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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Department Goals

The advancement of learning is central to the mission of the Department of Geological Sciences. The primary goal of the department is to provide an inclusive environment conducive to the highest quality teaching, learning, and scholarship. To achieve this, it is necessary to provide guidelines to ensure continued faculty development in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities (SCA), and Service to the profession, the university, and the public community. To this end, another department goal is to guide each faculty member through the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process as smoothly as possible. The department believes that the RTP evaluation procedures should help the faculty member develop to their fullest potential.

B. UPS 210.002

As UPS 210.002 is the controlling document in faculty personnel policies and procedures, and establishes the minimum standards that govern retention, promotion, and granting of tenure (RTP) for probationary faculty, and the promotion of tenured faculty. The affected faculty member has the responsibility of becoming thoroughly familiar with UPS 210.002. For probationary faculty, this relates primarily to the description and preparation of the Portfolio. The Portfolio contains the evidence of performance and is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. The faculty member shall assure that the Portfolio meets the organization and content requirements specified in UPS 210.002.

C. Department Personnel Document Goals

The purpose of this department personnel document (DPD) is to supplement UPS 210.000 and UPS 210.002 by specifying the evaluation criteria and the kinds of activities that relate to these criteria, as well as the performance standards and the types of evidence necessary to document success in each evaluation criterion throughout the RTP process. It is important that a healthy RTP dialogue be established early and be maintained between the faculty member and the department. This dialogue shall be promoted by: (1) communication of needs and desires of both the faculty member and the department; (2) multiple opportunities for the faculty member to assess their progress towards personal goals described in the Prospectus as well as in the Teaching, SCA, and Service narratives of the Portfolio; and (3) timely recommendations and assistance from the department chair and department personnel committee (DPC). The ultimate
goal of the evaluation process is for the faculty member to reach their potential as a teacher-scholar.

**D. Prospectus**

While UPS 210.000, UPS 210.002, and this DPD are the controlling instruments in the RTP process, the Prospectus is an outline of goals set forth by the probationary faculty member that shall help guide the probationary faculty member successfully through the RTP process. 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. The Teaching, SCA, and Service segments of the Prospectus shall be based on the position description. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required, and accomplishments they expect to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Geological Sciences Department Personnel Standards for retention, tenure, and promotion.

Faculty members shall have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their Portfolio. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process.

The Prospectus shall be due to the department chair by the date set by Faculty Affairs and Records. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the department chair and the dean, who will provide written feedback by the date set by Faculty Affairs and Records. The Prospectus shall be included in the Portfolio submitted for each full review.

**E. Department Personnel Committee**

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of three tenured members of the department and one tenured alternate, none of whom may be on any type of leave during that year of service. The department chair may not serve on the DPC. The three DPC members shall be selected by secret ballot from a slate of all qualified faculty members within the department. If there are fewer than four qualified, tenured faculty in the department, similarly qualified faculty from related disciplines shall be added to the slate to bring the total number of candidates to four. If multiple candidates from related disciplines are nominated (and agree to participate if elected), a separate secret ballot shall be conducted to determine which non-departmental faculty member(s) shall fill any vacancies in the four-member slate. A final secret ballot shall be conducted to determine who shall serve on the DPC and who shall serve as alternate on the DPC. The elected DPC term is one year.
As described in UPS 210.000, there are certain RTP situations in which an otherwise qualified DPC member may be deemed unable to serve. Additionally, DPC members are expected to disqualify themselves in situations involving an actual or apparent conflict of interest. Regardless of the cause, the alternate shall serve on the DPC in the event that the number of committee members drops below three.

F. Portfolio Guidelines

New faculty members are encouraged to attend university workshops regarding construction of the Portfolio and Appendix, and to consult with department colleagues and/or the department chair. Establishment of a mentoring relationship with a tenured faculty member is encouraged.

New faculty members should consult the Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) website for the Portfolio checklist, Table of Contents, Appendices Table of Contents, and other pertinent information to assemble their RTP portfolio.

