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).
According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

According to University Policy Statement 210.002 (3/5/19 version), Section III.A.: • Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards… …shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. • All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall be reviewed by the department as part of each program performance review. • Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.
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I. **Preamble**

The Department of Counseling (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service to the Department, College, University, Profession, and Community. Adequate communication, especially regarding personnel policies, is of utmost importance to the maintenance and enhancement of a high-quality faculty and, thus, a viable University. With this objective, the Department shall institute the following procedures for assessing Portfolios for the purposes of retention, tenure and promotion. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and reviewing bodies may be aided in their respective roles by having available to them as clear and as objective a statement as is reasonably possible of the Department’s expectations. Furthermore, the Department faculty specifically affirms their position that the best interests of the University, the College, the Department, and their many students are served when the faculty represent a wide diversity of interests and activities.

II. **Philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development**

We believe that knowledge is evolving and socially constructed and that learning is produced through an interaction of different perspectives that enable students to connect their education to their own experience. Thus, in our educational practice, we aim:

1. To create classroom communities where learning is interactive and dynamic.
2. To engage in reflective teaching and learning that draws attention to the process through which knowledge is produced and content learned.
3. To encourage all students to voice their perspectives and experiences.
4. To model various approaches to knowledge construction and learning for our students.
5. To enable students to understand the implications for their practice of differences and similarities related to culture and the range of human diversity.
6. To expand learning beyond the classroom to the broader societal and institutional contexts where students will engage in their practice.
7. To empower students to shape communities that are more humane.

III. **Department Structure**

The Department is coordinated by a Department Chair, selected according to UPS 211.100. The Department Chair has the responsibility of communicating the standards and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion to all Department faculty members.

IV. **Department Mission Statement**

The faculty in the Department of Counseling are committed to training competent professionals who are eligible for licensure as Marriage and Family Therapists and Professional Clinical Counselors in clinical mental health settings in the state of California. We work with students from diverse cultural and economic backgrounds who are committed to improving the quality of life for children and adults in the community. We utilize an integrated approach in conceptualizing prevention, assessment, treatment, and research. Practice-based student learning is constructed through partnerships with non-profit agencies in diverse communities. Students are expected to engage in reflective practice, to consistently apply ethical standards, to practice cultural sensitivity, and to take responsibility for social change. We collaborate with students as they develop cultural competence and professional identities that incorporate a dedication to
service and life-long learning. We strive to create an education that is guided by relevant community needs and research on learning.

V. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee functions
The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called "the Committee") shall make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to members of the Department as specified in UPS 210.000.

B. Committee structure
1. The Committee shall consist of at least three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. The Committee shall consist of members from the Department unless there are not enough eligible, tenured faculty to fill the Committee. Faculty members being considered for promotion shall not serve in the personnel evaluation process for retention, tenure, and/or promotion at any level.
2. The alternate member shall participate on the Committee in those deliberations in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete the term or is ineligible to evaluate a particular case. Should a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty. When possible, the new alternate shall be from the same Department as the regular Committee member who was unable to complete the term.
3. Faculty from outside the Department can be nominated to serve.
4. Committee members shall serve a one-year term. The term shall begin early in the Fall Semester, following the election of members.

C. Election of committee members
1. The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the third week of classes in the Fall Semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot.
2. All eligible members of the Department are automatically on the ballot for the Committee, except for the Department Chair. Service in the personnel evaluation process is part of the normal and reasonable duties of tenured faculty. In cases where the Department has no tenured faculty members to serve on the Committee, any faculty member in the Department may make a nomination of a tenured faculty member within the campus to represent that Department; all qualified nominees who agree to serve if elected will be included on the slate. Nominees shall be presented to the faculty for election in the following manner and order: a) listed by Department affiliation; b) listed by rank and seniority within the Department; and c) alphabetized by last name, thereafter. A person nominated from outside the Department shall have the person’s Department listed in parentheses next to the name.
3. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote for as many of the official nominees as shall have been determined to be the membership number for the Committee for that year, and not more than that number. The top three persons receiving the largest number of votes in each Department slate shall be elected as members of the Committee. The committee will determine the roles: Chair of the committee, and regular members. The person receiving the fourth largest number of votes will be the alternate.

D. Committee procedures
1. The Committee shall review and evaluate in writing (i.e., typed) the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure or promotion. In this evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications under each category of the criteria listed in Section VI of this document. (Here and throughout, see UPS 210.000 and UPS 210.002 for further requirements and information.)
2. All materials and deliberations are confidential and not to be discussed with those who are not part of the review process.
3. The Committee's evaluation for each area is to be based on the Portfolio according to the professional judgment of the committee members. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for describing the faculty member under review as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" with respect to each area of performance.
4. The Committee shall receive the evaluation of the Department Chair after completing their evaluation and recommendation.
5. The Committee shall formulate a recommendation that shall state in writing the reason for the recommendation. The recommendation and evaluation report shall be separate signed documents and approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.
6. Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.
7. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

VI. General Guidelines
A. Prospectus
During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty 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 expected to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the Departmental Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.002 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The faculty member shall submit the Prospectus to the Department Chair by February 28th. These narratives will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College, but prior to May 1st. 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.

