



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

Official Department Personnel Standards for the Department of Secondary Education

Approved by Dr. Kari Knutson Miller, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 2/6/2018 for implementation in the 2018-2019 Academic Year

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dps/edsc2018.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dps/edsc2018.pdf)

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 210.000 (3/26/18 version), Section V.C.: ▪ 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.

I. Preface

The Department of Secondary Education (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 the creation and dissemination of knowledge are central to the advancement of truth. The Department also believes that teaching, in all its forms, is the primary task of this department.

The Department recognizes that faculty are the key to quality programs and effective learning environments. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning through contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Department, College of Education, University, profession, and the community.

The Department proposes a personnel document consistent with the Mission and Goals of the University. This document responds to the multiple roles of the faculty at the various stages of their careers.

The Department shall 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 shall be aided in their respective roles by having available clear and objective statements of the Department’s expectations. Furthermore, the faculty members specifically affirm their position that the best interests and needs of students are served when the faculty represent widely diverse interests and activities creating a mosaic of talents. With this document, the Department recognizes both the full range of talents possessed by the faculty and the great diversity of functions inherent in the mission of an institution of higher education.

II. Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

- developing and implementing comprehensive syllabi;
- communicating clear expectations to students;
- demonstrating a variety of teaching and assessment strategies;
- modeling effective teaching practices;
- reflecting on teaching practices.

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

- expanding knowledge;
- applying knowledge to consequential problems in education;
- 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;

- attending University, College, and Department meetings;
- completing Committee assignments;
- completing other College and Department duties as assigned by either the College, Dean, or Department Chair;
- supporting the work of the Department, College, and University; and
- contributing to the community in general through service activities.

III. Department Mission

The Mission of the Department is to develop quality secondary school teachers. We are committed to providing a program that reflects the complex contexts of the secondary classroom and models a professional community where learning is interactive and dynamic. Our philosophy is to prepare educational leaders through a course of study that bases practice upon knowledge of current research. We develop students as life-long learners, reflective practitioners, and change agents who positively influence decision-making in schools and communities to improve the education of adolescents.

The Department offers the Single Subject Credential Program, in collaboration with academic departments. A Masters of Science in Secondary Education degree is also offered, with concentrations available in Secondary Education and Teacher Induction.

IV. Role of the Department Chair in the Personnel Process

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

- Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair may consult with new probationary faculty members concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors in consultation with the faculty.
- The Department Chair shall review the files for faculty unless the Department Chair is not of a sufficient rank to be eligible to review the file or is being considered for promotion themselves. In that case the Dean shall assume the responsibilities of the “Department Chair.”

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 UPS 210.000 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

B. Committee Structure

All Committee members shall be tenured faculty and shall not be serving as the Department Chair of a department. Committee members shall have a higher rank or classification than those being reviewed. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he/she is 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 his or her term of office or he or she is ineligible to participate.

C. Election of Committee Members

The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester each year.

All tenured faculty members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B above shall be automatically placed on the slate of nominees for the Committee. If the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members, nominations of individuals not in the Department shall be made in writing to the Department Chair prior to the election. In addition, nominees shall make a written declaration to the Department Chair prior to Wednesday of the second week of the semester indicating that they wish to be considered. Nominees shall be presented to the Department faculty for election in the following manner: alphabetized by last name, identified by Department affiliation and rank. Nomination(s) from outside of the Department shall be listed on the bottom of the ballot alphabetically in the Department from whence the nomination came. No person shall appear on more than one nomination ballot.

Each tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote by secret written ballot for three members from the list of nominees. In the case of a tie, the Committee member shall be decided by a coin flip by the Department Chair, in the presence of Department faculty members.

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 a 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 each category of the criteria listed in Section VII of this document. The Committee shall formulate a separate recommendation that shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation.
2. The Committee's evaluation for each area shall be based solely on the information submitted in the Portfolio in accordance with UPS 210.000 and the Department Personnel Standards. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for rating the faculty member under review as **excellent, good, or inadequate**, with respect to each area 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 evaluation, the recommendation, and 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. Prospectus

With the guidance, support, and advice of an appointed faculty mentor, each probationary faculty member shall construct a Prospectus during his or her initial year of probationary status. The Prospectus shall be comprised of narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service that “describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments (s)he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion” (UPS 210.000). Each narrative shall not exceed 500 words. Throughout subsequent revisions of the Prospectus the faculty mentor shall also be available for counsel. While having no formal approval process, the Department Chair and College Dean shall review the Prospectus and shall each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College, but prior to May 1. The Committee does not provide feedback on the Prospectus, but does view it within the Portfolio contents for all full performance reviews.

During subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that shall typically occur during the probationary period. Faculty members’ progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion shall be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Standards.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare the required information and documentation for the Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to attend the workshops held by the Faculty Affairs and Records Office at the beginning of each fall semester. Additionally, they are encouraged to attend College or University-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 UPS 210.000 and as provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. The contents of the appendices should represent ongoing reflection and a process of sorting and refining over time.

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

The College of Education recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service as vehicles to give meaning to the essence of scholarship. It also values collegiality, ethical and professional behavior, and a commitment to the good and well-being of the Department.

A. Teaching Performance

The primary mission of this Department's faculty is teaching. The students' perceptions of a teacher are an important—though not decisive—means of assessing the quality of teaching. **Qualitative evidence of effective teaching is equally important.** The faculty member's self-assessment should explain the evidence submitted and address significant discrepancies between data from student opinion forms and qualitative indicators. The faculty member is encouraged to submit carefully selected exemplars of teaching effectiveness and reflective practice. These exemplars may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- class visitations and reviews by colleagues;
- evidence of additional training in teaching;
- evidence of additional assessment of instruction (such as mid-term evaluations, focus groups, interviews, analysis of student work);
- audio, video, and/or digital recordings of lessons;
- independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member;
- documentation of service as thesis/project advisor for Master's degree students;
- documentation of academic advisement, mentoring activities, and fieldwork coordination;
- new course proposals that have been accepted for inclusion in the curriculum;
- written and signed comments by students;
- innovative teaching, such as team or collaborative teaching or teaching at a distance; and
- any other teaching related information and/or materials germane to higher education teaching effectiveness.

1. Mandatory Indicators

- a. To be placed in the Portfolio:
 - i. Self-Assessment (maximum 1000 word self-assessment narrative)
The faculty member shall include a written discussion of his/her teaching activities. This shall include 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 shall go beyond a simple description of course content and pedagogy. It should include an analysis of the statistical summaries and how trends in student written comments can contribute to an understanding of the data. **The faculty member should be careful to identify trends in the statistical data and written comments.**

- ii. 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.
 - iii. Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires If data are missing, a written explanation shall 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 shall be included if evaluations were conducted at the previous institution.
 - iv. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distributions for each semester shall be provided. The peer evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught.
- b. To be placed in the appendix:
- i. 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, Department Chairing Committees, grant preparation, or accreditation work. The reflective narrative shall list and discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.
 - ii. Course Syllabi & Materials A representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials prepared by the instructor to demonstrate his/her teaching effectiveness shall be included in the appendix. Tests, study aids, and other materials, such as advance organizers, video and/or digital technology, innovative strategies, online instructional concepts and techniques, evidence of portfolio and case study assessment, etc., may also be included in the appendix.
 - iii. Original Student Opinion Questionnaires If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair.
 - iv. Qualitative Indicators of Effective Teaching The faculty member shall submit carefully selected exemplars of teaching effectiveness

and reflective practice as outlined in VII. A. Teaching Performance. These materials shall be carefully selected and revised over time to represent the enhancement of one's teaching performance.

2. Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

All subcategories of teaching effectiveness are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of this category: student opinion questionnaires, qualitative indicators, and (when appropriate) non-instructional assigned time—all are equally valued.

- a. Student Opinion Questionnaires: The student opinion form consists of items rated on a five point Likert scale. University-provided statistical summaries of all ratings for all classes for each semester shall be used. The following scale shall be used to evaluate a faculty member's effectiveness based on statistical summaries. The assessment of ratings is based on cumulative percentage of ratings over the full period of review. The evaluation may also take into consideration recent trends in the ratings (for example if there is a steady rise upward).

Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty's member's teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not be used by any level of evaluation as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments. Evaluation of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student opinion questionnaires and contained in written comments on these forms. The evaluations may take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught (size, level, delivery mode, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance.