Future changes in UPS 210.000 and/or FAR policy shall supersede the following pertinent information:

- The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the last day before the due date of the file to the Chair (on or about September 15 for the second-year probationary review, and October 1 for all other full performance reviews). In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio and its Appendices.
- It is the responsibility of the faculty member submitting the Portfolio and Appendices to ensure their completeness.
- The portfolio and its appendices shall be submitted through the university’s designated platform for evaluation.
- Original grade reports and summaries of SOQ scores are placed in the Portfolio; original SOQ forms are placed in the Portfolio Appendix.
- A table summarizing information for each class taught, including year, semester, course title, schedule number, units, number enrolled, SOQ score and grade distributions should be included in a Portfolio appendix; see Appendix 1 for an example.
- Though many of the DPD evaluation criteria are quantitative, the faculty member should not focus the Narratives on listing their accomplishments, but instead shall provide context for their activities and accomplishments and discuss quality issues.
• After submission of the Portfolio, required material that is missing shall be provided in a timely manner. Additional material that documents a substantial change in the status of an activity may be submitted to FAR as long as it is referenced in one of the Portfolio narrative summaries. Permission from the university Faculty Personnel Committee is required to add non-required additional materials. Late addition of materials causes the Portfolio to be returned to all levels of review before it can be considered for subsequent levels of review (see UPS 210.002, section III.A.6.a-b.). The terminal deadline for candidates to submit additional material to the Faculty Personnel Committee is set by FAR.

G. Abbreviated “Review Files” for Third- and Fifth-Year Probationary Faculty
Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their full performance review during year 2 or year 4 would, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit a “Review File”. The Review File comprises three items: 1) an updated curriculum vitae; 2) statistical summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires for the period since the last full review; and 3) grade distributions for the period since the last full review. When subject to a periodic review, the faculty member shall submit the Review File by October 1, review of which shall be completed by June 1. The DPC, the Department Chair, and the appropriate administrator shall provide a signed statement indicating that the Review File was received, reviewed, and evaluated. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the signed statement, and a copy shall be forwarded to Faculty Affairs and Records for placement in the faculty member’s PAF. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the appropriate administrator may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member’s progress.

Per UPS 210.000 Section I.K., a full performance review may be requested for any probationary faculty member at any level of review for probationary years three or five when, typically, only an abbreviated review would be required. If the President agrees and requires a Full Performance Review for a faculty member in probationary year three or year five, then the rules governing Full Performance Reviews apply.

The performance review criteria are as follows:
II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Productive faculty engage in three complementary aspects of professional life: (1) TEACHING in and out of the classroom, (2) SCHOLARLY and CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (SCA) that enhance student and peer learning, and (3) PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY, and COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES (Service) that support the advancement of learning.

Performance shall be rated as Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory as defined in section III of this document (Standards of Performance). Narratives should highlight accomplishments and address weaknesses while citing specific evidence from the appendices, and should be used as a venue to explain any accomplishments not specifically listed in Section II, A, B and C. There are required numbers of items in each category of Teaching, SCA, and Service. Evaluators may use the evaluation form given in Appendix 2. The intent of Appendix 2 is to: (1) make some of the portfolio preparation easier for the faculty member; and (2) make evaluation easier for all levels of review.

For evaluation committees (DPC and university Faculty Personnel Committee), the final rating in each evaluation category shall reflect the majority vote of the committee members. Committee members in the voting minority may express their views in the faculty evaluation. At each level, the key evaluation decision is between Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. Although a rating of Satisfactory is the minimum requirement for positive RTP action, it is the department’s goal that all faculty members attain and sustain a rating of Excellent in each evaluation category.

The level of accomplishment required varies depending on the RTP review level of the faculty member as outlined in Section III below.

A. Teaching

Teaching effectiveness shall be based on the evaluation of the faculty member’s performance during the review period, as described in the teaching narrative and supported by materials in the Portfolio. The evaluation shall specifically consider:

1. **Student Opinions of Questionnaires**: Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) should reflect the faculty member’s conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization and attention to student needs. Although summaries of student response to questions on the department SOQ are useful quantitative indicators of performance, qualitative evidence, such as written student comments on the SOQ forms, as well as unsolicited comments by students
(e.g., emails, letters, etc.), may be included in the evaluation. All raw SOQ data and the original forms shall be included in the Portfolio.