B. Portfolio preparation and submission
It is the responsibility of each faculty member being considered for personnel action to prepare the required information and documentation for the faculty member’s Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the appropriate Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. The Department shall follow procedures outlined in UPS 210.000 with regard to the Prospectus.

C. Portfolio organization and documentation
The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the standard table of contents as specified by UPS 210.000. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. A Curriculum Vita shall be submitted using APA style wherever appropriate.

D. Categories for personnel action
The three major categories of faculty performance are as follows: teaching; scholarly and creative accomplishments; and Professional, University, and Community service. In alignment with UPS 210.002, teaching performance will be the most important criterion for promotion, retention, and tenure decisions, followed by scholarly and creative accomplishments. Whereas lesser consideration will be given to Professional, University, and Community service in promotion, retention,
and tenure decisions, the Department highly values active engagement in service activities commensurate with a faculty member’s level of academic rank and experience.

E. Faculty responsibilities

As full-time employees of CSUF, Department faculty are expected to meet faculty responsibilities as they apply to each of the above evaluation categories. In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include but are not limited to, meeting classes, holding assigned office hours at assigned times and places, and participating in Department academic advising procedures. In the area of scholarly and creative activities these responsibilities include but are not limited to, presenting refereed, blind reviewed presentations or posters, publishing refereed journal articles, books, and book chapters, and creating media materials, such as training/clinical videos. In the area of service these responsibilities include but are not limited to, regular attendance at Department meetings, completing committee and other Department duties as assigned by the appropriate Department Chair, participating in service at the College and/or University levels during each review period, and engaging in external service such as community work and contributions to the profession. Evaluators shall take into consideration, in evaluating a faculty member's performance, the extent to which the faculty member has met these faculty responsibilities.

VII. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty: Criteria and Weighting

A. Teaching Performance

Retention during the probationary years will be predicated upon the individual's self-assessment and progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. Procedures concerning service credit and the Prospectus shall be implemented in accordance with the provisions of UPS 210.000. The philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development (HHD) and Department mission statement guide the primary responsibility of Department faculty, which is teaching. Each faculty member shall establish a teaching environment where student learning is central, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content, and review of the curricula and the counseling degree; and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills necessary to make a positive contribution to society. A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in one’s discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn both within and outside the classroom. Faculty members also demonstrate a commitment to inclusivity as evidenced by diversity sensitivity and infused attention to cultural diversity in their course curricula.

1. Evaluating teaching performance

Evaluation of teaching performance shall include evaluation of the following: a) pedagogical approach and methods; b) student response to instruction; and c) ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher. Faculty members are encouraged to solicit other reviews of teaching performance to be included in the Portfolio at the time of submission. For example, classroom observations by Department colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Classroom observations by departmental colleagues require a written report and will be conducted in accordance with Article 15.14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and UPS 210.080. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, the creation of culturally inclusive teaching environments, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessments by faculty from other departments or other universities may also be included.

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating teaching performance:
a. Mandatory Indicators

1) Comprehensive Self-assessment
The comprehensive self-assessment shall include a reflective review of the faculty member's pedagogical approach, teaching philosophy and performance as well as methods, goals and direction of her/his future teaching. It shall address the faculty member's teaching with respect to the Department's mission, the HHD Philosophy, and to the appropriate goals of the University Mission and Goals. In addition, the faculty member is encouraged to discuss one’s contributions to student learning in the comprehensive self-assessment.

2) List of courses taught
A semester by semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, and the unit value. If release time was received, the weighted teaching unit value shall be listed along with an explanation of the activities for which it was granted. Mean SOQ ratings shall be included for each course with the rating of Excellent (89.5% A’s and B’s or higher), Good (74.5% to 89.4% A’s and B’s), Fair (59.5% to 74.4% A’s and B’s), or Poor (less than 59.4% A’s and B’s).

3) Course syllabi and materials
The file shall include a representative selection of course syllabi and supplementary materials, such as tests and study aids, prepared by the faculty member to promote student learning.

4) Statistical summaries of student opinion forms
The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses during the period of review must be included. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by an appropriate administrator.) Statistical summaries of student opinion data for all of the years for which service credit is given should be included, if available.

5) Student opinion of teaching forms
The Student Opinion Questionnaire shall be included for each course taught at CSUF for academic credit during the period of review. Student opinion data for all the years for which service credit is given shall be included. If such data are not available or if the data are incorrect, a letter from the Department Chair shall attest to the unavailability or errors included.

