

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.   
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

---

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).



December 13, 2022

To: James Hussar, Ph.D.  
Chair, Department of Art

Arnold Holland, Ed.D.  
Dean, College of the Arts

From: Carolyn Thomas, Ph.D.   
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: **Departmental Personnel Standards for the Department of Art**

The proposed Departmental Personnel Standards from the Department of Art have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.

CT:mc

cc: Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support  
Lisa D. Long, College Personnel Standards Review Committee  
Joseph Biel, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee  
Faculty Affairs and Records

**DPS RECEIVED MINOR EDITS, May 2023**

## Department of Art Personnel Standards

Approved March 8, 2023

### I. Preamble

This Department of Art Personnel Standards document (Standards) sets forth expectations and procedures for personnel evaluations for Department of Art faculty seeking retention, tenure, and promotion as well as for evaluators at all levels.

### II. Department of Art Personnel Standards, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002

These Standards, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002 establish the range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. UPS 210.000 (II.B.4.e) and UPS 210.002 (II.A) identify three areas of review: Teaching Performance; Scholarly and Creative Activity; and Professional, University, and Community Service.

Faculty seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion shall compile their Evidence of Performance (Section V) to be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), the Department Chair (DC), the Dean of the College of the Arts, the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) as appropriate, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President or designee.

### III. The Prospectus

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty shall write a Prospectus that includes developmental narratives for Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, University, and Community Service, not to exceed 500 words for each narrative. These narratives shall describe the faculty member's professional goals, areas of interest, resources required, and accomplishments they expect to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion as set forth by these Standards, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. These narratives will have no formal approval process but will be reviewed by the DC and the Dean of the College of the Arts, who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the college dean, but prior to May 1. These narratives shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member's Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure-track position.

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

### IV. Election of the Department Personnel Committee

A. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of an uneven number of members and no fewer than three members. These members shall have been granted tenure and shall not include the DC. They shall be elected by tenured and probationary (tenure-track) faculty before the end of the spring semester.

B. Two members shall be elected for one-year terms and a third member shall be elected for a two-year term. The terms shall be staggered in such a manner that two members are elected

each year. The member receiving the greatest number of votes shall serve the two-year term. No member shall serve two consecutive two-year terms.

C. At least one tenured faculty member shall be elected each year to serve as an alternate for a one-year term. The alternate(s) shall serve as a replacement in any instance involving a DPC member's self-disqualification, temporary absence, or disqualification for any other reason, in accordance with UPS 210.000 (III.K). Alternates shall be determined by the number of votes received and shall be called upon to serve in that order.

D. The members of the DPC shall elect the chair of the DPC.

## V. Evidence of Performance

### A. The Portfolio and its Appendices

1. The Portfolio and its Appendices are the functional equivalent of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and are the basis for RTP evaluation, recommendations, and actions. They shall be cumulative and representative of performance. For probationary faculty, the Portfolio and Appendices cover the period from the beginning of probationary service to the last day before the due date of the file to the DC. For tenured faculty, the Portfolio and Appendices cover the period since the submission of the file for promotion to Associate Professor to the last day before the due date of the file to the DC. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio.

2. It is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to meet the RTP timeline and ensure the completeness of their Portfolio and Appendices.

### B. The Portfolio shall include the following items:

1. Table of contents of the Portfolio (available from Faculty Affairs and Records).
2. A table of contents of the Appendix to the Portfolio.
3. A copy of these Standards.
4. The Prospectus.
5. The faculty member's current curriculum vita covering their entire academic and professional employment history.
6. Narrative summaries, which are concise (maximum 1000 words each) self-assessments of accomplishments in each of the three areas of review.
7. A semester-by-semester list in chronological order of all courses taught during the period under review showing the session, course number, course title, and weighted teaching units (WTU).
8. Copies of the SOQ forms used by the department.

9. Statistical summaries by class of objective responses on SOQ forms for all fall and spring classes that the faculty member has taught during the period under review.

10. Statistical summaries of grade distributions from all fall and spring classes that the faculty member has taught during the period under review for which students received University credit (including service credit years), as well as any material that may help interpret these statistical summaries.