Results from statistical summaries:

Excellent	90% or more A and B ratings, with at least 40% A's
Good	75%-89% A and B ratings
Inadequate	Fewer than 75% A and B ratings.

Note: The reviewers shall note the wide range of scores possible within each University-provided statistical summary. For example, it should be noted that a faculty member with 74% A and B scores would be classified as an inadequate teacher, as would a faculty member with only 50% A and B ratings. Faculty members who feel their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching should carefully explain their scores, and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be noted by the reviewers.

Reviewers shall also take into account student comments as well as the

faculty member’s explanation of the ratings in the teaching narrative when assigning a rating for this category.

- b. The reviewers shall rate the Qualitative Indicators and render a rating of: **excellent, good, or inadequate, according to the guidelines below.**

Guidelines for Assessing Additional Indicators of Effective Teaching Performance		
Holistic Rating	Quality of Evidence	Examples (provided by the faculty member)
Excellent	Contains strong and varied evidence (6 or more examples total <i>yearly</i>) of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching strategies and/or assessment tools; on-going development of teaching skills in courses taught	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of using audio, video and/or digital recordings of lessons ● Documentation of academic advisement, mentoring activities, and fieldwork coordination ● New course proposals that have been accepted for inclusion in the curriculum
Good	Contains varied evidence (4) examples total <i>yearly</i>) of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching strategies and/or assessment tools, on- going development of teaching skills of courses taught	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inclusion of other evidence of teaching effectiveness, or teaching materials that show comprehensive course design and implementation (e.g., visual aids, handouts, support materials) ● Engagement in the scholarship of teaching and classroom research
Inadequate	Any level of activity that is below the standard for good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation in formative assessment and adjustment of instruction

- c. Non-Instructional Assigned Time: Non-instructional assigned time shall be assessed on qualitative indicators documenting performance effectiveness according to the elements of the agreed job description. A minimum of one indicator of high-quality evidence per element, yearly, is required for a rating of Excellent. The proportionality of evidence required for demonstration of effectiveness shall be considered commensurate to the ratio of assigned time to teaching load (i.e., a position that requires 6 units of assigned time and 6 units of teaching shall be evaluated 50% on each; a position that requires 3 units of assigned time and 9 units of teaching shall be evaluated 25% on assigned time and 75% on teaching time). The exception is the release time provided to new faculty—this time is not considered part of teaching performance.

Qualitative evidence shall include the job description, a letter from the Department Chair (or appropriate supervisor) that discusses the faculty member's effectiveness in that role, and some of the following (as appropriate): additional letters of support; documentation of academic advisement, mentoring activities, and fieldwork coordination; agenda and minutes from conducted meetings; informal assessments of effectiveness and adjustment of practice; record of presentations given; evidence of additional training related to the administrative role; incorporation of technology; and/or sample documents developed within the role.

Composite Rating of Teaching Effectiveness: Based on a composite of the student opinion questionnaires and qualitative indicators, and when appropriate non-instructional assigned time, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching effectiveness as either: **excellent**, **good**, or **inadequate**.

- A rating of **excellent** shall be rendered for high-quality, effective teaching including either **excellent** in both categories or **excellent** in one category and **good** in the other category.
- A rating of **good** shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth teaching rated **good** in both categories.
- A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered when either category is evaluated as **inadequate**, regardless of the evaluation for the other category.

Qualitative	SOQ data	Composite Rating
Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Excellent	Good	Excellent
Good	Excellent	Excellent
Good	Good	Good
Good	Inadequate	Inadequate
Inadequate	Good	Inadequate
Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate
Inadequate	Excellent	Inadequate
Excellent	Inadequate	Inadequate

3. 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.
- c. Improvements and/or trends in teaching performance shall 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. Such activities may: (a) complement teaching; (b) contribute to the advancement of the field and/or extend the meaning or application of existing knowledge, and, more broadly, contribute 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, and the University; (g) enhance the reputation of the University; and (h) enhance collaborative scholarship.

- Note #1: The term “scholarly and creative activity” as used here relates primarily to the Carnegie Foundations report by Ernest Boyer regarding the “scholarship of discovery” and the “scholarship of integration”— i.e., to the production of new knowledge and/or to the extension or application of existing knowledge. The Department recognizes and strongly values multiple types of scholarship including the “scholarship of teaching” and the “scholarship of application/professional service” (to use Boyer terminology), with all areas addressed in their own respective sections of UPS 210.000 and in the Department of Secondary Education Standards.
- Note #2: Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many, including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research and meta-analysis, and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.