6) Statistical summaries of grade distributions
The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester of the period of review must be provided.

b. Additional Indicators
The faculty member may submit other evidence that demonstrates teaching effectiveness and contributions to student learning, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Peer review of teaching following classroom visitations, lectures, or seminars.
2. Documentation and evaluation of teaching activities in colleagues' classes.
3. Documentation of fieldwork coordination, academic advisement, or mentoring activities.
4. Development of new course proposals, which have been approved for inclusion in the curriculum.
5. Development of instructional technology strategies to enhance student learning.
6. Development of student portfolio and case study assignments.
8. Publications about teaching that do not qualify for inclusion in section VII.B.1.b.
9. Evidence of additional training in teaching, such as teaching certificates offered by the CSUF Faculty Development Center.
10. Evidence of collaborative teaching activities.
11. Video or audio recordings of lessons taught.
12. Independent study/research projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member.
13. Documentation of service as thesis advisor or as thesis committee member for CSUF master's degree students or undergraduate Honor’s students.
14. Documentation of service as committee member for external master’s or doctoral students.
15. Mentorship of students to be successful in the program or to continue to pursue doctoral education.

c. **Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance**

A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is arrived at based on the three factors defined below:

1.) **Pedagogical approach and methods**

   Pedagogical approach and methods includes a self-assessment of the faculty member as a teacher. Self-assessments shall address the faculty member’s pedagogical approach, philosophy of teaching, and teaching performance highlighting strengths and areas for growth in teaching. The self-assessment should also address ways in which the instructor integrates diversity awareness, inclusivity, and or social justice into teaching. Methods, goals, and direction of future teaching shall also be discussed. Course syllabi and samples of course materials (e.g., Power Point presentations, lecture notes, course materials, multi-media created for courses, sample activities, exams, or completed papers or projects from students) shall also be included. The Committee shall rate pedagogical approach and methods as "**excellent**," "**good**," "**fair**," or "**poor**" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent**- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and attention to diversity.

**Good**- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, attention to diversity.

**Fair**- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate marginal teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and attention to diversity.
Poor: Self-assessment and course materials demonstrate unacceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments, and effectiveness, and attention to diversity.

2.) Evaluation of instruction
The evaluation of a faculty member’s instruction shall be demonstrated through multiple means. Whereas faculty members are required to submit their Student Opinion Questionnaires, they shall not be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. The quantitative and qualitative data from Student Opinion Questionnaires are to be presented along with analysis of grade distribution, as well as additional considerations and evaluations of teaching. Further, the evaluation of instruction portion of Teaching Effectiveness can be further enhanced with additional considerations to broaden the evaluation of specific classes beyond SOQ ratings and grade distributions. The faculty member can highlight factors to consider, such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, typical grade distributions for a Master’s level course, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation can also take into account the faculty member's efforts to improve teaching performance.

a.) Student Opinion Questionnaires
Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated comments or courses. These comments can contextualize the quantitative ratings and provide other insight into student evaluation of teaching, but do not impact the quantitative rating. The following scale shows the range applied when rating the statistical summaries of student opinions of each class:

- **Excellent**: -- 89.5% or more A and B ratings with at least 60% A
- **Good**: -- 74.5 to 89.4% A and B ratings
- **Fair**: -- 59.5 to 74.4% A and B ratings
- **Poor**: -- less than 59.4 % A and B ratings

The following scale shows the range applied when rating the qualititative comments of student opinions of each class:

- **Excellent**: -- Nearly all comments are considered positive
- **Good**: -- The majority of comments are considered positive
- **Fair**: -- There is an equal balance of positive & negative comments
- **Poor**: -- The majority of comments are negative and raise issues about the instructor
b.) Grade Distributions

Grade Distributions contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. Though primarily a graduate department, undergraduate and graduate course grade distribution should be evaluated following the same criteria: considering the level of the course (100 level versus a 300 level course), the rigor of the course assignments, and the type of course being evaluated (such as clinical, content, or research courses).

Students in the graduate program must demonstrate a minimal level of mastery, given that the program is preparing graduate students for a specific profession. Graduate students cannot graduate with less than a 3.0 GPA or with more than two C grades. If graduate students are developing adequate mastery, then it would be expected, for example, that average distribution would be in the high B’s. Grade Distributions should accurately reflect students’ level of mastery of course content. It would be expected, for example, that average distributions for content courses would be in the higher B range, and clinical courses (those where letter grades are given) would have more B+’s and A-’s than A’s. Practicum courses typically have 100% of students with a rating of Credit, although some semesters a student may earn a No Credit. It is expected that grade distributions would be near the departmental average. Deviation in either direction—higher or lower, would need to be explained. It is understood that some classes might have higher than average grade distributions due to teaching excellence, or the particular composition of the students in a class. The DPC will consider a consistent pattern of high or low grades across all courses as a cause for concern.