2. Peer Evaluations: The principal purpose of peer evaluations is to observe the faculty member in the classroom and to provide timely advice on how to improve their teaching performance. The DPC or its designees shall be responsible for performing these visits and providing the written report of the observations. For probationary faculty, classroom visitations shall be conducted at least once each semester. Post-tenure faculty who are eligible for promotion shall be observed in the class at least once per year, or more frequently as deemed necessary by the DPC. As per UPS 210.080, the faculty member being evaluated shall be provided with a notice of at least five (5) days before a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. Any faculty member may request additional classroom visitations. The DPC member or designee conducting the classroom visitation shall abide by best practices set forth in UPS 210.080, complete the appropriate form, and forward signed copies of the observation forms to the department coordinator chair and the faculty member. The DPC member or designee will meet and discuss the visit and observations with the faculty member at the faculty member’s request. All forms documenting classroom visitations shall be included in the Portfolio.

3. Student Research: Supervision of student theses is required. Involvement of students in the faculty member’s research is viewed as a critical part of the educational process at CSUF. A thesis proposal constitutes evidence of attracting students for research. Supervision of graduate theses is encouraged and should be discussed in the narrative. Additional service on graduate thesis committees, both within CSUF and at other institutions, is highly recommended. Examples of undergraduate and graduate thesis proposals and theses shall be included in the Portfolio.

4. Expectations regarding student achievement: The faculty member’s expectations of student achievement shall be appropriately rigorous for the level and goals of the course. Learning outcome goals for each course, as well as copies of course syllabi and other appropriate materials, shall provide a gauge for this assessment. The results of grading practices shall be consistent with the norm for comparable courses in the department (Appendix 3). Higher medians and narrower ranges are acceptable, without grade inflation, providing that the grading practices can be justified and explained in the Narrative. The strongest evidence of expectations of student achievement may include, but not be limited to:

(a) course syllabi;
(b) learning goals for specific courses;
(c) grading rubrics;
(d) examples of assessment methods (e.g., labs, projects, exams);
(e) graded examples of student work

Note: All examples of student course work must be presented in a way that protects students' anonymity

5. **Pedagogical approach and method:** Each course shall prepare students for more advanced courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite, and shall build on previous courses. Faculty shall employ appropriate and diverse teaching and learning assessment methods. The strongest evidence of pedagogical approach may include, but not be limited to:

   (a) incorporation and assessment of innovative teaching techniques or strategies in lectures, laboratory, or field environments;
   (b) original curricular development.

6. **On-going professional development as a teacher:** Faculty shall demonstrate a thoughtful, deliberate effort to improve teaching effectiveness. The strongest evidence of on-going professional development as a teacher may include, but not be limited to:

   (a) revision of course materials or instructional strategies;
   (b) completion of textbooks, laboratory manuals, field guides, etc.;
   (c) contributions in such activities as General Education (GE) course coordinator, laboratory coordinator, field course coordinator;
   (d) documentation of participation in pedagogical workshops or seminars.

7. **On-going professional development in the discipline:** Faculty members shall be current in their discipline so as to maintain their teaching effectiveness. The strongest evidence may include, but not be limited to:

   (a) professional (technical) meeting attendance;
   (b) consulting certifications (e.g., CA registered geologist);
   (c) attendance on professional field trips or activities during which the faculty member furthered their knowledge;
   (d) participation in workshops or training sessions sponsored by professional organizations;
   (e) funding of grants for teaching equipment and/or pedagogical innovations;
   (f) orchestrating/organizing symposia, workshops, other group interactions in support of the teaching objectives of the department.

**B. Scholarly and Creative Activities (SCA)**

Research is considered to be an essential subset of SCA. Research shall be original and/or innovative, shall adhere to the scientific method, shall produce peer-reviewed products, and shall
lead to new or improved understanding of the discipline (see Appendix 4 for definitions). Traditional scientific research and pedagogical research are of equal importance. Standards for both are the same (see section III.B).