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

#### C. The Appendix to the Portfolio

In addition to the Portfolio, the faculty member shall assemble an appendix containing supporting materials that are directly relevant to the narrative summaries in the Portfolio. The appendix shall be cumulative, covering the period under review.

The Appendix shall include:

1. SOQ Raw Data (if SOQs were administered using paper) or Comment Reports (if SOQs were administered online) for all fall and spring courses taught during the period under review for which students received credit. File names shall clearly identify courses by prefix, number, section, semester, and year.
2. A representative syllabus and other selected materials for each fall and spring course taught during the period under review. Multiple sections of the same course taught during the period under review need be represented only once.
3. Supporting materials for accomplishments discussed in the narratives. The narratives must indicate the location of supporting materials in the appendix for ease of retrieval and evaluation.

#### D. Evidence of Teaching Performance

Teaching is the most important category under review. An environment where learning is central and equitable is mandatory. In a narrative summary limited to 1000 words, the faculty member shall discuss the number and nature of courses taught, student response to instruction, pedagogical approach and methods, student achievement, currency as an instructor and as a professional in the discipline, assessment methods, and grading procedures. The narrative summary is a self-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, teaching philosophy and goals, and plans for the ongoing maintenance and improvement of teaching effectiveness. The department shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member's teaching performance.

##### 1. Mandatory Indicators of Teaching Performance:

- a. Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance.
- b. Clear and well-organized course syllabi.

c. Sample teaching materials. Materials may include but are not limited to:

i. Class handouts or exercises.

ii. Project and assignment details.

iii. Quizzes and tests.

iv. Rubrics.

v. LMS pages.

vi. Slide presentations.

vii. Recorded lectures.

d. SOQ statistical summaries.

e. SOQ written comments.

f. Grade distribution statistical summaries, as well as any material that may help evaluators to interpret these statistical summaries, including department grade point averages.

g. Evidence of currency in the visual arts in the faculty member's area of expertise.

h. Anonymous examples of student artwork (from studio courses) or research/essay papers (from lecture courses).

2. Supporting Indicators of Teaching Performance that may be presented:

a. Evidence of professional recognition of students and/or former students: grants, honors, awards, or commissions.

b. Program development and innovation.

c. Support and continued supervision of resources and/or facilities beyond normal teaching duties.

d. Research or creative activities related to teaching the discipline.

e. Participation on graduate student committees.

f. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.

g. Optional peer observations of teaching performance by tenured or tenure-track colleagues in the Department of Art. The evaluations may include classroom visitations that assess pedagogical approach and methods, student response to instruction, and course requirements. The choice of the evaluator(s) and the nature, frequency and

procedures of the visitation(s) shall be the responsibility of the faculty member, in consultation with the DC. Peer observations must be conducted in a way consistent with UPS 210.080.

h. Unsolicited written comments from students.

i. Other evidence relevant to teaching assignments.

#### E. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

In a 1000-word narrative, the faculty member shall discuss and evaluate scholarly and creative achievements. It is essential to put scholarly and creative indicators in a well-defined and focused context and explain the professional objectives of the accomplishments.

The Department of Art indicators include activities that, by their very nature, establish a form of peer review. There is a selective and highly competitive process involved in the participation in exhibitions, selection for publication by professional journals and presses, awards or grants, letters of validation by off-campus peers, etc. Due to the nature of diverse disciplines within the Department of Art, faculty must provide documentation of peer review to support their level of accomplishment(s). A common definition of peer review for the RTP process shall be:

Substantiation of the creative and scholarly activities of the faculty member under review by qualified individuals, institutions, organizations, publications, presses, or societies off campus. In the case of co-authored or other collaborative work, faculty must provide documentation of their contribution. Indicators of the faculty member's performance in scholarship and creative activity may include but are not limited to:

##### 1. Primary indicators:

a. One-person exhibitions in a gallery or museum.

b. Publication of an authored or co-authored book or edited volume.

c. Retrospective exhibitions.

d. Invitational or competitive shows or other events, including but not limited to curated film, performance, electronic media arts, and design art festivals.

e. International or national traveling group shows.

f. Peer-reviewed publications of original research or creative work in scholarly or professional venues, including but not limited to research/creative articles in art, design, art history or industry journals.

g. Funded competitive commissions, awards, or extramural grants.

h. Curation of an exhibition.

i. Selective residencies or fellowships.

j. Professional commissions or purchase of work for collections.