1. Indicators

- a. Self-Assessment (mandatory) is a written discussion of the faculty member’s performance in scholarly and creative activities. It shall include a discussion of the faculty member’s research agenda, which should be 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 self-assessment narrative is limited to 1000 words.
- b. Publications consist of the dissemination of externally reviewed scholarly works that appear in journals, books, and other forms of publication. Documentation shall include one of the following: (1) letter of acceptance and commitment to publish (for unpublished works), (2) reprint of published works, or (3) a copy of the publication of a book in final printed version. Peer review comments and documentation of

quality shall be included whenever possible. See “Notes” section on pp. 14-15, Section VII.B.4., for additional information about documentation requirements, particularly for co-authored publications.

- c. Pragmatic Scholarship consists of grants awarded, engaged scholarship projects, consultantships, policy analysis, program evaluation, service as a member of a research project, contracts/consultantships that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field, public press articles, books, and other non peer-reviewed materials prepared for the “lay” or “practitioner” audience, and other comparable scholarly activities 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 also external reviewers’ comments and the identifiable benefits to the field, when available. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products (e.g., summary reports, program evaluation, and recordings), are encouraged in this category.
- d. Scholarly Presentations are papers and presentations given or accepted to be given at professional meetings, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or convocations. They may consist of featured presentations, keynote addresses, poster sessions, panel discussions, and other forms of work, all of which shall be peer-reviewed or invited presentations of a substantive nature, and based on a theoretical or conceptual framework.

2. Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activities

These lists are not in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how his or her 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 the following criteria in evaluating scholarly and creative work, including:
 - clarity of conceptualization;
 - originality of scholarship;
 - external peer reviews;
 - publication in peer-reviewed journals, externally reviewed books, or media;
 - professionally-recognized scholarly presentations and/or invitations at the state, national, or international levels.
- b. In addition, in light of our philosophy, we also evaluate scholarly and creative activities based on whether the activity meets one or more of the following criteria:
 - complements teaching;
 - contributes to the advancement of the field and, more broadly, to human achievement;
 - contributes to the overall quality of the Department, the College, and the University;
 - enhances the professional growth of the faculty member; and
 - advances the reputation of the University.

- c. High-quality scholarly work includes all of the following:
- *work 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 showing what has been done in the past and a rationale as to why additional work is needed.
 - *work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge.* Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research and meta-analysis, and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.
 - *work that is externally reviewed by peers,* with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. One of the best ways of providing such documentation, especially for publications that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments.
 - other types of activities/indicators that add strength to a faculty member's scholarly record (but that do not replace the requirement for scholarly publications) include: grants awarded (except as specified in section VII.B.3 below); peer-reviewed or invited scholarly presentations/posters; contracts/consultantships that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field; public press articles, books, and other non peer-reviewed materials prepared for the "lay" or "practitioner" audience; and other comparable scholarly activities.

3. Guidelines for Ratings

It is expected that the faculty member shall demonstrate an on-going, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the entire review process leading to tenure and promotion. Based on the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member's overall scholarly and creative activity as **excellent**, **good**, or **inadequate**.

- a. A rating of **excellent** shall be rendered for extensive, focused, and in-depth scholarly activity including (a) an average of one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) per year, after the first year of service; AND (b) an average of one presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly. In lieu of b, a faculty member may have an average of two high-quality peer-reviewed publications (published or in press) per year, after the first year of service. A large, high-quality, externally-

funded grant, and/or a meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined per the guidelines that follow, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of **excellent** in scholarly and creative activities.

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

- multi-year funding, operating on a 2 year or greater grant cycle with total award of approximately \$50,000 or more; and
- 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
- 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
- evidence that the impact of the grant shall be substantial (e.g., number of candidates impacted, number of partner districts impacted, evidence of university and/or prek-12 collaboration, letters of support).

Note about pursuing externally-funded grants:

External grant writing is something generally not undertaken by junior faculty members. Instead, external funding opportunities should generally be sought by tenured faculty who have already established themselves as strong researchers. Faculty are advised that they shall still need to establish themselves as researchers primarily through peer-reviewed publications. While a substantial grant adds strength to a faculty member's scholarly record, it does not replace the requirement for scholarly publications.

