

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).

**Official
Approved
Department
Personnel
Standards**

Date: 11/10/2016



California State University, Fullerton

College of Engineering & Computer Science

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Department Personnel Standards

Approved November 10, 2016 by Interim Provost Anil K. Puri
Effective 2017-2018 Academic Year

Approved October 20, 2016 by
Susamma Barua, Interim Dean, College of Engineering & Computer Science

Revised and approved by
Civil and Environmental Engineering Department on October 12, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Preface	3
II. Department Structure	3
III. Scope of Document	3
IV. Department Personnel Committee	3
A. Committee Functions	3
B. Committee Structure	3
C. Election of Committee Members	4
D. Committee Responsibilities	4
E. Chair's Responsibilities	5
F. Abbreviated Review Files for Third and Fifth Year Probationary Faculty.....	5
V. General Guidelines	6
A. Prospectus	6
B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission	6
C. Portfolio Contents and Organization	6
VI. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion	7
A. Teaching Performance	7
B. Scholarly and Creative Activities	11
C. Professional, University, and Community Service.....	14
VII. Guidelines for Applying Evaluation Criteria in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions	16
A. Retention During Probationary Years	16
B. Tenure Requirements	16
C. Promotion to Associate Professor	16
D. Early Promotion to Associate Professor	17
E. Early Tenure	17
F. Promotion to Full Professor	17
G. Early Promotion to Full Professor	17

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS
DEPARTMENT OF
CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING

I. Preface

The Department of **Civil and Environmental Engineering** (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing high quality programs that provide future **engineers/ scientists** with state-of-the-art knowledge in their chosen field. Emphasis is on developing technical and professional skills that prepare students for successful careers and as productive citizens. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning and to providing an environment where learning and the expansion of knowledge are central to all activities. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is instructional faculty who demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. It is the position of the Department that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department proposes a personnel document, consistent with 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.

II. Department Structure

The Department of **Civil and Environmental Engineering** is led by a Department Chair who is selected via UPS 211.100 procedures approved by the President. The Department offers Bachelor’s and Master’s degree programs in **Civil and Environmental Engineering**.

III. Scope of Document

The document summarizes policies and procedures with respect to the selection and function of the Department Personnel Committee, the preparation of a Prospectus, and the preparation of Portfolios. The document also describes criteria to be used in the evaluation of Portfolios during the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process.

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the “Committee”) shall make specific recommendations concerning faculty retention, promotion, and granting of tenure as specified in UPS 210.000.

B. Committee Structure

The Committee shall consist of three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. All Committee members shall have a higher rank of classification than those being evaluated. No person shall serve as a Committee member during the year in which he/she is being considered for RTP action.

An alternate Committee member shall participate on the Committee in the event that a

regular Committee member cannot complete the term. Should such a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty.

C. Election of Committee Members

1. The Department shall elect the committee by the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot. All tenured faculty who meet the requirements in IV. B. above are automatically on the slate of potential Committee members except the following: (a) the Department Chair, (b) those who are being considered for RTP action that year, (c) those who will be on sabbatical leave during any part of that year, and (d) faculty who serve on the Faculty Personnel committee (FPC) during that year.
2. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for up to three Committee members. The three faculty members receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected as "regular" Committee members. The person with the 4th highest number of votes shall be the alternate. In the case of a tie, the last regular member and the alternate shall be decided by the flip of a coin (or by drawing names randomly, should the tie involve more than two people). Per UPS 210.000, if a department does not have enough tenured faculty to provide a choice for Committee membership (i.e., has fewer than four tenured faculty), the slate shall contain one or more tenured faculty from another department, which could include department chairs from other departments.
3. The Committee shall elect its Chair for a one-year term.

D. Committee Responsibilities

1. The Committee shall review and evaluate Portfolios of faculty members involved in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

Following a review of the Portfolio, the Committee shall prepare a written composite evaluation describing the candidate's performance (faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion) or progress (if probationary faculty) under each of the evaluation areas--teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and professional, University, and community service--as described in Section VI. of this document.

2. The Committee's evaluation for each area shall be based on information provided in the Portfolio. Each Committee member utilizes his/her best professional judgment in assessing how well the established evaluation criteria have been met.
 - a. *Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention:*
The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides supportive rationale for rating the probationary faculty member's PROGRESS in each category as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory**. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the Committee members.
 - b. *Faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion:*
The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides supporting rationale for rating the faculty member's PERFORMANCE in each category as **excellent, good, needs**

improvement, or unsatisfactory. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VI. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the Committee members.