Patterns across various semesters shall also be considered in evaluating the appropriateness of grade distributions.

c.) Additional considerations

Though not required, the overall evaluation of instruction portion of Teaching Effectiveness can be further enhanced with additional considerations to broaden the calculated rating of specific classes based on SOQs. In this type of evaluation each course shall be rated separately and 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 pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member’s overall level of experience and efforts to improve teaching performance.

Additional methods of instructional evaluation could include peer evaluations of actual classroom teaching. Faculty members from the same institution can be invited to evaluate a faculty member’s instruction in the classroom and provide an assessment of the teaching and classroom environment. Faculty members can submit multiple evaluations from different classes. Classroom observations by departmental and university colleagues require a written report and will be conducted in accordance with Article 15.14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and UPS 210.080. If a faculty member wishes to address specific classes with patterns of lower SOQ ratings the faculty member can submit a peer evaluation that addresses those student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student evaluation forms and contained in written student
comments on these forms. This provides the faculty member with an external evaluation of the class that considers multiple factors (class size, preparation involved, etc.) in addition to the SOQ ratings.

In evaluating an Assistant Professor’s instruction, there is a focus on developmental progress. This view is to allow the Committee to evaluate a faculty member’s development as a teacher and trace progress over time. In evaluating an Associate Professor’s period of review, the same criteria shall apply, with the exception that the whole period of review shall be given equal weight. While the Committee will take note of consistent improvements over the course of the review period, it is anticipated that an Associate Professor should demonstrate a pattern of high teaching quality throughout. The Committee shall rate evaluation of instruction as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent**- The majority of courses overall are excellent as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and any additional considerations that reflect an outstanding performance in evaluation of instruction. The grade distributions are near the departmental average, any deviations are clearly explained and there is clear effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures.

**Good**- The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are good or above as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and additional considerations that reflect a good performance in evaluation of instruction. The majority of the grade distributions are near the departmental averages, any deviations are clearly explained, and there is effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures.

**Fair**- The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are fair or above as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and additional considerations that reflect a fair performance in evaluation of instruction. The grade distributions fluctuate above or below the departmental average with little explanation or rationale for this pattern, and there is unclear effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures.

**Poor**- The majority of courses overall, but specifically those from the three most recent years, are poor as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and additional considerations that reflect a poor performance in evaluation of instruction. The grade distributions are significantly skewed in one direction with no explanation or rationale to explain the distribution, and there is clear ineffectiveness and unfairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures.

3) **Ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher**

All faculty are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by conference participation and/or other interactions with their colleagues and other professionals that focus on learning new material within the discipline while striving to maintain cultural competency. It is expected that scholarly and creative accomplishments will be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and student participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings. Each faculty member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to strive for or
maintain the highest level of teaching effectiveness. This program could include participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, attending conferences, developing or revising curriculum based on new professional standards or requirements, attending clinical trainings and certifications, and familiarity with the pedagogical literature in the faculty member’s discipline. The faculty member will need to identify and distinguish how the professional development activity contributes to one’s development as a teacher. When specific areas of improvement have been identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these areas.

Over the entire period of review the Committee shall rate ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher. For retention evaluations progress towards these goals will be assessed. The ratings are "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent**- Evidence of at least three substantive activities (such as obtaining a Faculty Development teaching certificate, attending a day-long teaching workshop, regularly attending a conference that enhances teaching, or obtaining continuing education credits for one’s license) activities in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Good**- Evidence of at least two activities in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Fair**- Evidence of at least one activity in the Portfolio demonstrate marginal commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Poor**- No evidence in this type of activity in the Portfolio demonstrates unacceptable commitment to professional development in the discipline and as a teacher.

**Composite Rating of Teaching Performance**

Based on a composite of the ratings of the three areas described above, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching performance as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" according to the following criteria:

**Excellent** – At least two scores of Excellent and one score of Good are considered outstanding teaching performance.

**Good**- At least three scores of Good, two scores of Good and one score of Excellent, or two scores of Excellent and one Fair are considered clearly acceptable teaching performance.

**Fair**- At least three scores of Fair, or two scores of Fair and one score of Good or Excellent, or two scores of Good and one of Poor is considered marginal teaching performance.

**Poor**- Anything below two scores of Fair and one score of Poor, and two scores of Poor are considered unacceptable teaching performance.
B. Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments
Each faculty member shall establish a record of scholarly/creative endeavor that generates, integrates and/or disseminates knowledge. When appropriate, these endeavors should be integrated with teaching, actively involve students, and/or attract external support. Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activity generates benefits for the faculty member as well as for the University. Such activity may: a) complement teaching; b) contribute to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement; c) promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike; d) increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines; e) enhance the professional growth of the faculty member; f) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, University and community; g) advance the reputation of the University; and h) enhance collaborative scholarship. Scholarly and creative activity is expected to be consistent with the areas of inquiry associated with counselor education, counseling and/or psychology, and social justice.