Engaged Scholarship: A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined per the criteria established by the College of Education, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. Engaged scholarship cannot be used to achieve a rating of good or lower.

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

- A clear rationale of the need for the work addressed and for the strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out (the plan must be supported by evidence-based practices).
 - Work should have a conceptual or theoretical basis; (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing peer-reviewed knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work 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.
 - 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.
 - A description of the evaluation process and outcomes that includes: research questions informed by and situated within the literature; an analysis of findings that are contextualized within the particular community/district/school/classroom needs and the discipline; implications that illustrate the practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the better; and directions for future work. Evaluation results and implemented changes based on this evaluation must be completed and disseminated before the faculty member can submit this work for the RTP process.
 - Evidence of dissemination activities and feedback from stakeholders must be included. Dissemination may be accomplished in various ways, including formal presentations to partnership groups and reports for partners.
- b. A rating of **good** shall be rendered for extensive or in-depth scholarly activity including (a) an average of one high-quality peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) every two years, three (3) publications during a five year review cycle; AND (b) an average of one refereed presented conference presentation, funded grant, or pragmatic publication (published or in press), yearly.
- c. A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for good.

4. Notes

- a. Quality, quantity, and the impact of the faculty member's contributions shall be considered in light of prevailing professional standards.
- b. All scholarly and creative activities shall be properly documented with a complete APA citation. Additionally, letters of acceptance, documentation of peer review, letters of invitation, galley pages, copies of final printed versions of publications, and letters of review and evaluation of performances are expected, depending on whether the

activity is unpublished or published. A detailed statement shall be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author, signed by each co-author. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Records has an appropriate form, and when used this form shall be signed by each co-author.

- c. Documentation also shall provide for scholarly and creative work in progress. Care shall be taken to distinguish work in progress from that already completed.
- d. The impact of scholarly and creative activities is measured by its overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or to benefit students. It is incumbent upon the faculty member under review to clearly delineate such evidence in the Portfolio.
- e. Once tenure and promotion are earned, a faculty member may concentrate his/her scholarly energies in areas other than the publication of peer-reviewed articles. For example, rather than publishing peer-reviewed articles, a tenured faculty member may instead choose to publish a scholarly book that contributes substantially to the field. The faculty member shall demonstrate that his/her work has undergone a rigorous review process. Whichever scholarly path is chosen, the faculty member shall demonstrate a sustained and focused scholarly agenda, regardless of whether that focus results in peer-reviewed articles, scholarly books/book chapters/edited books, or some combination thereof.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

Faculty in applied fields such as those in the Department are encouraged to make original scholarly contributions in the form of written material, and 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 shall 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 the College, the area of service has much in common with that of scholarly and creative activities. 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 her/his 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.

We are a College of Education and we are dedicated to the enhancement of the education of teachers. Our mission is to provide an exemplary level of education of

teachers consistent with the mandates of the State of California, the University, and the recommendations of appropriate professional bodies governing the education of all students. Our emphasis is one that is founded on service to the educational community at large with a special emphasis on dynamic interaction with the schools and districts within our service area and region. All College faculty are expected to assume an active role in addressing the needs of our students and the educational communities within our region.

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 member under review to show how the work addresses some or all of these indicators.

- a. Self-assessment (mandatory) that discusses the impact of the contributions on the profession, the field, and the individual. There is a 1000 word limit for the self-assessment narrative.
- b. Professional Service, including but not limited to the following:
 - assuming professional leadership roles;
 - attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops that may not be peer-reviewed or theoretical in nature;
 - acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates;
 - editing professional journals;
 - reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals or conferences;
 - providing private practice or consultations relevant to the field;
 - reviewing grant proposals;
 - providing professional training to others;
 - receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition;
 - participating as an invited member on state or national policy Committees and forums; and/or
 - engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community.
- c. University Service, including but not limited to the following:
 - active participation in Department, College, University, and/or System-wide Committees and activities;
 - special services to the community (e.g. lectures);
 - participation in community groups, such as involvement with public school programs;
 - active involvement as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups;
 - formulation of, or participation in, programs or institutes;
 - active membership on advisory boards within the University or community; and/or
 - lecture/staff development given to university audiences and other university classes.
- d. Community Service, including service valuable to school districts and the wider community and region.

