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I. Preface
The Reading Department (hereafter called "the Department") is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible that meet the evolving needs of our students, community, and region. The Department is also committed to establishing an environment wherein the creation of knowledge and its organized dissemination are central. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs and effective learning environments is the faculty. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning by supporting faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community.

The Department will use the standards set out in this document as a guide for faculty preparing the Portfolio for retention, tenure, and promotion, and as the criteria for Portfolio evaluation. Department faculty affirms its position that the interests and needs of students are best served when the faculty represents diverse experiential and academic strengths, creating a "mosaic of talent." With this document, the Department intends to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great scope of the functions inherent in the mission of an institution of higher education.

II. Faculty Responsibilities
As full-time employees of CSU Fullerton, Department faculty members are expected to meet professional responsibilities as they apply to each of the Portfolio evaluation categories.

A. In the area of teaching, examples of these responsibilities include:
1. meeting classes;
2. holding established office hours at regular times and places;
3. participating in Department academic advising procedures; and
4. attending faculty meetings.

B. In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, examples of these responsibilities include:
1. expanding knowledge;
2. applying knowledge to consequential problems in education; and
3. advancing the reputation of the University.

C. In the areas of professional, university, and community service, examples of these responsibilities include:
1. contributing to the advancement of the field;
2. increasing opportunities for students in the discipline;
3. attending University, College, and Department meetings
4. fulfilling committee assignments;
5. fulfilling other College and Department duties as assigned by either the College Dean or Department Chair;
6. supporting the work of the Department, College, and University; and
7. contributing to the greater community in general through service activities.

III. Department History and Mission
The Reading Department was established in the mid 1970s. Its mission is to provide the highest quality research-based instruction in Reading Education at every level. Undergraduate courses contribute to the University’s General Education program. Graduate courses lead to the MS in Reading Education, California Reading Certificate, and/or a Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential. In an age of increasing demands for a highly literate society, Department faculty strive to engage undergraduate students in the use of effective reading strategies and to matriculate graduate-level Reading Educators who are well prepared to implement and direct
IV. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus for First-Year Probationary Faculty (500 words or less each, for teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare the required information and documentation for the Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to attend the workshops held by Faculty Affairs and Records at the beginning of each fall semester as well as college-wide personnel workshops, and to seek assistance from colleagues.

C. Portfolio Organization and Documentation

1. The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member following the standard table of contents as specified in UPS 210.000. The numbering, order, and format of this table of contents are required; items may not be added, deleted, or rearranged.

2. Materials for items 1.0 through 7.0 in the main Portfolio, and documentation materials in the Appendix must be complete (See Table 1). All required documentation that is not provided or not available must be explained in a memo.

3. Materials specified in this table of contents should be presented in one tabbed binder.

4. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented in the Appendix. The contents of the Appendix should represent ongoing reflection and refinement.

5. Faculty members who have been granted service credit must include documentation in all areas (teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service) for these years.

6. To facilitate storage during the review period, the Portfolio binder and all Appendix materials must be presented in no more than two boxes of standard size.

7. Faculty members have the option of submitting their Portfolios through the Electronic Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Process (ERTP).

