). Faculty hired at the associate professor or professor rank without tenure will be expected to meet the department requirements for tenure within the time specified in UPS 210.000.

7.2.2 Promotion to Associate Professor
Promotion from assistant to associate professor is automatically granted with tenure.
7.2.3 Promotion to Professor
To be considered for promotion to professor, candidates shall be judged to have excellent performance in at least one of the three categories of teaching (as indicated in 6.1.3), scholarly/creative activities (as indicated in 6.2.3) or professional, university, and community service (as indicated in 6.3.3) and judged to have at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.

7.3 Early Tenure and Promotion
Consideration for early tenure and/or early promotion shall be based upon a time period deemed of sufficient duration for all levels of review to make a reliable evaluation of a faculty member’s performance.

7.3.1 Early Tenure
To be considered for early tenure, candidates shall be judged to have excellent performance in teaching (as indicated in 6.1.3), scholarly and creative activities (as indicated in 6.2.3), and professional, university, and community service (as indicated in 6.3.3).

7.3.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor
To be considered for early promotion to associate professor, candidates shall be judged to have excellent performance in teaching (as indicated in 6.1.3), scholarly and creative activities (as indicated in 6.2.3), and in professional, university, and community service activities (as indicated in 6.3.3).

7.3.3 Early Promotion to Professor
To be considered for early promotion to professor, candidates shall be judged to have excellent performance in teaching (as indicated in 6.1.3), in scholarly/creative activities (as indicated in 6.2.3), and in professional, university, and community service (as indicated in 6.3.3).

8.0 Department Personnel Committee Election
The Department Personnel Committee consists of three full-time tenured faculty members elected annually by all full-time members of the faculty. Election of the personnel committee shall be by secret ballot. Normally, the elections for the following year’s committee take place at the last regular faculty meeting in May. A fourth member to serve as an alternate in the absence of one of the three other members is elected at the same time. The alternate will serve if a member of the committee is deemed to be disqualified for service by the department chair due to illness, conflict of interest, or other compelling reasons, or if a member is self-disqualified due to conflict of interest.
• Approved by the Department of Communications faculty on March 19, 1999. Revision approved by the faculty on February 7, 2003.
• Revision approved by the faculty on November 5, 2004, with authorization for minor revision needed. Final revised version submitted to the Faculty Personnel Committee on 5-7-05. Approved by Vice President Ephraim Smith for implementation in the 2005-06 academic year.
• Revision approved by the faculty on April 29, 2009.
• Addition of grade distribution guidelines approved by faculty on February 24, 2010.
• Addition of service guidelines and a point structure approved by faculty on March 24, 2010. Revision approved by the faculty October 12, 2012.
• Revision approved by the faculty on October 11, 2013.

Appendices

Appendix A is the department’s Student Opinion Questionnaire. Appendix B is the Co-Authorship Disclosure Form. Appendix C includes the Personnel Review Worksheets for Teaching Activities. Appendix D is the Personnel Review Worksheet for Scholarly and Creative Activities. Appendix E is the Personnel Review Worksheet for Service Activities.
Appendix A
Department Student Opinion Questionnaire

1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

1.1 Instructor presents materials in an organized manner.
1.2 Instructor communicates effectively and clearly explains material.
1.3 Instructor stimulates and maintains interest in course.
1.4 Instructor encourages questions and/or discussion.
1.5 Instructor is accessible to students.
1.6 Instructor provides assignments, exams, and course activities that are relevant to the course.
1.7 Instructor demonstrates interest in students.
1.8 Instructor demonstrates interest in teaching.
1.9 Instructor treats students fairly and impartially.
1.10 Overall, how do you rate this instructor?
1.11 Overall, how do you rate this course?
1.12 Overall, how do you rate how much you learned in this course?

PLEASE CONTINUE ON PAGE 2 - Do not write in the blank space below.
2. General Comments

2.1 Please provide your specific comments elaborating on your responses and other aspects of your instructor's teaching performance and/or course.
Appendix B
University Co-Authorship Disclosure Form
http://forms.fullerton.edu/academic_affairs/forms/far/RTPCoAuthorship.pdf

Co-Authorship Disclosure Form

There were ___ co-authors responsible for the final preparation of

(Name of work)

The following chart indicates the creative responsibility of each of the co-authors (please list co-authors in the order in which they appear on the work). If this format does not provide a suitable mechanism for explanation, you may use a separate sheet of your own design, but it must include sign-offs from your co-authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature/Name</th>
<th>Creative Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAR 9/6/2010
Appendix C.1
Sample Template: Teaching

6.1.1.2. Documentation 3): Representative Student Comment Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Communication:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Teaching:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Feedback:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Disposition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impartiality:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C.2
Sample Template: Teaching

#### 6.1.1.2. Documentation 4): Numerical Student Opinion Questionnaire Ratings Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings Averages by Year</th>
<th>Year 1: 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 2:</th>
<th>Year 3:</th>
<th>Yr 4:</th>
<th>Yr 5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 233 3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 233 3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 101 3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 101 3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average: 3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 233 3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 233 3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 101 3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 101 3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average: 3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Average</strong></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall: 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratings Averages by Course/Other Criteria (Optional):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratings Average:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grade Averages by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1: 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 2:</th>
<th>Year 3:</th>
<th>Yr4:</th>
<th>Yr 5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 233 2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 233 2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 101 2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 101 2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average: 2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 233 2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 233 2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 101 2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 101 2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average: 2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Average</strong></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall: 2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### Grade Averages by Course/Other Criteria (Optional):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #:</th>
<th>Grade Average:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
## Appendix D

### Department of Communications Personnel Review Worksheet

#### Scholarly and Creative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Work(s)</th>
<th>Indicator Number*</th>
<th>Primary 1</th>
<th>Primary Other</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Ref#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Primary 1 (Min 2.0):</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total All Primary (Min 3.0):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Secondary (Max 3.0):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total (Min 4.0):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Years Prior To Tenure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Yrs:</th>
<th>1 Average:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

*List indicator number from personnel document (Ex. 6.2.2.1(1))

**Enter points in appropriate column

***Attach numbered list of comments on separate sheet
### Appendix E

#### Department of Communications Personnel Review Worksheet

**Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Assignment</th>
<th>Indicator Number*</th>
<th>Dept/Col</th>
<th>Univ/Sys</th>
<th>Prof/Comm</th>
<th>Lead****</th>
<th>Comments***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Add Rows As Needed, Mutl yr assign OK on one row)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min 2.0</td>
<td>Combined Min .5</td>
<td>For Full Min .5</td>
<td>Total (Min 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Yearly Average for Reviews Prior to Tenure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*List indicator number from personnel document (Ex. 6.3.2 (12) for reviewing manuscripts.)

** Enter points in appropriate column

***Attach numbered list of comments on separate sheet

****Additional points (typically .25 for Leadership Role)