3. After the Committee completes its evaluation and reviews the Department Chair's evaluation, the Committee shall formulate a recommendation, which states in writing the reasons for the recommendation relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. All actions taken by the Committee shall be approved by a simple majority vote.
4. Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.
5. The Committee shall submit its evaluation and recommendation statements to the Department Chair in accordance with the published timelines for the personnel action cycle.

E. Department Chair's Responsibilities

According to UPS 210.000 the Department Chair has the responsibility to:

1. Communicate the standards and criteria for RTP to all Department faculty members.
2. Inform each new faculty member within two weeks after the assumption of official duties at the University of all personnel procedures including those covered by this document.
3. Provide guidance, advice, and support to assist new probationary faculty in preparing their Prospectus.
4. Provide the probationary faculty member with written feedback on the Prospectus prior to May 1.
5. Consult, during the spring semester, with each faculty member for whom a personnel recommendation will be made during the following fall semester to assure that the annual updating of the Portfolio has been initiated and that the compilation is proceeding according to the requirements of this document. Such consultation shall be documented and submitted to Faculty Affairs and Records by the end of the semester.

Tenured Chairs not seeking promotion have additional responsibilities that include reviewing and evaluating portfolios (see UPS 210.000 IV. D., Responsibilities of Department Chairs). In situations where the Department Chair is ineligible to participate in the evaluation and review process, the Dean assumes these responsibilities (UPS 210.000 IV.F).

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

Faculty members evaluated as making 'Excellent' or 'Good' progress in their full performance review during year 2 or year 4 shall, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit an "Abbreviated Review File." The Abbreviated File comprises only three items: (1) an updated portfolio vita, (2)

statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review. When subject to an Abbreviated Review, the file shall be submitted by October 1, review of which shall be completed by June 1. The Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean shall provide a signed statement indicating that the Review File was received, reviewed, and evaluated. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the signed statement, and a copy shall be forwarded to Faculty Affairs and Records for placement in the faculty member's Personnel Action File. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the College Dean may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member's progress.

V. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus

According to UPS 210.000 Section III. A., 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 UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus due dates shall be determined by the Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) and the College. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean (or equivalent). The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews. However, as goals evolve and change over the probationary period, faculty may provide updated versions of the Prospectus if they so choose.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each faculty member seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion to prepare the information required for the Portfolio and to deliver the materials to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. A general timetable for submitting the Portfolio is provided in UPS 210.000 I.K. Specific timetables for each year are prepared and distributed by the FAR Office early in the fall semester.

C. Portfolio Contents and Organization

According to UPS 210.000 Section III. B.,

1. The Portfolio, including its Appendices, is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. Although the Portfolio itself shall be submitted in hard copy form in a binder, the faculty member may choose to submit the Appendices via the Electronic Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Process (ERTP). If appendices are submitted in hard copy format, materials should be presented in small to medium binders for each section – i.e., one binder for the main portfolio and one for each appendix section—teaching, scholarship, and service, with all binders then placed into one banker's box (or similar container) for delivery to the department chair.

For Probationary Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from

the beginning of probationary service to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio and its Appendices. The FAR office will provide each new probationary faculty member with a binder and enumerated tabs.

For Tenured Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period since the submission of the file for promotion to Associate Professor to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered.

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the completeness of the Portfolio and Appendices.
3. In the Portfolio and Appendices, faculty members shall describe and document significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the period under review. Quality over quantity shall be emphasized; a more limited number of appropriately documented high-quality accomplishments is generally more compelling than a compendium of all activities. Note, however, that all accomplishments shall be listed in the Portfolio Vita (described in section III. B. of UPS 210.000). A clear connection between the narratives, the Table of Contents of the Appendix, the Portfolio, and the documents or artifacts in the Appendix shall be established. The Portfolio and accompanying Appendices shall be prepared following guidelines provided by the FAR Office, also posted on the FAR website.
4. The Portfolio shall be organized as directed in UPS 210.000 Section B.4.