8. 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, (2) statistical summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review.
Table 1: UPS 210.000 Required Table of Contents for the RTP Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.0     | Table of Contents  
A standard copy of this document, provided to the faculty member by the Department Chair. |
| 2.0     | Table of Contents of Appendix  
The table of contents for appendix items shall be organized to present supporting documentation in the three areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and professional and service activities. |
| 3.0     | Approved Department Standards or UPS 210.000  
The Department of Reading Personnel Standards shall fulfill this requirement.  
3.10 Prospectus (500 words or less each, for teaching, scholarship, and service)  
The Prospectus articulates the faculty member’s prospective intentions for professional endeavors in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service (see section VI.A of this document). |
| 4.0     | Portfolio Vitae  
The faculty member’s vita shall be current and reflect accomplishments and work described in the Portfolio. |
| 5.0     | Narrative Summary: Teaching Performance (1,000 words or less)  
This Self-Assessment Narrative Summary is the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in teaching for the period of review (see section V.A.1.a. of this document).  
5.10 List of Teaching Assignments  
The list of teaching assignments shall be organized to include information specified in section V.A.1.b.  
5.20 Sample Form: Student Opinion Questionnaire  
A blank copy of the Student Opinion Questionnaire(s) used for courses taught shall be included.  
5.30 Summaries: Student Opinion Questionnaire  
Original printouts of the statistical summaries of the Student Opinion Questionnaire must be provided.  
5.40 Summaries: Grade Distributions  
Printouts of the summaries of grades given in your classes must be provided. (The University-provided lists of individual student grades should be included in the Raw Data Binder). |
| 6.0     | Narrative Summary: Scholarly and Creative Activities (1,000 words or less)  
This self-assessment narrative summary is the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in scholarship, for the period of review (see section V.B.1.a. of this document). |
| 7.0     | Narrative Summary: Professional, University, and Community Service (1,000 words or less)  
This self-assessment narrative summary is the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in service, for the period of review (see section V.C.1.a. of this document). |
**Appendix**
The faculty member will provide documentation to support the achievements described in the Portfolio. The Appendix should be organized in sections paralleling the Table of Contents above: teaching; scholarly and creative activities; and professional, university, and community service activities.
V. Criteria for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-Time Faculty
   A. Teaching Performance
      Each faculty member shall demonstrate that his or her mastery and currency in the
discipline is consistently translated into structuring and implementing effective learning
experiences as appropriate to the nature of each course. Mandatory indicators for
demonstration of teaching performance are listed below.

1. Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Teaching Performance
   a) Self-Assessment Narrative Summary (maximum 1,000 words) The self-assessment
      narrative summary for teaching shall be the faculty member’s retrospective
      analysis of accomplishments in teaching, for the period of the review. The
      narrative shall include an analysis of Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) and
      grade distribution data. These data should be synthesized with other data provided
      in the Portfolio to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Trends in student written
      comments on the Student Opinion Questionnaires should be identified, and any
      significant discrepancies between data from these forms and other data included in
      the Portfolio should be addressed. The self-assessment should also include a
      reflective analysis of pedagogical methods to ensure student success and future
      goals and direction for teaching.
   b) List of Courses Taught A listing of all courses taught throughout the period of
      review shall be provided. The list shall include the semester, the Department name,
      the course name, and number, and the unit (WTU value).
   c) Workload Faculty workload may include activities in a variety of areas in addition
      to teaching specific courses: for example, adjustments in workload for the
      preparation of substantive changes in instructional methods, course development
      activities, overseeing activities in the Reading Center, chairing committees, grant
      preparation, or work to prepare for accreditation. The Portfolio shall list and
      discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.
   d) Course Syllabi and Materials A representative selection of course syllabi from
      each course taught and additional materials prepared by the instructor to facilitate
      teaching effectiveness shall be included in the Appendix. Tests, study aids, and
      other materials, such as advance organizers, video technology, innovative
      strategies, instructional television concepts and techniques, PowerPoint
      presentation printouts, evidence of Portfolio and case study assessment, etc., shall
      also be included in the Appendix.
   e) Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires The University-provided
      statistical summaries for all courses taught shall be included. If data are missing, a
      written explanation must be provided by the instructor and verified by the
      Department Chair. If service credit was given, data on student rating of instruction
      from all years for which credit was given are to be included.
   f) Original Student Opinion Questionnaires The individual questionnaires for all
      classes taught for the period of review shall be presented as part of the Appendix
      section on teaching. Organize and label these Appendix materials by year,
      semester, course, and section. The Department Chair will add the forms to the
      Portfolio when it is received. If data are missing, a written explanation must be
      provided and verified by the Department Chair.
   g) Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions The University-provided statistical
      breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester must be provided. Faculty
members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught. The faculty members shall address the evidence in the Portfolio and Appendix relating to academic standards, including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught and deviations from the mean. Criteria for assessment and grading shall be included in the faculty member’s narrative.

h) Additional Indicators of Effective Teaching The faculty member shall submit additional documents of teaching effectiveness and reflective practice. These may include but are not limited to the examples in Table 2 below.

2. Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Two categories of data are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness:
Student Opinion Questionnaires and Additional Indicators.

a) Student Opinion Questionnaires use a five-point Likert scale for the quantitative documentation of student ratings of instruction. The University-provided statistical summaries of these forms will be used. The Student Opinion Questionnaires include students’ written comments, which should be reviewed for trends each semester. For the period under review, the following criteria will be used to evaluate the average student opinions of all courses:

- excellent: 90% or more A and B ratings
- good: 80% - 89% A and B ratings
- progressing: 70% - 79% A and B ratings
- inadequate: Less than 70% A and B ratings

These criteria are to be used as a general guide, with recognition that these data do in fact represent opinions, submitted anonymously, and with no formal documentation of validity or reliability. Student opinions of instruction contribute 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. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments. The faculty member shall provide a narrative of teaching performance that addresses student ratings and comments and his or her efforts to improve or maintain teaching performance. In cases where the quantitative rating summaries for one or more courses fall below the range of good, the faculty member may provide written rationale in the narrative, which, if submitted, the Committee (see UPS 210.000 for formation of the Department Personnel Committee, DPC) shall consider in its deliberations for assigning the Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (as specified below). For example, special consideration may be extended when unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (such as the nature and difficulty of the course load) are addressed in the Portfolio with specific documentation. In addition, in cases where Student Opinion Questionnaire data extend over several years under review, greater emphasis should be placed on the data for the most recent four semesters. Based upon these criteria, and consideration of the individual case, the reviewers shall evaluate the Student Opinion Questionnaire data and render a rating of excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate.
a) **Additional Indicators** The faculty member shall describe in the narrative and provide additional documentation of teaching effectiveness. This documentation shall be carefully selected and revised over time to illustrate on-going professional development as a teacher and currency in the discipline. Examples of additional indicators of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching approaches and/or assessment tools, and on-going development of teaching skills are provided in Table 2. Please note that these activities may fall under more than one area (teaching, scholarly and creative activities, or service). Activities shall only be used in one area and it shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to explain the nature and context for each activity in the narrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Examples of Additional Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Course outlines with clearly defined goals which are aligned to instructional approaches and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer and Department Chair observations of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive trends in the student comments on the Student Opinion Questionnaires, indicating strengths in elements of effective instruction such as knowledge of the field, competent use of teaching approaches and techniques, and/or selection of quality instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of student work samples illustrating attainment of instructional learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of innovative teaching practices such as team or collaborative teaching or distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of pedagogy that promotes just, equitable, and inclusive educational practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of innovative pedagogical practices or teaching approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documented use of technology to enhance instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Video and/or audio tapes of exemplary lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissertation, thesis, or project advisement or committee member for master’s or doctoral degree students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Center coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohort coordination, and/or fieldwork coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent study projects directed by the faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accepted new course proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Honors or awards related to teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of teaching effectiveness, or teaching materials illustrating effective course enhancement, course design, implementation, and learning goal assessments (e.g., visual aids, handouts, PowerPoint presentations, scoring rubrics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching and classroom research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of formative assessment and adjustment of instruction (such as course-specific evaluation, inventories, focus groups, interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of professional development related to teaching and/or assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reviewers will use the following criteria to rate the additional indicators of teaching effectiveness for the period under review:

- **excellent**
  Provides strong and varied evidence (five or more well-documented additional indicators of effective teaching that is sustained over time

- **good**
  Provides varied evidence (four well-documented indicators) of effective teaching

- **progressing**
  Provides limited evidence (three acceptable indicators) of effective teaching

- **inadequate**
  Provides fewer than three acceptable indicators of effective teaching, and progress toward effective teaching is not evident

Based upon these criteria, the reviewers shall evaluate the Additional Indicators and render a rating of *excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate*.