##### 2. Supporting indicators:

- a. Research/creative papers presented at regional, national, or international scholarly conferences.
- b. Publication of reviews on art, design, or art history in professional or scholarly journals.
- c. Work reviewed, discussed, and/or reproduced in off-campus publications.
- d. Letters of validation by off-campus peers in reference to specific creative and/or scholarly accomplishments.
- e. Commendations related to research/contributions to the field.
- f. Intramural and extramural grant proposals.
- g. Works in progress.

#### F. Evidence of Professional, University, and Community Service

In a 1000-word narrative, the faculty member shall discuss contributions to the Profession, to the University, and to the Community during the period under review. Professional and service activities that encourage mutually beneficial working partnerships, serve the needs of the profession and/or external community, enhance the campus' role as a regional center, and/or lead to student opportunities and learning are supportive of the department's mission. Indicators of the quality of the faculty member's contributions to the profession, to the University, and to the community may include but are not limited to the following professional and service activities:

1. Participation in professional organizations.
2. Participation in workshops.
3. Participation on juries for professional groups.
4. Presentation of papers to community groups (such as docent councils or museum support groups), distinct from research papers presented at scholarly conferences.
5. Membership on College of the Arts committees.
6. Membership on Academic Senate committees.
7. Membership on University committees.
8. Department service including but not limited to
  - a. Serving as area lead.
  - b. Membership on department committees.
  - c. Student recruitment, outreach, or participation in alumni events.
  - d. Maintenance, upkeep, and oversight of technology and facilities necessary for instruction.

- e. Serving on graduate thesis committees.
- 9. Jury activity for public groups.
- 10. Organizing shows, conference sessions, or other events.
- 11. Mentoring of probationary faculty.
- 12. Serving on organization boards or committees.
- 13. Being a discussant of presented papers.
- 14. Serving as faculty advisor of a student organization.
- 15. Developing/facilitating internships, service-learning opportunities, or community-engaged learning opportunities.

## VI. Evaluation of Evidence of Performance

A. Each of the three areas of review shall be assigned one of the following ratings: "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Needs Improvement," "Does Not Meet Expectations."

B. The DPC shall determine the rating it assigns to each area of review by majority vote of its members. However, the evaluation report shall incorporate a discussion of all points of view held by members of the DPC (UPS 210.000, Section III.E.1).

### C. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Evaluators shall review the mandatory and supporting indicators of Teaching Performance (Section V.D) and take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.), efforts to improve teaching performance, and evidence of cultural taxation. Evaluators shall assign a rating of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Needs Improvement," or "Does Not Meet Expectations" based on their evaluation of "Narrative Summary, Sample Teaching Materials, and Supporting Indicators" and "SOQs." When assigning a rating, evaluators shall weigh "Narrative Summary, Sample Teaching Materials, and Supporting Indicators" more heavily than "SOQs."

#### 1. Narrative Summary, Sample Teaching Materials, and Supporting Indicators

Evaluators shall review the Narrative Summary, syllabi, sample teaching materials including syllabi and anonymous examples of student work, and supporting indicators (Section V.D) and assign a rating of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Needs Improvement," or "Does Not Meet Expectations" based on the following criteria:

- a. Establishment of an equitable environment conducive to learning for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population.
- b. Creation of courses linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.