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

All tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated within three performance categories -- (1) teaching, (2), scholarly and creative activity, and (3) professional, University, and community service. High quality performance is expected of each faculty member in all three areas. However, in support of the “learning is preeminent” mission of the University, and in compliance with UPS 210.000, the primary emphasis in the retention, tenure, and promotion process shall be on *teaching performance*. *Scholarly and creative activity*, also an essential part of faculty activity, is the second most important performance category.

A. Teaching Performance

The Department expects that each faculty member shall demonstrate effective teaching (both in and outside of the classroom) at all levels of review. Students’ opinions of teaching are an important (though not decisive) means of assessing the quality of teaching. Also important are quality of instructional materials, documentation of student learning, rigorous but fair methods of evaluating and grading students, peer evaluations, and evidence of ongoing professional development with respect to maintaining currency in the field and to pedagogical growth. In all cases, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to describe the quality of the teaching performance.

As stated in UPS 210.000, each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio and Appendices according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple indicators of teaching performance. These shall include mandatory indicators and at least two of the four additional indicators listed below.

The following indicators and criteria are used in evaluating teaching performance:

1. **Mandatory Indicators**

To be included in the portfolio:

- a. **Self-assessment (limited to 1000 words)** – This shall include a reflective discussion of the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and performance, as well as future goals and directions. The self-assessment statement shall include a discussion of teaching objectives, methods, and evaluation procedures (including grading distributions relative to academic standards). Also, it shall address on-going professional activities with respect to development both within the discipline (professional conferences) and pedagogical development (seminars and workshops). Also, when areas of concern have been identified in previous RTP evaluations, the faculty member shall include in the self-assessment a discussion of specific strategies that have been used to address those concerns.
- b. **List of courses taught** – This list shall include a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught during the review period. The listing shall include the course number, name, and unit value. If assigned time was received, the weighted teaching unit value shall be listed along with an explanation of the assigned-time activity.
- c. **Statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires** - Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) responses contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. However, per UPS 210.000 they shall not be used as the sole indicator in evaluation of teaching. The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught during the period of review shall be included. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data shall also be provided for all service-credit years. If not available, a written explanation, verified by the faculty member’s former supervisor, shall be included.

Evaluations of teaching performance shall address subjective written comments on SOQ forms, as well as the other ‘mandatory’ and ‘additional’ indicators described in VI.A.1 & 2.

- d. **Statistical summaries of grade distribution** - University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each class shall be

included. Grade distributions for courses in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, normally range between 2.2-2.9 for lower division courses, 2.4-3.0 for upper division courses, and 3.0-3.6 for graduate courses.

To be included in the Appendix:

- e. Course syllabi and assessment materials - A syllabus shall be included for each course taught, preferably for the most recent course offering if the course has been taught more than once. Supplemental instructional materials (e.g., sample course notes, assignments, handouts, and exams) shall also be included.
- f. Individual student opinion questionnaires - The original, raw data student-completed student opinion forms for each course shall be provided. If forms are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data, if available, shall also be provided for all service-credit years. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.
- g. Professional development activities – Faculty must provide evidence of continued professional development that supports both currency in the discipline and pedagogical development. Examples to support currency in the field might include attendance at professional conference, participation in professional organizations, or other scholarly interactions with colleagues. Activities that support improved teaching might include attendance at pedagogical seminars, workshops, or other trainings.

2. Additional Indicators

- a. Pedagogical Approach and Methods
In addition to the above mandatory indicators of teaching performance, faculty may also provide evidence of contribution to student learning through such activities as: 1) academic advising, 2) development of new courses/curriculum, 3) use of innovative approaches to teaching, fostering, and/or assessing student learning, such as development of instructional technology, 4) organization of pedagogical workshops, 5) mentoring and/or supervision of internships and independent studies, 6) supervision of student theses/projects/ comprehensive exams, or 7) other indicators supporting teaching effectiveness, including teaching awards or recognitions.
- b. Professor Engineer (PE) license – This document shall include a copy of PE license or approval letter. The Department also recognizes the importance of the Professional Engineer (PE) license. Licensed faculty members are good models for our students, and are more likely to impart the professional and ethical obligations of the licensed practice of engineering. The department encourages faculty member to obtain their professional engineer license during their probationary years.

c. Classroom Visitations

Classroom visitations by Department colleagues can provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessment shall be in the context of the level and objectives of the course. Assessments by external evaluators may be included.