3. **Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness.** Reviewers will weigh SOQs and Additional Indicators equally for each period under review to determine an overall rating of teaching effectiveness. Primary consideration will be given to evidence of high-quality instructional practices and rigorous standards for student performance as evidenced in the Portfolio. In addition, the overall rating of teaching effectiveness will consider the clarity and completeness of the narrative summary of teaching performance, including the faculty member's pedagogical approach and self-assessment of significant accomplishments, as described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Criteria for Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness based on Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) and Additional Indicators (AI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>progressing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inadequate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activities is essential to university-level teaching and service. Such activities (a) contribute to the advancement of the field, (b) complement teaching, (c) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, the College, the University, or community, (d) contribute to the dissemination and application of knowledge in schools and districts, (e) extend the meaning or application of existing knowledge, (f) promote currency of knowledge, methodology, and the spirit of critical inquiry, and (g) sustain professional growth of the faculty member.

The phrase "scholarly and creative activity" as used here relates primarily to the Carnegie Foundation report by Ernest Boyer regarding the "scholarship of discovery" and the "scholarship of integration" i.e., to the production of new knowledge and/or to the extension or application of existing knowledge. The Department recognizes and strongly values multiple types of scholarship including the "scholarship of teaching" and the "scholarship of application/professional service" (to use Boyer's terminology), with all areas addressed in
their own respective sections of UPS 210.000 and in the Department of Reading Personnel Standards.

Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many, including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research, and meta-analysis and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.

1. Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Scholarly and Creative Activities
   a) **Self-Assessment Narrative Summary** (maximum 1,000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for scholarly and creative activities shall be a retrospective analysis of accomplishments in scholarship for the period of the review. It must include a well-defined, focused research agenda that is clearly evident and documented in an ongoing body of work.
   b) **Scholarly Publications** consist of scholarly work that appears in peer-reviewed books, chapters in edited books, journal articles, and other forms of peer-reviewed media. Documentation must include a copy of the book, article, or material. If these are in press and therefore not yet available in print, then a letter of acceptance and commitment to publish must be provided. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to delineate the nature of the contribution of scholarly and creative activities to the field of study. Documentation of peer review, galley pages, copies of final printed versions of publication, letters of review, and evaluation of performances are expected.
   c) **Pragmatic Scholarship** consists of publications which add knowledge to the field. Funded grants, policy analyses, program evaluations, and contracts/consultantships are examples of such activities, and may be reported in non-peer-reviewed materials such as non-peer reviewed invited publications, public press articles, newsletters, or brochures prepared for lay audiences. In documenting pragmatic scholarship, the faculty member must delineate the nature of the contribution of the pragmatic scholarship activity to the field of study.
   d) **Scholarly Presentations** are peer-reviewed papers, presentations, poster sessions, panel discussions for professional meetings, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or convocations. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to delineate the importance of the scholarly presentations to a theoretical framework and advancement of the field of study.

2. Characteristics of a Focused Research Agenda
   The following characteristics of a research agenda are not listed in order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how his or her work meets some or all of these criteria.
   a) **Work that has a conceptual or theoretical basis.** This typically is accomplished through reference to related scholarly literature, summarizing what has been done in the past and indicating how the new work advances knowledge and/or practice.
   b) **Work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or that extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge.** Examples of research designs for advancing knowledge include experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research, and meta-analyses. Knowledge may also be advanced through
creation of approaches, methods, and techniques that translate theory into practical applications. Knowledge may be applied through development of materials that synthesize existing knowledge, such as innovative curricula and program development.

c) *Work that is externally reviewed by peers.* The faculty member must verify the quality of the peer-review process. Reviewer comments should be included, when possible.

d) *Work that is published in respected sources.* Publication sources may be books, journals, and/or other media. The faculty member should provide documentation of the quality, scope, and importance of the journal or book.

