

**Official  
Approved  
Department  
Personnel  
Standards**

Date: 5/2/2016



**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,  
FULLERTON**

**College of Education  
Educational Leadership Department  
Personnel Standards**

**Approved, May 2, 2016 by Provost Cruz for  
Implementation beginning with the 2016-2017 Academic Year**

## **I. Preface**

The Department of Educational Leadership (hereafter called ‘the Department’) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible that meet the evolving needs of our students, community, and region. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning with an emphasis on establishing an environment where learning, creation of knowledge, and dissemination are central to everything we do. We also believe that education—teaching in all its forms—is the primary task of higher education today. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs and effective learning environments is the instructional faculty. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning through contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service to the Department, College of Education, University, the profession and community. The Department proposes a personnel document consistent with the Mission and Goals of the University which recognizes the unique nature of our programs as being linked to the community that we serve and which also responds to the multiple roles of the faculty at the various stages of their careers.

The Department will institute the following procedures designed to assess the Portfolio for the purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion. The Department faculty take the position that the evaluated faculty members and the evaluating and review bodies will be aided in their respective roles by having available as clear and objective a statement of the Department’s expectations as is reasonably possible. Furthermore, the Department faculty specifically affirm their position that the best interests and needs of students are served when the faculty represents a wide diversity of interests and activities creating a “mosaic of talent.” We intend to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of the functions higher education must perform.

The field of educational leadership is an interdisciplinary, applied field of endeavor, and teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service activities frequently intermesh. We also encourage and reward cross-unit collaboration. Consequently, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to determine how and in which categories to describe and document activities that cut across the three Portfolio areas of performance. It is also the faculty member’s responsibility to address in the narrative for each section how the included activities contribute to development in that specific Portfolio area.

## **II. Faculty Responsibilities**

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

In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include, for example:

- meeting classes,
- holding established office hours at regular times and places,
- participating in Department academic advising procedures,
- collaborative program development and evaluation, and
- planning for and participating in the unit accreditation process.

In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, faculty are expected to engage in activities that will enhance the overall mission of the professorate, for example:

- expanding knowledge,
- applying knowledge to consequential problems in education, and
- advancing the reputation of the University.

In the areas of professional, university, and community service these responsibilities include, for example:

- contributing to the advancement of the field,
- increasing opportunities for students in the discipline, and
- attending University, College, and Department meetings,
- completing committee assignments,
- completing other duties as assigned by either the Department chair or Dean of the College of Education,
- supporting the work of the Department, College, and University, and
- contributing to the community in general through service activities.

### **III. Department History and Structure**

The history of this program began as early as the 1960s at CSUF. The faculty in school administration officially became the Educational Administration Department on September 15, 1981. The M.S. in Education with a concentration in Educational Administration was approved in January 1985. The Department name change to Educational Leadership took place in 1996.

### **IV. Role of the Chair in the Personnel Process**

With respect to the personnel process, the following guidelines shall apply:

- As provided in UPS 210.000, before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the department chair shall consult with new probationary faculty members concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors. (See UPS 210.000 for further details.)
- The department chair will review the files for faculty in the department unless they are not of a sufficient rank to be eligible to review the file. In that case the Dean assumes responsibilities of the "chair" (as required by UPS 210.000).

### **V. Department Personnel Committee**

#### **A. Committee Functions**

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the "Committee") shall evaluate portfolios and make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to the members of the Department as specified in the UPS 210,000 and the MOU.

#### **B. Committee Structure**

All Committee members shall be tenured faculty and not be serving as a Chair of a Department. Committee members must have a higher rank or classification than those being reviewed. No individuals shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which they are the subject of the personnel review process. An alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any circumstances in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete the term.

**C. Election of Committee Members**

The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the third week of classes in the fall semester each year. All tenured faculty members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B above are automatically on the slate of nominees for the committee except the following: (a) Department Chairs; (b) those who decline in writing to the Chair prior to the second week of classes in the fall; and (c) those who are being considered for a personnel action that year. Any tenured faculty member in the Department may make an additional nomination or nominations of individuals from other Departments. These individuals shall be listed on the ballot if they agree in writing to serve on the Committee. Nominees shall be presented to the faculty for election in the following manner: identified by Department affiliation and rank, and alphabetized by last name. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote for three nominees by secret written ballot. The alternate member shall be the individual who received the highest number of votes among those nominees not elected to the committee

**D. Committee Chair**

The Committee shall select its Chair for one-year term.