3. Rating Criteria

Overall teaching performance - The overall rating for teaching performance effectiveness shall be based on a combination of: (1) student opinion ratings (SOQ data), (2) students' subjective comments on SOQ forms, (3) evaluation of other mandatory information, and (4) evaluation of any additional indicators. Based upon the total evidence provided in both mandatory and additional indicators, the reviewers shall rate the faculty member's overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory**. Again, SOQ ratings shall not be used as the sole determinant of an instructor's overall evaluation. However, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide additional indicators of teaching effectiveness and the responsibility of RTP reviewers to evaluate the quality of these indicators in arriving at an appropriate overall rating for teaching performance.

Examples of criteria for use in assigning the following ratings for Teaching are:

“Excellent” – clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; a faculty member's mean SOQ course rating of 3.50 or above for most courses taught during the review period (as indicated on SOQ printouts); subjective comments on SOQs that support good teaching; average grade distributions that fall within normal department ranges or are otherwise explained and justified; documented evidence of high quality course syllabi and assessment techniques; engagement in professional development activities; and participation in additional indicators that support student learning as listed under VI.2.

“Good” – clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; a faculty member's mean SOQ course rating of 3.00-3.49 for most courses taught during the review period (as indicated on SOQ printouts); subjective comments on SOQs that support good teaching; average grade distributions that fall within normal Department ranges or are otherwise explained and justified; documented evidence of high quality course syllabi and assessment techniques; engagement in professional development activities; and participation in additional indicators that support student learning as listed under VI.2.

“Needs Improvement” - incomplete self-assessment of teaching performance; a faculty

member's mean SOQ course rating of 2.60-2.99 for most courses taught during the review period (as indicated on SOQ printouts), with students' written comments indicating some frustration with their learning experience; other indicators that are below the standard for a rating of "good".

"Unsatisfactory" – unclear self-assessment of teaching; a faculty member's mean SOQ course rating falls below 2.60 for most courses taught during the review period (as indicated on SOQ printouts), with students' written comments indicating serious dissatisfaction with their learning experience; additional indicators that are below the standard for a rating of "needs improvement".

Overall teaching performance - Based upon the total evidence provided in both mandatory and additional indicators, the reviewers will rate the faculty member's overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, needs improvement or unsatisfactory**. However, in accordance with UPS 210.000, the evaluation *shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional, etc.)*. The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member's overall level of experiences. It is the faculty member's responsibility to point out any special circumstances (e.g., number of new preparations or perhaps a late change in assignment), that should be considered and the responsibility of RTP reviewers to give appropriate consideration to such circumstances in assigning the overall rating for teaching effectiveness.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities

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

The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activity may be evidenced through (1) creation of new knowledge, (2) integration of knowledge, and/or (3) dissemination of knowledge. It is expected that over the period of review faculty members' scholarly and creative endeavors shall result in **high quality, peer-reviewed** pieces of work -- i.e., journal articles, high quality papers published in conference proceedings, book chapters, books, or other comparable works. Recognition will be given for engaging students in the faculty's research and scholarly activities. External grants submitted, especially those awarded, shall strengthen performance in this category. Other indicators adding support to the faculty member's scholarly and creative accomplishments are works in progress and non peer-reviewed publications and achievements.

It is expected that those evaluating the Portfolio shall consider the quality as well as the quantity of performance. When the scholarly or creative activity has made a major impact on the discipline or on professional practice, it is appropriate to assign additional weight to it. In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document the importance of their work, as well as the quality of the publications/outlets where their work appears.

It is the position of the Department, in line with the University Mission and Goals, that collaborative research/scholarly and creative efforts are of benefit to the institution as well as to the individual. **For tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and creative category shall include at least three peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be as primary author, and the other two at least major author.** A major author is defined as a co-author who made major contributions to key aspects of the study and the paper. It is the responsibility of co-authors to describe major contributions to the article (e.g., formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the experimental design, organizing and conducting the statistical analysis, interpreting the results, writing a major portion of the article) and to document such contributions through co-author disclosure statements from other authors. Note: For student co-authors working under the mentorship of the faculty member, the need for co-authorship disclosure of the faculty member's contribution is waived. It is assumed that faculty supervision of student's work reflects a major contribution.