3. **Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activities**

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an ongoing, focused, and in-depth program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the review process leading to tenure and promotion.

In addition to the criteria and definitions outlined above, reviewers will consider the nature, complexity, and contribution to the field of each scholarly publication in evaluating the faculty member’s documentation of scholarly and creative accomplishments provided in the Portfolio. The impact of scholarly and creative activity is measured by its overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or to benefit students. It is incumbent upon the faculty member under review to clearly delineate such evidence in his or her Portfolio.

Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render a rating of *excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate.*

**excellent** A comprehensive self-assessment and an exemplary record of scholarly activity. Exemplary is defined as an average of one high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publication in press per year of review following the first probationary year for a total of four. *In addition,* an average of one high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grant, or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period is required. A large, high-quality, externally-funded grant, as defined per the guidelines that follow, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities.

A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined by the criteria established by the College of Education may also be used for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of *excellent* in scholarly and creative activities. Engaged scholarship cannot be used to achieve a rating of *good* or

---

1 The period under review for the promotion to Full Professor shall not include a probationary year. Thus, excellent is defined as an average of one high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publication in press per year of review for a total of five.
lower. The criteria for a meaningful high-quality engaged scholarship project is below. For more information see VI.B.

A large, high-quality, externally funded grant includes all of the following criteria:

- Multi-year funding, operating on a 2-year or greater grant cycle with total award of approximately $50,000 or more,
- A proposal that has a conceptual or theoretical basis (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area,
- A proposal that is externally reviewed by peers, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. The peer-review process should reflect the competitiveness of the grant. One of the best ways of providing such documentation, especially for grants that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments provided with the text of the grant,
- Evidence that the impact of the grant shall be substantial (e.g., number of candidates impacted, number of partner districts impacted, evidence of university and/or preK-12 collaboration, letters of support).

A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project includes the following five criteria (faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence):

- A clear rationale of the need for the work addressed and for the strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out (the plan must be supported by evidence-based practices).
- Work should have a conceptual or theoretical basis (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing peer-reviewed knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work, showing what has been done in the past, and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in the area.
- Multiple forms of evidence shall be provided by the faculty member that demonstrates both the quantitative and qualitative impact of the project. A clear impact on a district/community partner is required. These could include a letter from partners, data collected, etc.
- A description of the evaluation process and outcomes that includes; research questions informed by and situated within the literature, an analysis of findings that are contextualized within the particular community/district/school/classroom needs and the discipline, and implications that illustrate the practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the
better and directions for future work. Evaluation results and implemented changes based on this evaluation must be completed and disseminated before the faculty member can submit this work for the RTP process.

- Evidence of dissemination activities and feedback from stakeholders must be included. Dissemination must include a broad audience.

**good** A comprehensive self-assessment and good performance in scholarly activity. *Good* is defined as an average of three high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications published or in press for the period under review following the first probationary year, and an average of one high-quality pragmatic scholarly product or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period².

**progressing** A limited self-assessment with a poorly focused scholarly agenda and/or modest performance in scholarly activity. *Progressing* is defined as an average of two high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications published or in press for the period under review following the first probationary year, and/or an average of fewer than one pragmatic scholarly product or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period.

**inadequate** A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment and/or a record of scholarly and creative activity falling below that defined above as *progressing*.

C. **Professional, University, and Community Service**

It is expected that the faculty member will contribute to the ongoing refinement and development of communities of learning through service to the profession, the University, and the community.

Professional service has much in common with scholarly and creative activities, though the audience for professional service activities is broader. Professional service activities may:

- complement teaching by allowing the instructor to draw from applied experience;
- promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied;
- bring recognition as a leader to the faculty member from his or her peers; and
- enhance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.