1. Indicators
The following indicators shall be used in evaluating scholarly and creative activity:

a. Self-assessment (mandatory)

The self-assessment must include both a reflective review of the faculty member's scholarly and creative activity and future goals and direction with reference to the benefits listed above and applicability to the faculty member's Prospectus. The statement shall emphasize the scholarly accomplishments of the faculty member since appointment at CSUF or since the last action and should be documented by supporting evidence.

b. Scholarly and Creative Activities

1) High Quality Scholarly and Creative Activities Defined
Types of publications and grants that are eligible to be considered “high quality” (note that the faculty member must make the case for the quality, per VII.B.1.b.3; however, only certain kinds of publications are eligible):

a.) Disciplinary specific and pedagogical articles published or accepted in professionally recognized, externally peer-reviewed journals are included. These include, but are not limited to, original data driven manuscripts (qualitative or quantitative), extensive literature reviews, manuscripts on innovative teaching methods, case-studies or other clinically focused manuscripts, and theoretical pieces that are consistent with the field of counselor education, counseling, psychology, and related fields. Documentation must include evidence of peer review, evidence of quality as outlined below, and one of the following: (1) the letter of acceptance and commitment to publish the article or (2) a reprint of the published article.

b.) Books (authored or edited), including textbooks, monographs, or book chapters in edited books, either published or accepted for publication by a process of external (peer) review should be included. Documentation must include one of the following: (1) a copy of the publication in the final printed version; (2) the letter of acceptance and commitment to publish or (3) the galley page proofs.

c.) High-quality, time-intensive externally funded grants.

2) Moderate Quality Scholarly and Creative Activities
There are types of publications and scholarly work that can supplement the portfolio but are not considered high-quality items unless there are compelling reasons. It is up to the faculty member to place the publication in the appropriate professional context for evaluation and make the case for how this work should be evaluated and considered. Moderate
quality scholarly work may include:
   a.) editing a book series;
   b.) book or article prizes;
   c.) book reviews;
   d.) reprints of a faculty member’s scholarly work;
   e.) professionally produced visual media (DVDs, streaming videos, etc.);
   f.) published training manuals or curriculum; trade or self-help books, etc.

3) Evaluation of Publications
   Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement and the contribution of
   the faculty member to the publication. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to
   provide the necessary evidence to evaluate the quality of the publication. Indicators
   may include:
   a.) The publication process and the type of review (i.e., refereed, blind reviewed,
       etc.).
   b.) Whether the publication is in a state, regional, national or international journal.
   c.) The status of the journal as measured by rejection/acceptance rates and impact
       factor.
   d.) The prestige of the publication as measured by its contribution to the profes-
       sion and its ranking in the Social Sciences Citation Index.
   e.) Whether the authored work is single-authored, and the specific contributions in
       first-authored, or equal-authored works.
   f.) How often the authored work is cited by others as reported in citation databases
       such as the Social Sciences Citation Index. External peer reviews on published
       materials, for example, book reviews written by professional peers in academic
       outlets.
   g.) Self-published and pay for publication materials are not eligible for review or
       recognition unless there is a compelling rationale provided by the faculty mem-

4) Documentation of Publications
   Documentation of all accomplishments shall include a complete citation in APA
   Style for each scholarly and creative work; a copy of each scholarly or creative work
   published since the faculty member's appointment; and copies of letters of acceptance
   for those completed works that are "in press" or otherwise in the process of publica-
   tion. For works presented in a medium other than print, the copy may be in a form
   suitable for evaluation as appropriate to the discipline (e.g., DVD, CD, digital file,
   etc.).

   Work that has been accepted for publication or presentation after a peer-review or
   jury process shall be distinguished from work that was not subject to a peer review or
   jury process. Scholarly or creative works are considered to have been completed
   when they have been accepted for publication or presentation without further revi-
   sion; books and book chapters must have proof beyond a letter of acceptance such as
   the final printed version or the galley page proofs.

   c. Applied Scholarship

   1) Consideration is given to internal or external grants funded by government agencies,
   and/or private agencies.
2) Applied scholarship activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the faculty member and are carried out through consultation, policy analysis, program evaluation, and so forth are also considered. In documenting applied work, faculty shall include not only their own written record of the project, but also, where possible, the evaluations of those who received the service. Publications related to such activities, such as white papers or manuals including dissemination products, are encouraged in this category.