- c. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods and learning modalities.
  - i. Pedagogical methods consider student needs.
  - ii. Use of technology is accessible and appropriate to the learning experience.
  - iii. May include service-learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, semester-abroad courses or other high-impact practices.
- d. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
- e. Fair and transparent grading system.
- f. Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching.
- g. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

2. SOQs

Evaluators shall review SOQ quantitative and qualitative data and assign an overall rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations.”

a. SOQ Quantitative Data

Ratings of SOQ quantitative data shall be based on frequency distributions for the period under review. Frequency distributions and corresponding ratings are subject to interpretation. Generally, SOQ quantitative data shall be assigned a rating according to the following scale:

Rating	Frequency distributions during period under review
Exceeds Expectations	90% or higher A + B responses
Meets Expectations	70% or higher A + B responses
Needs Improvement	60-69% A + B + C responses
Does Not Meet Expectations	0-59% A + B + C responses

b. SOQ Qualitative Data

Evaluators shall review and rate SOQ student comments. Generally, when the predominant tone of student comments is positive, the evaluators shall assign a rating of “Exceeds Expectations.” Generally, when the tone of student comments is mostly positive with occasional negative comments, the evaluators shall assign a rating of “Meets Expectations.” Generally, when there is a

combination of positive comments and patterns of negative comments, evaluators shall assign a rating of “Needs Improvement.” Generally, when the predominant tone of student comments is negative, evaluators shall assign a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations.”

### 3. Grade Distributions

The faculty member shall comment in the Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance on the distribution of grades assigned to students. Evaluators shall comment on whether or not the grade distributions appear to be appropriate depending upon the level and types of courses that have been taught. However, grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. Academic rigor shall be assessed based on the supporting documents and materials included in the appendix (assignments, examples of student work, rubrics, etc.).

### 4. Evaluators shall rate faculty members as:

- a. “Exceeds Expectations” in Teaching Performance when the faculty member has been rated as “Exceeds Expectations” in the category of “Narrative Summary, Sample Teaching Materials, and Supporting Indicators” and at least “Meets Expectations” in the category “SOQs.”
- b. “Meets Expectations” in Teaching Performance when the faculty member has been rated as “Meets Expectations” in the category of “Narrative Summary, Sample Teaching Materials, and Supporting Indicators” and at least “Meets Expectations” in the category “SOQs.”
- c. “Needs Improvement” in Teaching Performance when the faculty member has been rated as “Needs Improvement” in one category (assuming a higher rating in the remaining category) or in both of the categories. For probationary faculty, a rating of “Needs Improvement” in probationary year 2 or 4 leads to a full performance review in probationary year 3 or 5, respectively.
- d. “Does Not Meet Expectations” in Teaching Performance when the faculty member has been rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or both of the categories. For probationary faculty, a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” leads to a recommendation for termination during the second-year review and a terminal year during any other probationary year review.

### D. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evaluators shall review the evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity and take into account the quality, significance, and relative merit of each accomplishment as substantiated by documentation of peer review. Additionally, evaluators shall consider the faculty member’s contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work and evidence of cultural taxation.

Per UPS 210.002, Section II.B.2.b.1, quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluators may assign additional value to accomplishments based on their importance and scope, their positive

critical reception, the status and selectiveness of the corresponding venue, journal, press, or organization, and other factors as deemed appropriate.

Evaluators shall assign a rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations” considering first and foremost the primary indicators listed in Section V.E.1. Single accomplishments of significant merit, such as one-person exhibitions in a reputable gallery or museum or publication of a peer-reviewed book with a reputable press, may be assigned the value of multiple primary indicators. Evaluators shall consider the supporting indicators listed in Section V.E.2 as supporting evidence of scholarly and creative activity but not in lieu of primary indicators nor sufficient to merit promotion or tenure absent primary indicators. However, supporting indicators may be sufficient to merit retention during the probationary period. Furthermore, supporting indicators of significant merit, such as successful grant proposals or having work featured or extensively discussed in prestigious off-campus publications, may be assigned the value of primary indicators.