University service is the faculty member’s participation in committee, project, and student advisory activities of the Department, College, and University. Through University service, faculty members contribute to the implementation and evolution of the structure and climate of our own learning community.

Community service is the faculty member’s involvement in activities that contribute to the betterment of the local region. As a member of the College of Education, particularly,

---

² The period under review for the promotion to Full Professor shall not include a probationary year. Thus, *good* is defined as an average of four high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications published or in press for the period under review, and an average of one high-quality pragmatic scholarly product or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period.
faculty members are expected to represent the University in the schools, districts, and other educational communities within our service area.

1. **Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Professional, University, and Community Service**
   a) **Self-Assessment Narrative Summary** (maximum 1,000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for professional, University, and community service shall be a retrospective analysis of accomplishments in these areas, for the period of the review. It must include a well-defined, focused service agenda that is clearly evident and documented in an ongoing body of work.
   b) Additional evidence of service shall be provided and evaluated by indicators such as those listed in Table 4. These lists are not exhaustive, nor are items presented in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how his or her work addresses indicators such as these in each of the three categories of service, including time demands and personal contributions.
   c) The Department recognizes that some activities require substantially more time and energy than others. For instance, writing a substantial portion of an accreditation document or serving on the Academic Senate or a University committee is more demanding than membership on an advisory board that meets once a semester. The faculty member shall provide documentation of the degree of involvement and the importance of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Indicators of Professional, University, or Community Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership roles in local, state, regional, national, and international professional organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Editing professional journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals, or conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing consultations relevant to the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presenting at professional meetings and workshops (which may not be peer reviewed or theoretical in nature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing grant proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invited membership in state or national policy committees and forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing professional training to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University Service</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Active participation in System-wide, University, College, and Department committees and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active involvement as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively supporting the RTP process for untenured faculty (e.g., serving as a faculty mentor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Actively supporting the recruitment efforts of new students into our Department
• Actively supporting the pursuit of higher education of CSUF students
• Actively supporting the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students into the Department, College, and University
• Formulation of, or participation in, programs, institutes, symposiums, or workshops
• Active membership on advisory boards within the University or community
• Lecture/staff development given to University audiences and other University classes
• Faculty and/or student mentoring

Community Service
• Participation in community groups such as involvement with public school or community-based programs
• Special services to the community, such as task forces, workshops, and lectures
• Service to school districts, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, and the wider community and region

2. Rating Criteria for Professional, University, and Community Service
It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate ongoing service in some combination of all of the three service areas detailed above. The Department defines University service to include involvement which is distributed across the Department, College and University levels. Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render a rating of excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate.

excellent A comprehensive self-assessment of service and a well-documented record of substantial involvement in an average of two or more activities in each of the three areas of service (University, professional, community) per year of review following the first probationary year, and including at least one sustained contribution at the University level (in contrast to Department and College-level service) or higher.

good A comprehensive self-assessment of service and a well-documented record of sustained and substantial involvement in four or more activities, distributed among the three categories of service per year of review following the first probationary year.

progressing A limited self-assessment of service, and/or fewer than four documented activities of acceptable quality in the three categories of service per year of review following the first probationary year.

inadequate A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment of service and/or fewer than three documented activities of acceptable quality in the three categories of service per year of review following the first probationary year.

VI. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
A. Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty
Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual’s progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member must be rated, at minimum, good in the area of teaching and one other area, and progressing in the remaining area, and making obvious progress toward a rating of good in this third area.
B. Criteria for Granting of Tenure

1. A faculty member shall normally be considered for tenure during his or her sixth probationary year, with tenure beginning his or her seventh year, if awarded, regardless of the rank at which he or she was appointed.

2. The granting of tenure is the most significant personnel action that the University takes, because it represents an affirmation that the probationary faculty member will be an asset to the University over his or her entire career. 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 Department Personnel Standards.