The faculty member is required to present research in peer-reviewed media. UPS 210.002 clearly indicates that there shall be high quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, and that quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluators shall consider the quality of all publications. Documentation of the peer-review process must be included in the Portfolio. In SCA with multiple authors, it is essential that the faculty member specifies their contribution and describes how that contribution is a significant part of the activity. Signed multiple-author forms (Co-author Disclosure Forms) or comparable letters are required from all co-authors who are not CSUF students for all multi-authored, peer-reviewed publications. Faculty members are reminded to be especially aware of their responsibility to safeguard the rights of undergraduate and graduate students when publishing the results of research. Student involvement in SCA shall be considered as an enhancing factor. Submitted journal articles and/or grants shall be originally submitted after the CSUF start date, with CSUF affiliation. In cases where research was started prior to the CSUF start date, the faculty member shall address work done at CSUF in the portfolio narrative. If service credit was granted, articles and/or grants can have submission dates that reflect the time period of the service credit and with affiliation from the institution where the service credit was performed. At the time of hire, the department chair and DPC will evaluate what, if any, SCA submissions will count toward the RTP process and discuss this with the faculty member. Awards for some aspect of SCA must be documented and shall be considered an enhancing factor.

Accomplishments in SCA shall be based on the evaluation of the faculty member’s performance during the review period, as described in the SCA narrative and supported by materials in the Portfolio. At each level of RTP evaluation, SCA is grouped into the following criteria:

---

**Peer-reviewed Publications (and manuscripts intended for such publication)**

1. First or lead authorship (see Appendix 4 for definition of lead author) of research published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required, in professionally recognized, rigorously and externally peer-reviewed, high-quality scientific journals. A full citation (with title, authorship, date, journal, volume, pages), with a reprint or preprint of the paper, shall be included in the Portfolio. The faculty member shall document the quality of the journal using, but not limited to, Impact Factor, Immediacy Index, Cited Half-Life, Rejection Rate, and/or journal ranking in geosciences.
2. First or lead authorship of research published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required, in professionally recognized, rigorously and externally peer-reviewed, scientific journals. A full citation (with title, authorship, date, journal, volume, pages) and reprint or preprint shall be included in the Portfolio.

3. First or lead authorship of research or a review article published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required, in a professionally recognized, rigorously peer-reviewed scientific medium, such as a book, book chapter, symposium volume contribution, geologic map (with text), professional organization field trip guidebook, article or other comparable expression that does not qualify for category II.B.1 or II.B.2. A full citation (with title, authorship, date, medium, volume, pages) shall be included in the Portfolio; a reprint or preprint of the contribution shall be included in the Portfolio.

4. Co-authorship of research published, in press, or accepted with no further revision required in peer-reviewed media (see 1 and 2 above). A full citation (with title, authorship, date, medium, volume, pages) shall be included in the Portfolio; a preprint or reprint of the contribution shall be included in the Portfolio.

5. First or co-authorship of a manuscript that has been submitted for publication in peer-reviewed scientific media. A copy of the manuscript and a letter from the editor acknowledging its submission shall be included in the Portfolio.

6. First or co-authorship of a peer-reviewed paper not recommended for publication. A copy of the manuscript, with reviews and pertinent correspondence, shall be included in the Portfolio.

7. First or co-authorship of a research manuscript in a late stage of development for submittal to peer-reviewed media. A copy of the working manuscript shall be included in the Portfolio.

Note: In the case of multiple-author peer-review publications, the amount of the faculty member’s contribution shall be documented with a Co-authorship Disclosure Form, or comparable letters, signed by all co-authors except CSUF student co-authors. Faculty members are reminded to be especially aware of their responsibility to safeguard the rights of undergraduate and graduate students when publishing the results of research.
Contract Research Reports

8. First or co-authorship of a final, accepted contract report, accompanied by a written review by a representative of the contracting agency. The contract must be between the university and the client; private consulting reports are not considered as SCA in RTP evaluation. In the case of multiple-authored reports, the amount of the faculty member’s contribution shall be documented with a Co-Authorship Disclosure Form, or comparable letters. A copy of the research report and the client review shall be included in the Portfolio.