3) The faculty member has the responsibility to provide documentation as to whether applied scholarship should be considered high quality or moderate quality.

d. Scholarly Presentations

Scholarly papers and presentations given shall be seen as additional but lesser scholarly contributions as they are considered steps toward publication. These are to be cited in APA Style and include the name, date and location of the presentation. Peer review is one indicator of quality for this category of scholarship. Documentation must include evidence of peer review and either an acceptance letter/email or copy of the conference proceedings where the presentation is listed. Invited and/or keynote presentations that are scholarly in nature can be considered. Faculty members are encouraged to present at counseling-specific conferences (e.g., ACA, ACES, WACES, etc.), but also other professionals conferences within a faculty member's chosen scholarly interests (APA, AWP, National Multicultural Summit, NLPA, etc.).

2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activity

These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how the faculty member’s scholarly and creative accomplishments address some or all of the criteria listed below and the particular objectives identified in the faculty member's Prospectus.

a. The Department employs traditional criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work, and may include:
   1) Clarity of conceptualization.
   2) Originality of scholarship.
   3) Contribution to the faculty members' discipline and/or to interdisciplinary scholarship.
   4) Contribution of the faculty member in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work.
   5) Impact on scholarship in the field.
   6) Quality of the forum in which the work appears (for example, acceptance rates of journal articles, whether the journal is regional or national, if a journal is a flagship publication like the Journal of Counseling & Development or The American Psychologist).
   7) External peer reviews from outside the University of a faculty member’s scholarly contribution to the profession or the faculty member’s prominence in a specific area of study.

b. In addition, in light of the missions and philosophy of the Department and HHD, the Department also evaluates scholarly and creative activities based on the degree to which they:
   1) Complement teaching.
2) Contribute to the advancement of counseling and counselor education and, more broadly, to human achievement.
3) Contribute to professional expectation of evidence based practice as defined by applied empirical research (qualitative or quantitative), clinical expertise, or multicultural competency.
4) Complement clinical application.
5) Promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike, and the greater professional community.
6) Increase opportunities for students in academic and professional disciplines.
7) Contribute to the overall quality of the Department, College, and the University, and the greater professional community.
8) Enhance the professional growth of the faculty member.
9) Advance the reputation of the University.
10) Enhance collaborative scholarship across disciplines or with other institutions.
11) Impact traditionally underserved populations and/or social justice focused topics in counseling, psychology, and allied helping professions.

3. Guidelines for Rating Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments
It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of work over the entire period is required to achieve tenure, with some of this work being first authored. Faculty members can follow the guidelines above in VII.B.1.b.1 to define “High quality scholarship,” but at the minimum it is defined as being published, produced, or supported by professionally recognized outlets and being externally peer-reviewed. It is up to the faculty member to provide the supporting evidence of what makes a publication or creative activity high quality.

The Department recognizes the mentoring process in a faculty member’s first year, thus scholarly and creative accomplishments are expected to flow from the second year onward from an organized plan of activity. Based upon the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member’s overall scholarly and creative accomplishments as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" as follows:

- A rating of "excellent" shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment and outstanding performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of eight items are required over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period: six must be high quality scholarship, one of which must be a first or single authored blind-refereed journal article; and two professional presentations are required.

- A rating of "good" shall be rendered for a comprehensive self-assessment and clearly acceptable performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity. A total of six items are required over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period: four must be high quality scholarship, one of which must be a first or single authored blind-refereed journal article; and two professional presentations are required.

- A rating of "fair" shall be rendered for an adequate self-assessment with marginal performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity: three to five items over the entire tenure and/or promotion review period including one first or single authored blind-refereed journal article and one professional presentation.
A rating of "poor" shall be rendered for an inadequate self-assessment and/or unacceptable performance in depth and/or breadth of scholarly activity as evidenced by fewer items than required to achieve a “fair” rating.

C. Professional, University, Community Service

Untenured faculty members shall present, in the Prospectus, service objectives related to the categories of service: Professional, University, and Community service.

1. Professional and Community Service

Faculty in applied fields such as those in the Department are required not only to make original scholarly contributions in the form of written material, but also to communicate and implement knowledge by means of presentations and consultations, workshops and trainings, activity within national and local organizations, and leadership positions within national and local organizations. The benefits of Professional/Community service are many, including:

   a. Complement teaching by allowing the teacher to draw from applied experience.
   b. Promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied.
   c. Promote currency in the knowledge, methodology, and spirit of inquiry available to students and faculty alike.
   d. Enhance the professional growth of the faculty member.
   e. Advance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.
   f. Directly impact positive change in communities, organizations, and individuals.

For the purpose of professional maintenance and growth, each faculty member is encouraged and expected to engage actively in the affairs of the discipline and related professions, such as the following: assuming professional leadership roles at the regional, state, national, and international level; attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops; acquiring professional licenses, credentials and certificates; serving on the editorial boards of professional journals; reviewing manuscripts/submissions for book proposals, professional journals or conferences; providing direct service to the community or consultations relevant to the field; reviewing grant proposals; receiving professional training or providing additional professional training to others; being interviewed by the media; and engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the Profession/Community and in support of the University's Mission and Goals. Ongoing, active involvement in at least one Professional and one Community service activity over the entire period of review is required for achievement of tenure in the Department.