3. The decision to grant tenure shall be based solely on an evaluation of the faculty member's performance as documented in the Portfolio. Tenure is expected if the faculty member's accomplishments are of sufficient quality and meet expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Departmental Personnel Standards.

4. In order to receive tenure, a faculty member must have received a doctorate in an appropriate field of study from an accredited university.

5. Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render determination regarding the granting of tenure. To achieve tenure, the faculty member must be rated *excellent* in the area of teaching or scholarship, and at least *good* in the other two areas. Table 5 summarizes the foregoing criteria for ratings in the three areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Teaching: SOQ</th>
<th>Teaching: AI</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>90% or more A and B</td>
<td>Five or more well-documented indicators, sustained over time</td>
<td>An average of one scholarly publication for the period under review and an average of one pragmatic scholarly activity or scholarly presentation per year*</td>
<td>Sustained and substantial involvement in an average of two or more activities per year in each of the three areas of service, and at least one sustained contribution at the University level or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>80-89% A and B</td>
<td>Four well documented indicators, sustained over time</td>
<td>An average of three scholarly publications for the period under review and an average of one pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year</td>
<td>Sustained and substantial involvement in an average of four or more activities per year, distributed among the three areas of service per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressing</td>
<td>70-79% A and B</td>
<td>Three documented indicators, sustained over time</td>
<td>An average of two scholarly publications and/or an average of fewer than one pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year</td>
<td>Fewer than an average of four activities per year of acceptable quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>Fewer than 70% A and B</td>
<td>Less than three documented indicators</td>
<td>Scholarly activity falling below that defined above as progressing.</td>
<td>Fewer than an average of three activities per year of acceptable quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A large, high quality, externally-funded grant or an engaged scholarship project may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities.

C. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
1. Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.
2. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may be considered for Early Promotion after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF. Early promotion to Associate Professor requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and potential that strongly indicate that, by the completion of the probationary period, the expectations for tenure stated in this document and Departmental Personnel Standards will be met. In addition, performance in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service shall have exceeded the requirements for excellent in all three areas.
3. Early tenure requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that strongly indicate that the faculty member will, by the completion of the probationary period, and including documentation of service years, achieve a rating of excellent in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
4. Promotion to Full Professor shall be based on a record that indicates commitment to the standards described above. The University expects that tenured faculty will continue to strive
for excellence in all three areas of performance, and that successful faculty members will display accomplishments, growth, and future potential throughout their careers. This will be evidenced by maintaining a rating of *excellent* in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, and at least *good* in the third area. The decision to grant promotion to the Rank of Full Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment described herein.

5. The period under review for the promotion to Full Professor will include the period since the submission of the file to promotion to Associate Professor to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is considered. This includes a minimum of four years of service as a tenured Associate Professor. The Portfolio and its Appendix shall be cumulative and representative of performance for this entire period.

6. Accomplishments documented in the Portfolio or its Appendix for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.

7. Early promotion to Full Professor shall be based on a record that clearly indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described above. This will be evidenced by a documented record of accomplishments, including service years, that achieves a rating of *excellent* in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

9. A candidate for promotion may withdraw his or her promotion request without prejudice at any level of review prior to the final decision.

10. Promotion from one rank to another requires that the faculty member request promotion via the University-approved form and according to University timelines.

Table 6 summarizes these criteria for promotion and tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Early Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Tenure and Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Early Tenure</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor</th>
<th>Early Promotion to Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>good</em> in teaching and one other area, and <em>progressing</em> in the third</td>
<td><em>Excellent</em> in teaching, scholarship, and service over a sustained period.</td>
<td><em>Excellent</em> in teaching or scholarship and <em>good</em> in the other two areas.</td>
<td><em>Excellent</em> in teaching, scholarship, and service over a sustained period.</td>
<td><em>Excellent</em> in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and at least <em>good</em> in the third.</td>
<td><em>Excellent</em> in teaching, scholarship, and service over a sustained period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>