9. First or co-authorship of a final, submitted contract report. In the case of multiple-authored reports, the amount of the faculty member’s contribution shall be documented with a Co-Authorship Disclosure Form or comparable letters. A copy of the working manuscript shall be included in the Portfolio.

Extramural Grant and Contract Proposals

10. Principal investigator (PI) or Co-Principal investigator (Co-PI) [or equivalent title depending on grant type and/or granting agency] with leadership role on a funded extramural research-related grant or contract proposal. A Co-PI shall document their leadership with a Co-Authorship Disclosure Form or comparable letters. Copies of the proposal and the acceptance letter shall be included in the Portfolio.

11. Co-investigator (Co-PI) status on a funded extramural grant or contract proposal. The amount of contribution to both the writing of the grant or contract proposal and the subsequent performance shall be documented with a Co-Authorship Disclosure Form or comparable letters. Copies of the proposal and the acceptance letter shall be included in the Portfolio.

12. PI or Co-PI status on a submitted extramural grant or contract proposal for which the decision is pending. A copy of the proposal shall be included in the Portfolio.

13. PI or Co-PI status on an un-funded extramural grant or contract proposal. Copies of the proposal and external reviews shall be included in the Portfolio.
Published Abstracts

14. *First or lead authorship* of published abstracts presented at professional meetings. Invited contributions, or those involving student participation, shall be identified in the Portfolio narrative. A copy of the abstract and letters of invitation, if any, shall be included in the Portfolio.

15. Co-authorship of a published abstract presented at professional meetings. Contributions involving student participation shall be identified in the Portfolio narrative. A copy of the abstract shall be included in the Portfolio.

Other SCA

16. *PI or co-PI* status on *funded intramural* grants or contracts. Copies of the proposal and the acceptance letter shall be included in the Portfolio.

17. *First or co-authorship* for *non-peer-reviewed publication*. In the case of multiple-authored publications, the amount of the faculty member’s contribution shall be documented with a Co-Authorship Disclosure Form, or comparable letters, signed by all co-authors, except CSUF student co-authors. Faculty members are reminded to be especially aware of their responsibility to safeguard the rights of undergraduate and graduate students when publishing the results of research. A copy of the publication shall be included in the Portfolio.

18. *Presenter* of technical workshops, short courses, or training sessions in which the faculty member has made a scientific contribution. Appropriate documentation of the nature of the contribution shall be included in the Portfolio.

19. *PI or Co-PI* status on an *un-funded intramural* grant proposal. A copy of the proposal shall be included in the Portfolio.

20. Construction and/or calibration of analytical equipment/instrumentation in support of research plans. Establishing a functional research lab, as appropriate for the faculty member’s area of expertise, is especially pertinent during the early probationary period (i.e. years 1-3).
C. Professional, University and Community Service Activity

Professional, university, and community service activity shall be evaluated with regard to the service objectives set forth in the individual’s Prospectus. Activities shall be related to one’s profession at Cal State Fullerton. Service contributions during the review period shall be evaluated based on activities described in the service narrative and supported by materials in the Portfolio and evaluators shall assess the quality, duration and significance of service. These objectives should reflect the commitment of the university to the advancement of learning.

Professional service activity may include, but not be limited to:

1. Organizer, convener, or chair of invited-paper symposia, technical-theme sessions, workshops, or contributed-paper sessions at professional conferences.

2. Officer, or active participant in an official capacity (e.g., board member, division chair, publication editor, or associate editor), for professional organizations. Recipient of an award from a professional society. A copy of the award letter, or other documentation, shall be included in the Portfolio.

3. Reviewer of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals or other technical publications. Documentation that demonstrates completion of review, but does not violate the confidentiality of authors, shall be included in the Portfolio.