**E. Committee Procedures**

1. The Committee shall evaluate the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. In its written evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications under: teaching, scholarship, and service. Where appropriate, the Committee shall formulate recommendations and shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation. (Here and throughout, see UPS 210.000 for further requirements and information.)
2. The Committee's evaluation for each area is to be based on the Portfolio according to the professional judgment of the committee members, UPS 210.000, and the Department Personnel Standards. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for rating the faculty member under review as **excellent, progressing, or inadequate**, with respect to each of the three areas of performance. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VII.
3. All actions taken by the Committee including recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.
4. The Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way the individual members voted.
5. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

## **VI. General Guidelines**

### **A. Developmental Narratives**

Each probationary faculty member shall construct a Developmental Narrative during the initial year of probationary status. A mentor provides guidance, advice, and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation and revision of the narrative. The Department Chair and College Dean will review the narrative and will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College but prior to May 1. The Department Personnel Committee will not review the Developmental Narrative. During subsequent years, the Developmental Narrative may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

Faculty who have previously approved Development Plans will not be required to write Developmental Narratives. Their progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion will be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Standards, and the evaluation will be guided by the developmental plan. UPS 210.000 I.H.1 states:

The Developmental Narrative will be included in the faculty member's portfolio that is submitted for review during the probationary period. The narrative is in addition to, and separate from, the retrospective self-assessment narratives that have always been a part of the portfolio.

### **B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission**

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

### **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 the UPS 210.000. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. The developmental narrative will be included in the portfolio. Curriculum vitae shall be included and citations shall follow APA guidelines. Self-assessment narratives are limited to 1,000 words. The student opinion of faculty teaching forms shall be added by the Department Chair when the Portfolio is received.

## VII. Criteria and Weighing for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty

The Department recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service activities.

### A. Teaching Performance

The primary mission of faculty is teaching. The students' perceptions of a teacher are an important—though not decisive—means of assessing the quality of teaching. Also important are:

- peer evaluations of teaching performance that are based on UPS 210.000,
- quality of teaching materials,
- evaluation and grading of student performance and how these are linked to the use of course materials and course delivery,
- rationale for textbook selection,
- course development and enhancement,
- ongoing professional development as a teacher.

Evaluations may more readily be assumed to be significant when data from student opinion forms and other evidence presented leads to similar conclusions. The faculty member's self-assessment should address significant discrepancies between data from student opinion forms and other data included in the narrative.

#### 1. Mandatory Indicators

- a. Self-Assessment: Faculty members must include a written discussion of their teaching activities that includes both a reflective review of teaching performance including goals for student learning and instructional strategies as well as future goals and direction of teaching. The self-assessment must go beyond a simple description of course content and pedagogy.
- b. List of Courses Taught: A semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review must be provided. The list must include the course number, title, and unit value.
- c. Workload: Faculty workload may include activities in a variety of areas in addition to teaching specific courses; for example, adjustments in workload for the preparation of substantive changes in instructional methods, course development activities, chairing committees, grant preparation, or work to prepare accreditation. The Portfolio must list and discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.
- d. Course Syllabi & Materials: A representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials **prepared by the instructor** to facilitate teaching effectiveness must be included in the appendix. Tests, study aids, and other materials, such as advance organizers, video technology, innovative strategies, instructional television concepts and techniques, evidence of portfolio and case study assessment, etc., may also be included in the appendix.

- e. Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Forms: The university-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught must be included. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.) If service credit was given, data on student opinions from all years for which credit was given are to be included.
- f. Original Student Opinion Forms: The Department Chair will add the forms to the Portfolio when it is received. (If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.)
- g. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions: The university-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester must be provided.

## 2. Other Indicators

The faculty member is urged to submit any other evidence that demonstrates teaching effectiveness such as, but not limited to, the following:

- a. class visitations and reviews by colleagues;
- b. evidence of additional training in teaching;
- c. additional assessment of instruction procedures;
- d. video and/or audio tapes of lessons;
- e. independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member;
- f. documentation of service as thesis/project advisor or committee member for master's degree students;
- g. documentation of academic advisement, mentoring activities, and fieldwork coordination;
- h. new course proposals that have been accepted for inclusion in the curriculum;
- i. written and signed comments by students;
- j. innovative teaching such as team or collaborative teaching or distance learning; and
- k. any other teaching related information and/or materials germane to higher education teaching effectiveness.

## 3. Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Two subcategories of teaching effectiveness are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of this category: student opinion forms and other criteria.

- a. Student Opinion Forms: The College form consists of a five point Likert scale. University-provided statistical summaries of all ratings for all classes for each semester will be used. The following scale will be used to evaluate a faculty member's effectiveness based on the statistical summaries. The assessment of the ratings is based on **average** percentage of ratings over the full period of review (see the appendix for an example of the statistical summary form). **The evaluation shall take into consideration recent trends in the ratings. Reviewers shall take**

into account student comments as well as the faculty member's explanation of the ratings in the teaching narrative when assigning a rating.