2. University Service

The success of any University or Department is partially dependent on the active participation of its faculty members in the various organizational and governance tasks. Due to the smaller size of the Department, faculty have an unusually heavy demand for involvement in program activities, such as advisement, curriculum development, program review for accreditation purposes, and so forth. These program activities fall upon the few full-time faculty members. All Department faculty are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of their Department, as well as those of the College and University. At a minimum, a faculty member is expected to attend meetings of the Department on a regular basis, participate in College and University faculty events, and serve on at least two departmental committees and two HHD and University committees or perform comparable tasks (i.e., completing multiple, one-time, labor intensive tasks such as updating all syllabi to be compliant with new changes or creating the Masters Clinical Training Handbook needed for accreditation, etc.) over the entire period of review for tenure. Contribu-
tions that exceed minimal expectations (e.g., participating on numerous committees or in activities of a more demanding nature, or assuming positions of leadership in such tasks) will enhance the faculty member's rating for service.

3. Evaluating Service
The Department believes that the quality, quantity, and impact of a faculty member's service contributions need to be considered in the context of the potential benefits to the profession, university, and/or community and in light of prevailing professional standards.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "excellent" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in three or more Professional and Community service activities and active, quality involvement in three or more Department, College and/or University service activities. Quality involvements might include at least an average of 1-2 hours per week, whether attending meetings or conducting business for that service activity, or a leadership position (for example, President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, or chairing a committee) that requires responsibilities beyond attending meetings. The service activity must either be time and labor intensive for a short duration (a month or more) or may require contributions over a semester or academic year.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "good" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least two Professional and Community service activities and active, quality involvement in at least two Department, College, and/or University service activities.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "fair" will be given for a record of service that includes active, quality involvement in at least one Professional/Community service activity or active, quality involvement in at least one Department, College, or University activity.

- For untenured faculty, a rating of "poor" will be given for a record of service that fails to include active, quality involvement either in Professional/Community service or in service to the Department, College, and/or University.

The untenured faculty member is reminded that the first two criteria, teaching and scholarly and creative accomplishments are of primary importance and must be developed in the probationary years. The other criterion, Professional, University, and Community service, needs to be developed, but is less heavily weighted for probationary faculty.

D. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1. Retention of Probationary Faculty
Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual's progress in meeting the criteria for tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member must be rated at a minimum:

- "good" or above in two areas, one of which must be Teaching Performance
- "fair" or better in the other area, with progress toward "good"
- Scholarly and Creative Activity must be rated "fair" or better, with progress toward "good"
2. **Criteria for Granting of Tenure**

Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure. In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member must be rated, at a minimum:

- "excellent" in two areas, one of which must be Teaching Performance. (NOTE: It is not expected that each faculty member will have been rated "good" or "excellent" over the entire period of review for tenure; what is important is attainment of a rating of "good" or "excellent" by the end of the review period.)
- at least "good" in the other area

3. **Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

Because the professoriate entails continual growth and reassessment, 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. Therefore, the decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described above. Further, during review for Professor, accomplishments used for prior promotion to Associate Professor shall not be used again for promotion to Professor. In the 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.

In order to be granted promotion to Full Professor, the faculty member must be rated, at minimum:

- "excellent" in two areas, one of which must be Teaching Performance.
- In order to qualify for a rating of “excellent” for promotion to Professor for service, tenured faculty are expected to provide leadership in service activities, such as serving as a board member (i.e., President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer) or chairing a College, University, Professional, or Community service committee. In addition, at least one of the campus service activities must be at the University level.
- at least "good" in the other area

4. **Early Promotion and Early Tenure**

The granting of early promotion to Associate Professor, Full Professor, or early tenure is a decision granted in cases of outstanding achievement and excellence. Successful early promotion or tenure requires evidence of sustained excellence that greatly exceeds the standards across Teaching Performance, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, University, and Community service. For promotion and tenure decisions, the Department would require a rating of Excellent in all three areas.

   a. **Early Tenure and Early Promotion**

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 will be rated as Excellent in Teaching Performance, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, University, and Community service.
b. Early Tenure

Early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, Community, and University Service are rated as Excellent. In order to be considered for early tenure, an eligible faculty member shall apply in writing to Faculty Affairs and Records no later than the end of the second week of classes of the fall semester.

c. Early Promotion to Professor

Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, Community, and University Service. Performance in all three areas of review shall be rated at a level of Excellent.