As with all evaluation categories, a faculty member's scholarly and creative contribution shall be rated as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory**. The following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several "hierarchical" indicators of performance. **Level I** includes the publication of one's work in peer-reviewed journals, books, or other comparable outlets, as well as obtaining major external grants. **Level II** includes accomplishments that are an important part of one's scholarly agenda such as scholarly presentations, book reviews, and external grants, but generally are one step below that of **Level I**. **Level III** includes evidence of work in progress and on-going activity.

In all cases, the *quality* of the scholarly and creative work shall be considered in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the quality of his/her accomplishments. Examples of quality indicators are journal acceptance records, journal impact factor, publication distribution figures, the scope of the publication (regional, national, or international), the quality of the editorial board and review process (blind vs. non-blind), and the extent of the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored work.

Level I

- Articles published (or accepted for publication without further review) as primary author or major author in peer-reviewed journals*
- Peer-reviewed books published or in press (as primary author or major author)
- Large externally funded grants (\$50K or more) as Principal Investigator or equal Co-PI
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance (e.g., digital projects, software development, book chapters, and high quality papers published in conference proceedings)

Level II

- Scholarly presentations at professional meetings
- Published peer-reviewed abstracts
- Papers published in non peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)
- Published book reviews
- Non-peer reviewed articles or books
- Manuscripts revised based on reviewer feedback and are under second review
- Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)
- Grants received, with major grants not qualified as Level I indicators
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Level III

- Research in progress
- Papers submitted for publication/presentation
- Grant proposals submitted
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

*Although multiple indicators are listed in Level I, it shall be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly and creative work in the field and, thus, are expected to be part of a faculty member's accomplishments at each level of review. It is also expected that faculty members will involve students in their research.

Note: For tenure, the scholarly and creative activity category shall include at least three peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be as primary author, and the other two as at least major author.

Criteria for assignment of ratings for Scholarly and Creative Activity:

“Excellent” – appropriate rating when a faculty member has four or more high quality indicators in Level I, four or more high quality indicators in Level II, and at least one high quality indicator in Level III, thus surpassing the requirements for a rating of “good.”

A rating of Excellent Progress is appropriate when sufficient progress for an Excellent rating have been made by a probationary faculty member in the 2nd year review and when approximately ½ of the requirements have been met by the 4th year review.

“Good” – appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least three high quality indicators in Level I, three high quality indicators in Level II, and at least one high quality indicator in Level III.

A rating of Good Progress is appropriate when sufficient progress for a rating of Good have been made by a probationary faculty member in the 2nd year review and when approximately ½ of the requirements have been met by the 4th year review.

“Needs Improvement” – appropriate rating when a probationary faculty member in year two or year three is not making clear progress toward reaching the standard for a rating of “Good” or “Excellent” as described above.

“Unsatisfactory” – appropriate rating when a faculty member at year four and beyond has not met, or is not on track to meet, the standard for a rating of either “Good” or “Excellent” as described above.

Note: Although multiple indicators are listed in Level I, it shall be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly and creative work in the field, with at least three peer-reviewed publications (as primary or major or corresponding author) required for tenure and promotion. Any work presented as *comparable* to high quality journal publications must be sufficiently documented to clearly establish its equivalence.

In rare cases, exceptions to the above ratings are possible. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out and document why an exception should be considered; and it is the responsibility of RTP reviewers to evaluate the special circumstances and arrive at an appropriate rating in light of such evidence. Also, if the number of required Level I indicators is exceeded for any rating category, these additional indicators can be used to replace Level II indicators. Level III activity, which includes research in progress, is expected of all faculty throughout their careers. It is also expected that faculty members will involve students in their research.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

All faculty members are expected to participate in appropriate professional, University, and community service activities. In the area of professional service, such activity is expected to surpass that of simply belonging to relevant organizations and attending conferences. As faculty members progress through their careers, it is expected that they will increasingly engage in continuous professional activities such as serving on professional committees, assuming leadership positions, serving as program planners, conducting seminars and workshops, and serving as professional consultants, on editorial boards, and/or as reviewers of scholarly/professional materials. Similarly, a faculty member is expected to actively serve the needs of the University and community by participating in a broad range of campus activities and in external community activities. All faculty members, after their first probationary year, are expected to increasingly make noteworthy contributions towards the work of the Department and University as it conducts its business and serves its community clientele. The following represents a sample breakdown of typical service activities into hierarchical categories.