**Rating results from statistical summaries:**

Excellent	90% or more A or B ratings, with at least 40% A's
Progressing	70%-89% A or B ratings
Inadequate	Fewer than 70% A or B ratings

- b. Teaching Performance: Based on their professional judgment of the **significance and breadth** of the evidence presented in the portfolio, the reviewers shall rate the Other Teaching Indicators and render a rating of: excellent, progressing, or inadequate.

**Ratings:**

Excellent	To achieve a rating of "excellent," the faculty member must show strong and varied evidence of effective teaching that is sustained over time.
Progressing	To achieve a rating of "progressing," the faculty member must show evidence of indicators of effective teaching.
Inadequate	To receive a rating of "inadequate," limited, weak, or no evidence of effective teaching is presented and progress toward effective teaching is not evident.

- c. Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness: An overall rating of teaching effectiveness will be based on the professional judgment of the reviewers. Primary consideration will be given to evidence of high quality instructional practices and rigorous standards for student performance as evidenced in the portfolio. **A summative rating will be based on data from (a) student opinion forms and (b) teaching performance.** A summative rating of teaching effectiveness will be either excellent, progressing, or inadequate.

In order for faculty members to receive a composite rating of progressing or excellent on teaching effectiveness, they must have received a rating of at least progressing on student opinion forms.

**4. Notes**

- In the self-assessment statement in the Portfolio, faculty are encouraged to synthesize both mandatory and additional indicators of performance as demonstrating teaching effectiveness.
- Special consideration may be extended when unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (nature and difficulty of courses, etc.) are addressed in the Portfolio with specific documentation.
- Improvements and/or trends in teaching performance should be discussed in the Portfolio.



## B. Scholarly and Creative Activities

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activities generates benefits for the faculty member as well as the University. **Because of the importance of collaborative work in our field, co-authored works are valued.** Scholarly activities 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 the 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, the College, the University, and the larger community, (g) advance the reputation of the University, (h) make significant contributions to the dissemination and application of knowledge in educational settings, and (i) enhance collaborative scholarship.

### 1. Indicators

- a. Self-Assessment (mandatory) is a written discussion of the faculty member's performance in scholarly and creative activities. It must include a discussion of the faculty member's research agenda which is a focused, well defined, on-going body of work and a reflective review of the faculty member's scholarly and creative activities documented by supporting evidence. The narrative is limited to 1,000 words.
- b. Scholarly Publications consist of the dissemination of external peer reviewed scholarly publications that appear in journals, books, and other forms of media. Documentation must include one of the following: (a) letter of acceptance and commitment to publish, (b) reprint of published articles, (c) copy of the publication of a book in final printed version. Documentation of peer review can include peer review comments or communication from editor to that effect. Acceptance rate and/or readership reach, and citation information may be included for consideration.
- c. Engaged Scholarship:  
A meaningful, high quality engaged scholarship project includes the following five criteria. Faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence as described below.
  - i. A clear rationale of the need for the work addressed and for the strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out (the plan must be supported by theory or evidence-based practices).
  - ii. Work should have a conceptual or theoretical basis; i.e., is conducted within the context of existing peer-reviewed knowledge. Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area.

- iii. Multiple forms of evidence shall be provided by the faculty member that demonstrate both the quantitative and qualitative impact of the project. A clear impact on a district/community partner is required. These could include a letter from partners, data collected, etc.
  - iv. A description of the process and outcomes that includes: research questions informed by and situated within the literature; an analysis of findings that are contextualized within the particular community/district/school/classroom needs and the discipline; implications that illustrate the practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the better; directions for future work.
  - v. Evidence of dissemination activities and feedback from stakeholders must be included. Dissemination may be accomplished in various ways, including formal presentations to partnership groups and reports for partners.
- d. A high quality, externally funded grant that includes all of the following criteria:
- i. Funded award of approximately \$50,000 or more; and
  - ii. A proposal that has a conceptual or theoretical basis; i.e., is conducted within the context of existing knowledge. Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area; and
  - iii. The person under review is the principal investigator (PI) or co-PI on the grant or grant proposal; and
  - iv. A proposal that is externally reviewed by peers, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. The peer-review process should reflect the competitiveness of the grant. One of the best ways of providing such documentation, especially for grants that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments provided with the text of the grant; and
  - v. Evidence that the impact of the grant shall be substantial (e.g., number of candidates affected, number of partner districts impacted, scope of dissemination strategies, evidence of university and/or preK-12 collaboration, letters of support).
- e. Pragmatic Scholarship consists of consultantships, policy analysis, program evaluation, serving as a member of a research project, non-peer-reviewed publications, and other forms of scholarship with an emphasis on the practical aspects of knowledge. In documenting pragmatic scholarship, faculty should include not only their own written record of the project, but must also provide external peer review

comments or other documentation of the identifiable benefits to the field. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products, are encouraged in this category.