2. Rating Criteria for Service Activities

A rating of **excellent** shall be rendered for service that reflects a high degree of involvement (5 or more yearly) involving two or more levels of service (Professional, University, and Community).

A rating of **good** shall be rendered if there are considerable quality service activities (4 yearly) involving two or more levels of service (Professional, University, and Community).

A rating of **inadequate** shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for good.

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 of tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member shall be rated:

- **Good** or **excellent** in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.

B. Criteria for Granting of Tenure

Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure and promotion after completing five probationary years.

In order to be granted tenure, the faculty member shall be rated:

1. **Excellent** in either Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities and at least **good** in two other areas.
2. In order to receive tenure, a faculty member shall have received a doctorate in an appropriate field of study from an accredited university. 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.
3. Early Promotion and Early Tenure: In order to be awarded early tenure and promotion to associate, the faculty member shall exceed the standards in VIII.B.1 by receiving a rating of **excellent** in all three areas, Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.

C. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires that the faculty member request promotion via the university-approved form and according to University timelines. For faculty requesting consideration for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, four years in rank is the standard time frame, unless the faculty member is requesting an **early** consideration for promotion to Full Professor. In order to be granted promotion to full professor, the faculty member shall be rated, at minimum:

1. **Excellent** in two areas (one of which must be Teaching) and at least **good** in the third area.
2. Early Promotion: In order to be awarded early promotion to Professor, the faculty member shall have a sustained record of **excellence** in all three areas since the last promotion.

Summary of Minimum Tenure and Promotion Requirements					
Department of Secondary Education					
Retention	Tenure and Promotion to Associate	Early Tenure	Early Promotion to Associate	Promotion to Professor	Early Promotion to Professor
Shall be GOOD or EXCELLENT in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service.	EXCELLENT in Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities and at least GOOD in two other areas.	Sustained EXCELLENCE in all three areas.	Sustained EXCELLENCE in all three areas.	A sustained level of high performance is required for promotion to professor. Excellent in two areas (one of which must be teaching) and at least Good in the third area.	Sustained EXCELLENCE in all three areas.



Mark as shown: Please use a #2 pencil and COMPLETELY FILL IN THE BOX of your answer.

Correction: Please completely erase or completely fill in the wrong answer AND PLACE AN 'X' IN THE BOX OF YOUR ANSWER.

1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

- | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree Somewhat | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.1 As a result of the instructor's work in this course, my understanding of the subject matter has increased. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.2 The instructor provided opportunities for students to be actively engaged in the class. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.3 The instructor contributed to my development as a professional. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.4 The instructor encouraged multiple perspectives. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.5 The instructor used a variety of strategies in teaching the course content. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.6 The instructor fulfilled the course objectives. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.7 The instructor was available during the office hours. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.8 The instructor communicated course expectations effectively. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- Please continue on Page 2

2. Comments

2.1 What feedback would you like to provide the instructor?



Mark as shown: Please use a #2 pencil and COMPLETELY FILL IN THE BOX of your answer.

Correction: Please completely erase or completely fill in the wrong answer AND PLACE AN 'X' IN THE BOX OF YOUR ANSWER.

1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

Please indicate your opinion of the statements provided.

Directions: Fill out the sections that are applicable to your situation.

Strongly Agree Agree Agree Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree

SUPERVISION

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.1 | Supervisor helped establish professional relationships with school personnel. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.2 | Supervisor was helpful in solving educational problems. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.3 | Supervisor was sensitive to individual needs. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.4 | Supervisor gave adequate feedback regarding student's performance. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.5 | Supervisor visited classrooms on a regular basis. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.6 | Supervisor was available for individual conferences as needed. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.7 | Supervisor related to students in a professional manner. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SMALL GROUP SEMINAR (If Applicable)

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.8 | Instructor used seminar to discuss our questions. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.9 | Instructor used seminar to discuss important issues. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.10 | Instructor used seminar for sharing activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.11 | Instructor used seminar to support classroom experience. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.12 | Instructor used seminar to guide students to learn concepts. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please continue to second page.

2. Comments

2.1 What feedback would you like to provide the supervisor/instructor?