Level I

- Chair of Standing Department Committees
- Department Chair
- Academic program coordinator/lab or center director
- Undergraduate or graduate advisor
- National/regional officer of professional association
- Membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
- Active membership on national/regional committees

- Active membership on University committees (e.g., senate committees that meet weekly or bi-weekly).
- Active membership on college committees/demanding projects
- Program Chair, professional conference/workshop
- Chair, College/University Committee
- Organizer of major professional meetings or community functions/workshops
- Honors, awards, or other evidence of outstanding recognition
- Extensive contributions to any one or more committees or projects
- Frequent reviewer of journal manuscripts (5 or more)
- Leadership role in preparing accreditation/PPR materials
- Professional consulting work
- Professional expert witness service
- Other significant comparable service work

Level II

- Active membership on professional committees
- Reviewer of professional journals/conference papers/books
- Program planner, or session organizer at professional conferences
- Workshop/seminar coordinator
- Conference/workshop presentations
- Speaking to community groups
- Non-profit or community consultant activities
- Active membership on advisory boards/expert panels
- Active membership on department committees
- Chair of Ad Hoc Department Committees
- Media interviews
- Faculty advisor for student associations/chapters
- Outreach activities
- Accreditation work

Level III

- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at conferences/workshops
- Volunteer academic/service activities

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

“Excellent” – appropriate rating when a faculty member has three or more high quality indicators in Level I, three or more high quality indicators in Level II, and at least one indicator in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of “good.”

A rating of **Excellent Progress** is appropriate when 1/3 of requirements for an **Excellent** rating have been met by a probationary faculty member in the 2nd year review and when 2/3 of the requirements have been met by the 4th year review.

“Good” – appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least two high quality indicators in Level I, several (three or more) high quality indicators in Level II, and at least one indicator in Level III.

A rating of **Good Progress** is appropriate when 1/3 of requirements for a rating of **Good** have been met by a probationary faculty member in the 2nd year review and when 2/3 of the requirements have been met by the 4th year review.

“Needs Improvement” – appropriate rating when a second or third year faculty member is not on track to meet the standards for a rating of either “Good” or “Excellent”.

“Unsatisfactory” – appropriate rating when a faculty member in the fourth year or beyond has not met (or is not on track to meet) the standard for a rating of either “Good” or “Excellent”.

Note: Many alternative indicators and exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, in any category it is possible that any one indicator may be so important (qualitatively or quantitatively) that it deserves as much weight as two or three indicators. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given, and the responsibility of RTP reviewers to evaluate the information provided.

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

A. Retention during Probationary Years

A recommendation for retention is contingent upon making sufficient progress toward the requirements for tenure and promotion, which means achieving a rating of Excellent Progress, Good Progress, or Needs Improvement for 2nd and 3rd year faculty. Fourth year faculty must receive a rating of Good or Excellent relative to their progress towards meeting tenure requirements.

B. Tenure Requirements

A person recommended for tenure shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in either teaching or scholarship and at least “Good” in the other categories.

C. Promotion to Associate Professor

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

D. Early Tenure

A decision for early tenure requires a rating of “Excellent” in all evaluation categories – Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service.

E. Early Promotion to Associate Professor

Under exceptional circumstances (per UPS 210.000), a faculty member may be considered for early promotion to Associate Professor prior to being eligible for tenure. Early promotion to Associate Professor requires a rating of “Excellent” in all evaluation categories – Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service.

F. Promotion to Full Professor

The decision to grant promotion to the rank of professor shall be based on a record of

sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all categories. At a minimum, a person recommended for promotion to Full Professor shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in two categories with no less than “Good” in the third category.

G. Early Promotion to Full Professor

According to UPS 210.000, early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of “Excellent.”

Special Notes:

- 1. According to ABET requirements, CEE department must support at least 4 different specialty areas. There are great diversities on the course contents of these areas. Some courses are highly mathematical (or Dry) compared to others (or Wet). In addition, student’s lack of preparation in mathematics makes the teaching more difficult. These factors should be appropriately accounted while rating faculty member’s teaching performance.**
- 2. According to ABET requirement faculty members teaching professional design courses in civil engineering where professional codes and standards are heavily used must have a Professional Engineering (PE) license or appropriate design experience. Structural Engineering (SE) license will be highly desirable for some advanced design courses.**
- 3. In addition to ABET requirements CEE department is expected to follow ASCE (American Society of Civil Engineers) guidelines.**