- f. Scholarly Presentations are peer reviewed papers and presentations given or accepted to be given at professional meetings, symposia, seminars, or colloquia. They may consist of featured presentations, keynote addresses, poster sessions, panel discussions, and other forms of work all of which must be peer reviewed and based on a theoretical or conceptual framework.
- g. If the dissertation is listed in the Portfolio as a published document, it should be included in the appendix section. If the dissertation is listed as an unpublished document, it need not be included in the Portfolio appendix.

## 2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activities

These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty members under review to show how their work addresses some or all of these criteria and the importance of the specific criteria in evaluating each scholarly or creative work.

- a. The Department employs traditional criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work:
  - clarity of conceptualization;
  - connection to the theoretical and scholarly literature;
  - originality of scholarship;
  - external peer reviews;
  - publication in respected journals, books, or media;
  - professionally recognized scholarly and prestigious invitations;
  - advances knowledge in the field;
  - influence on educational practice and settings.
- b. In addition, in light of our philosophy, we also evaluate scholarly and creative activities based on whether the activity:
  - complements teaching;
  - contributes to the overall quality of the Department, the College, the University, and the community;
  - enhances the professional growth of the faculty member; and
  - advances the reputation of the University and the profession.

## 3. High quality scholarly work includes all of the following:

- Work that has a **conceptual or theoretical** basis and is conducted within the context of existing knowledge. This can be accomplished through a review of related literature to show what was done in the past.
- Work that **results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or that extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge**. The dissemination of knowledge can be demonstrated through publication of

innovative articles, policy analysis, or program development, as well as through books, textbooks, or media that synthesize knowledge.

- Work that is **externally reviewed by peers**. Work that has been accepted for publication or presentation after a peer-review shall be distinguished from work that was not subject to peer review.
- Work that is **published in respected sources** such as journals, books, and media. Faculty should provide documentation of the quality, scope, and importance of the journal or book. Respected sources require a peer-review process for submitted materials.

**Note.** Co-authored publications where the person under review made substantive intellectual contributions may be considered high quality publications. Substantive contributions can be demonstrated by either 50% or more to the intellectual/creative process, or by contributions to the intellectual/creative process of a highly significant or vital nature as specified and verified by co-authors.

#### 4. Guidelines for Ratings

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication shall stem from a sustained program of focused work over the review period. Based on the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers using the standards outlined above in 2 and 3 shall rate the faculty member's overall scholarly and creative activity as "excellent," "progressing," or "inadequate." Reviewers will consider the length, complexity, and contribution to the field of each scholarly publication in evaluating whether the minimum or average publication threshold has been met.

##### a. Guidelines for **assistant professors** seeking tenure and promotion to **associate**:

- i. A rating of **excellent** shall be rendered for exemplary performance in scholarly activity. For a rating of excellent, it is generally expected that the portfolio will contain:
  - a) Four scholarly publications **including co-authored publications**; and
  - b) Four or more high quality pragmatic scholarship and/or scholarly presentations; and
  - c) One or more of the following:
    - (1.) Evidence that all four scholarly publications are of "high quality";
    - (2.) Additional scholarly publications;
    - (3.) A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project that meets all of the criteria in Section VII.B.2.c;
    - (4.) A funded grant that meets all of the criteria in Section VII.B.2.d.

- ii. A rating of **progressing** shall be rendered for a portfolio containing **four** scholarly publications.
  - iii. A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for a portfolio not meeting the criteria for progressing.
- b. Guidelines for **associate professors** seeking promotion to **full professor** (and tenure, if applicable) and for **full professors** seeking tenure:
- i. A rating of **excellent** shall be rendered for a portfolio containing either (a) four high-quality scholarly publications OR (b) two high-quality scholarly publications and two grants/engaged scholarship.
  - ii. A rating of **progressing** shall be rendered for a portfolio containing either 1) three scholarly publications OR 2) two scholarly publications and one grants/engaged scholarship.
  - iii. A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for a portfolio not meeting rating criteria for progressing.