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

5. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

a. Purpose

The purpose of the post-tenure review process is to help tenured faculty members assess their effectiveness in Teaching Performance, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, Community, and University Service. The process is intended to be collegial and non-punitive.

b. Frequency

Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed under these guidelines once every five years. Those who receive tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall normally be reviewed five years later for promotion to Full Professor, in keeping with UPS 210.020, Section II. A. Those faculty members who do not seek promotion to Full Professor will engage in a Post Tenure Review. Those faculty members who are scheduled for review while they are away on sabbatical or leave of absence shall be reviewed during the next annual cycle following their return.

c. Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)

The PTRC shall be comprised of the Department Chair and one member of the Committee. The PTRC will be guided in their evaluation UPS 210.020. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review are not allowed to serve on the PTRC.

d. Process

Based upon the calendar published by Faculty Affairs and Records, the post-tenure review process shall include the following steps:

1. At the beginning of the academic year, Faculty Affairs and Records shall identify and notify those faculty members who are to be reviewed. Portfolios are to be submitted electronically through Interfolio and are due October 1.
2. Each faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review shall submit a post-tenure portfolio to the Chair, who verifies its completeness and provides the portfolio to the PTRC and Dean (for required “contents,” see section g. below).
3. The PTRC shall provide the written evaluation of each faculty member under review to the Dean.
4. The Dean of the College shall provide a written evaluation of each faculty member under review.
5. Copies of the evaluations shall be provided to the faculty member under review by the Dean once both are completed.
6. The Department Chair and College Dean shall meet with the faculty member to discuss strengths and goals for the next 5 years. At this time, areas of growth and suggestions for improvement, if any, are noted and discussed.
7. The faculty member may submit a statement responding to the evaluations if the faculty member wishes to do so.
8. All evaluations and the faculty member’s response, if any, shall be sent to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records for placement in the faculty member’s file.

e. Contents
The contents of the post-tenure portfolio shall include these items:
1. Current CV that includes information about teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service, and indicates activities completed during the periodic evaluation period.
2. Summaries of student opinion questionnaires (SOQs) including the quantitative data and comments, for all courses taught during the periodic evaluation period.
3. A summary (maximum of two pages) that outlines the faculty member’s most significant achievements during the period of review and the faculty member’s goals regarding teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service for the next 5 years.

f. Documentation
The faculty member shall not submit documentation of all activities and accomplishments reported in the portfolio.
## 1. Section I

SECTION I: RATE EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW USING THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE:

A= EXCELLENT, B= VERY GOOD, C= SATISFACTORY, D= WEAK, E= VERY WEAK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 I rate the professor’s knowledge in the subject matter or process(es) for this course as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 I rate the professor’s demonstrated interest in students as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 I rate the degree to which the professor accepts and respects me as a person as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 I rate the professor’s preparation for class meetings as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 I rate the professor’s availability to students for consultation as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 I rate the clarity and connection of assignments and class process to the course as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 I rate the clarity and consistency of the grading criteria in this course as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 I rate the usefulness of the professor’s feedback as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 I rate the professor’s contribution to my own growth and learning as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Overall, I rate the professor’s teaching in this course as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Section II

SECTION II: Disregard the A,B,C,D,E scale for the items below. Answer these items by marking the appropriate response for each item. Add any comments on the back of the page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 The amount of work I did for this course was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ very great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The quality of my work for this course was:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 My contribution to this class was:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 My openness to supervision in class was:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The subject matter, methods, and skills learned in class will be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ of little use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ not useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ somewhat useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Comments

3.1 Please write any comments you would like to add in the box below.
1. Section I

SECTION I: RATE EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW USING THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE:
A= EXCELLENT, B= VERY GOOD, C= SATISFACTORY, D= WEAK, E= VERY WEAK

1.1 I rate the degree to which the professor accepts and respects me as a person as:

1.2 I rate the usefulness of the professor’s feedback as:

1.3 I rate the degree to which the professor provides suggestions for developing my counseling skills as:

1.4 I rate the contribution of the course to my level of awareness of professional issues as:

1.5 I rate the contribution of the course to my development as a counselor as:

1.6 I rate the degree to which the professor helps me formulate professional goals for myself during the practicum experience as:

1.7 I rate the degree to which the professor helps me define and maintain ethical behavior in counseling as:

1.8 I rate the degree to which the professor helps me formulate a theoretical rationale of human behavior as:

1.9 I rate the degree to which the professor offers resource information as:

1.10 I rate the clarity and consistency of the professor’s application of the departmental grading criteria as:

1.11 Overall, I rate the professor’s teaching in this course as:

2. Section II

SECTION II: Disregard the A,B,C,D,E scale for the items below. Answer these items by marking the appropriate response for each item. Add any comments on the back of the page.

2.1 The amount of work I did for this course was:
- very great
- great
- moderate
- fair
- poor

2.2 The quality of my work for this course was:
- excellent
- very good
- good
- fair
- poor

2.3 My contribution to this class was:
- excellent
- very good
- good
- fair
- poor

2.4 My openness to supervision in class was:
- excellent
- very good
- good
- fair
- poor
3. Comments

3.1 Please write any comments you would like to add in the box below.