1. Evaluators shall rate faculty members seeking retention as:

- a. “Exceeds Expectations” in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member is making excellent progress and is on track to exceed the requirement for tenure and promotion in this area.
- b. “Meets Expectations” in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area.
- c. “Needs Improvement” in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the candidate is making less than satisfactory progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area. For probationary faculty, a rating of “Needs Improvement” in probationary year 2 or 4 leads to a full performance review in probationary year 3 or 5, respectively.
- d. “Does Not Meet Expectations” in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area. For probationary faculty, a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” leads to a recommendation for termination during the second-year review and a terminal year during any other probationary year review.

2. Evaluators shall rate faculty members seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor as:

- a. “Exceeds Expectations” in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has three or more accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent. Additionally, the faculty member has worked to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

b. "Meets Expectations" in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has at least two accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent. Additionally, the faculty member has worked to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

c. "Needs Improvement" when the faculty member has fewer than two accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent or has failed to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has fewer than two accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent and has failed to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

3. Evaluators shall rate faculty members seeking promotion to Professor as:

a. "Exceeds Expectations" in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has three or more accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent. Additionally, the faculty member has worked to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

b. "Meets Expectations" in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has at least two accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent. Additionally, the faculty member has worked to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

c. "Needs Improvement" in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has fewer than two accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent or has failed to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" in Scholarly and Creative Activity when the faculty member has fewer than two accomplishments from the primary indicators or the equivalent and has failed to maintain an active scholarly and creative agenda as evidenced by accomplishments listed among the supporting indicators.

#### E. Evaluation of Professional, University, and Community Service

Evaluators shall review the evidence of Professional, University, and Community Service and take into account the significance of the activity and the nature and extent of the faculty member's involvement and evidence of cultural taxation as substantiated by documentation.

1. Evaluators shall rate faculty members seeking retention as:

- a. "Exceeds Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member is making excellent progress and is on track to exceed the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area.
- b. "Meets Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area.
- c. "Needs Improvement" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the candidate is making less than satisfactory progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area. For probationary faculty, a rating of "Needs Improvement" in probationary year 2 or 4 leads to a full performance review in probationary year 3 or 5, respectively.
- d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion in this area. For probationary faculty, a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" leads to a recommendation for termination during the second-year review and a terminal year during any other probationary year review.

2. Evaluators shall rate faculty members seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor as:

- a. "Exceeds Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has displayed at least four indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities. Of the four or more indicators, at least two distinct categories (Professional, University, Community) shall be represented. The faculty member shall provide evidence of service in the remaining category.
- b. "Meets Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has displayed at least three indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities. Of the three indicators, at least two distinct categories (Professional, University, Community) shall be represented. The faculty member shall provide evidence of service in the remaining category.
- c. "Needs Improvement" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has fewer than three indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities or when there is not evidence of service in each of the three categories.
- d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has fewer than two indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities and when there is not evidence of service in each of the three categories.

3. Evaluators shall rate faculty members seeking promotion to Professor as:

- a. "Exceeds Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has displayed at least four indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities. Of the four or more indicators, at least two distinct categories (Professional, University, Community) shall be represented. The faculty member shall provide evidence of service in the remaining category.
- b. "Meets Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has displayed at least three indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities. Of the three indicators, at least two distinct categories (Professional, University, Community) shall be represented. The faculty member shall provide evidence of service in the remaining category.
- c. "Needs Improvement" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has fewer than three indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities or when there is not evidence of service in each of the three categories.
- d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" in Professional, University, and Community Service when the faculty member has fewer than two indicators of service that display strong leadership, extensive involvement, or sustained participation in activities and when there is not evidence of service in each of the three categories.

#### VII. Recommendations in the RTP Process

- A. To be recommended for retention during the probationary period, the faculty member must receive at least a "Needs Improvement" rating in each of the three areas of review.
- B. To be recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must receive at least a "Meets Expectations" rating in each of the three areas of review.
- C. To be recommended for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must receive an "Exceeds Expectations" rating in each of the three areas of review.
- D. To be recommended for promotion to Professor, the faculty member must receive at least a "Meets Expectations" rating in each of the three areas of review.
- E. To be recommended for early promotion to Professor, the faculty member must receive an "Exceeds Expectations" rating in each of the three areas of review.