**5. Notes**

- a. Quality, quantity, and the impact of the faculty member's contributions all need to be considered in light of prevailing professional standards.
- b. All scholarly and creative activities must be properly documented with a complete APA citation, letters of acceptance, documentation of peer review, letters of invitation, dates, places, final printed versions of galley pages, locations, copies of final printed versions of publication, letters of review and evaluation of performances. A detailed statement should be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Records has an appropriate form.
- c. Documentation also should provide for scholarly and creative work in progress. Care should be taken to distinguish work in progress from that already completed. See UPS 210.000.
- d. The impact of scholarly and creative activities is not measured by the image of a specific journal or publisher, but by the activity's overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study, to benefit students, **and/or the community**. It is incumbent upon the faculty members under review to clearly delineate such evidence in their Portfolios.

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

Faculty in applied fields such as those in education are to be encouraged not only to make original scholarly contributions in the form of written material, but also to communicate and apply knowledge by means of presentations and consultations. (Conference presentations that result from external peer-review processes and are related to the faculty member's research agenda may be presented as part of the section on scholarship. Such items should be presented in only one section of the Portfolio.) Understood in the wider sense of communication and application of the knowledge base of the disciplines in education, the area of professional activities has much in common with that of scholarly and creative activities. The audience for professional activities is broader than is the scholarly audience. The benefits are much the same, that is, such activities may:

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

As with the area of scholarship, the quality, quantity, and impact of one's contributions all need to be considered in the context of the potential benefits and in light of prevailing professional standards.

### **1. Indicators**

Evidence of service shall be recognized and evaluated by such indicators as listed below. (These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty members under review to show how their work addresses some or all of these indicators.)

- a. self-assessment that discusses the impact of the contributions on the profession, the field and the individual which is limited to 1,000 words (mandatory);
- b. assuming professional leadership roles;
- c. attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops (which may not be peer reviewed or theoretical in nature);
- d. acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates;
- e. editing professional journals;
- f. reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals or conferences;
- g. providing private practice or consultations relevant to the field;
- h. reviewing grant proposals;
- i. receiving professional training or providing additional professional training to others;
- j. receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition;
- k. invited membership in state or national policy committees and forums; and/or
- l. engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community;
- m. active participation in System-wide, University, College, and/or Department committees and activities including evidence of the faculty member's contributions;
- n. special services to the community (for example lectures);
- o. participation in community groups such as involvement with public school programs;
- p. active involvement as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups;
- q. formulation of, or participation in, programs or institutes;
- r. active membership on advisory boards within the University or community;
- s. lecture/staff development given to university audiences and other university classes; and,
- t. service valuable to school districts and the wider community and region.

## 2. Rating Criteria for Service Activities

Faculty at the associate rank are expected to provide service at the college, university, and/or professional level as well as to the department. Faculty at the assistant rank are expected to focus their service activities primarily at the department level.

### Ratings

- A rating of **excellent** shall be rendered for professional activities that reflect a high degree of **consistent** involvement in terms of both quality and quantity.
- A rating of **progressing** shall be rendered if there are activities in 3 or more of the categories of indicators described above of increasing intensity as one progresses toward promotion. It is expected that faculty will render service in multiple settings (department, college, university, profession, and/or community).
- A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for a lack of sufficient professional activity.

### D. General Note on Ratings

In evaluating the indicators for the ratings, the Committee shall consider not only the quantity and quality of indicators, but also the time period between reviews.

## VIII. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

### A. Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty

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

- **progressing** in teaching and scholarship, and
- must be making obvious progress toward a rating of **progressing** in service.

### B. Criteria for Granting of Tenure

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure after six probationary years, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed. It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication shall stem from a sustained program of focused work.

In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member must be rated, at a minimum of:

- **excellent in teaching,**
- excellent in one other area, and
- progressing in the third area.

**C. Criteria for Promotion**

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

**1. Promotion to Full Professor**

In order to be granted promotion to full professor, the faculty member must demonstrate a sustained performance of:

- **excellence** in two areas (one of which must be teaching), and
- **progressing** in the remaining area.

**2. Early Promotion and Early Tenure**

Refer to UPS210.000 for eligibility requirements. In all cases, the faculty member must satisfy to a greater extent the requirements for promotion and/or tenure delineated in earlier sections. Additionally, special requirements are described below.

- a. **Early Tenure** requires that the faculty member must be rated at least **excellent in teaching and scholarship** and at least **progressing** in service.
- b. **Early Promotion to Associate Professor** requires that the faculty member must be rated at least **excellent in teaching and scholarship** and at least **progressing** in service.
- c. **Early Promotion to Professor** requires that the faculty member must be rated as having a sustained record of **excellence in all three areas**.