4. Reviewer of proposals for granting agencies such as NSF, DOE, and PRF-ACS. Documentation that demonstrates completion of review, but does not violate the confidentiality of applicants, shall be included in the Portfolio.

5. Leader or co-leader of field trips for professional organizations. A copy of the title page with leader designations shall be included in the Portfolio.

6. Presenter of technical seminars or lectures to academic or other professional organizations.

7. Consultant activity of a technical nature to public or private organizations. Alternatively, such activity may be considered under SCA, depending on the scientific level of the consulting activities and concurrence between the activity and the mission of the department and university.
University and community service activity may include but not be limited to:

8. Active participation in departmental governance and functions (e.g., service on committees such as curriculum, computer, seminar, space, student club advisor, graduate advisor). Each year of service on any given committee counts as one contribution in section III. Single semester service on a given committee counts as a half contribution in section III.

9. Active participation in CNSM and university governance and functions (e.g., service on committees such as awards, library, research, curriculum, grievance, international education). Each year of service on any given committee counts as one contribution in section III. Single semester service on a given committee counts as a half contribution in section III.

10. Presentations made to university or community groups.

11. Active participation in community activities that are concordant with the mission of the university and department, including serving on organization boards or committees, sponsoring student organizations, developing/facilitating internships, developing/facilitating service learning or community-based learning opportunities, serving the faculty bargaining unit, serving the community through the application of knowledge in the discipline, being interviewed by the media, and authoring publications pertinent to the objectives of the university.
III. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

Each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple criteria of performance in teaching, scholarly/creative, and service.

Retention of Probationary Faculty

Recommendation for retention is based upon a satisfactory level of performance in the three aspects of the faculty member’s professional activities in accordance with standards set forth in this document and UPS 210.002. It is expected that the faculty member shall demonstrate appropriate progress in performance levels and accomplishments such that a positive tenure decision is likely. A probationary faculty member is required to show appropriate accomplishments, growth, and promise in each of the three areas of review. UPS 210.002 section II.A.2 states “When weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement. The decision to retain (reappoint) a probationary faculty member is an affirmation that satisfactory progress is being made toward tenure; therefore, a probationary faculty member shall not be retained if the cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.” If service credit was granted, candidates “shall include documentation of accomplishments during those specific years for which the service credit was granted”. Accomplishments during service credit years shall be weighed in reasonable proportion to those achieved during probationary years at CSUF. However, accomplishments during service credit years shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion and/or tenure.

Table 1 is a matrix that illustrates the evaluation rating permutations of Teaching and SCA. Note that faculty members are expected to achieve at least Satisfactory ratings in both categories. Unsatisfactory ratings in either category, Teaching or SCA, in full review years two or four may result in a recommendation to submit a full review in the following year, which would normally be an abbreviated review. If a full review is required in the third year, then the standards of performance shall be those of the second year full review plus the expectations in year three. Likewise, if a full review is required in the fifth year, then the standards of performance shall be those of the fourth year full review plus the expectations in year five.

Termination shall be recommended if both Teaching and SCA have Unsatisfactory ratings in the fourth year full review (or subsequent full reviews).
Table 1. Matrix for assessing overall RTP rating of probationary faculty based on Teaching and SCA. This combined rating is used in Table 2 for tenure/promotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCA</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>termination at end of second year <em>may</em> be recommended; termination at end of fourth year (or at end of subsequent full review years) <em>shall</em> be recommended</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory termination at end of fourth year (or at end of subsequent full review years) <em>may</em> be recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>termination at end of fourth year (or at end of subsequent full review years) <em>may</em> be recommended</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>termination at end of fourth year (or at end of subsequent full review years) <em>may</em> be recommended</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Teaching

Specific goals for each review period are described below. 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 also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance and should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

A faculty member's teaching performance should be assessed using the criteria below:

1. Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized population.

2. Creation of a course linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.

3. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods and learning modalities.

4. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.

5. Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching.

6. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

Evaluators shall look for patterns of improvement in each Teaching evaluation category, especially where improvement was recommended in past reviews, and for evidence of sustained performance. Quantitative evidence (e.g. SOQs and Grade Distributions) shall only be used in combination with other evidence of teaching performance. Grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. While use of standardized Student Opinion Questionnaires is required as part of the evaluation process, any data gathered from SOQs must be considered in coordination with qualitative evidence of performance (e.g., student written comments; rigor of course materials, etc.) throughout the Teaching record.

Student Opinion Questionnaires are designed to solicit student feedback regarding instructors and course content. While they may reveal valuable trends in student perception, research indicates they are neither valid nor reliable measures of teaching effectiveness. Moreover, both qualitative and quantitative data gathered on SOQs can be impacted by racial, gender, and
linguistic bias, suggesting that individual students’ comments – as well as trends within SOQs themselves – must be interpreted cautiously and contextually. Additionally, CSUF recognizes that impactful teaching may create discomfort for students, affecting trends in course evaluations, and that not all students will respond to learning in the same way. Importantly, any single item on the SOQ – or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information – does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Overall, patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.

1. Second probationary year review (for year 1): During the first probationary year, the faculty member is expected to obtain initial feedback about teaching performance and apply that feedback in improving teaching performance.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of excellence in teaching; (2) majority of overall ratings on classroom peer reviews are excellent; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) two contributions from different categories of II.A.5 - 7.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of satisfactory teaching; Notable weaknesses indicated by students in response to individual questions or in written comments shall be addressed and corrected; (2) classroom peer reviews must average satisfactory for all categories, and those individual categories that are deemed unsatisfactory shall be addressed and corrected; (3) satisfactory rating in II.A.4; (4) one contribution from II.A.5 - 7.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet all of the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory. Weaknesses identified on SOQ forms and classroom peer reviews shall be addressed.

2. Third probationary year review (for year 2): This is an abbreviated review, covering a *single* year of activity. Although this review is for a *single* year, it occurs after two years of activity, and thus evaluators shall look for evidence of growth and progress toward tenure between years 1 and 2. Performance criteria for this one-year period are:

◊ **Excellent** – Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of excellence in teaching; (2) majority of overall ratings on classroom peer reviews are excellent; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis
proposal; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) two contributions from two different categories from among II.A.5 – 7.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of satisfactory teaching; it is expected that candidates shall have addressed weaknesses identified based on past SOQs and student comments; (2) classroom peer reviews must average satisfactory for all categories; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) satisfactory rating in II.A.4; (5) one contribution from among II.A.5 – 7.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet all of the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory. Weaknesses identified on SOQ forms, classroom peer reviews, and from II.A.1 - 7 have not been adequately addressed.

3. Fourth probationary year review (for years 1 – 3): This is a full performance review covering three years of activity (years 1, 2, and 3; i.e., the half-way point in the probationary period); therefore, requirements are cumulative. By this pivotal fourth year, evaluators shall expect to see strong evidence of growth and progress towards tenure through years 1 – 3.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of excellence in teaching; (2) classroom peer reviews must average excellent for all categories; (3) supervisor for three completed student thesis proposals, one of these having led to a completed student thesis; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) six contributions from at least two categories from among II.A.5 – 7.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of satisfactory teaching; it is expected that candidates shall have addressed weaknesses identified based on SOQs and student comments; (2) classroom peer reviews must average satisfactory for all categories; (3) supervisor for two completed student thesis proposals; (4) satisfactory rating in II.A.4; (5) three contributions from at least two different categories from among II.A.5 – 7.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.
4. **Fifth probationary year review (for year 4)**. This is an abbreviated review, covering a single year (year 4) of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after four years of activity and thus evaluators shall look for strong evidence of continued growth and progress toward tenure through years 1-4. It is important to note that the cumulative record of years 1 – 5 shall be evaluated during a tenure decision, which typically occurs in probationary year 6; hence the fourth (full performance) and fifth (single year) year reviews are critical gauges of the candidate’s progress toward tenure. Performance criteria for this one-year period are:

◊ **Excellent** – Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of excellence in teaching; (2) classroom peer reviews must average excellent for all categories for the period; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) excellent rating in II.A.4; (5) one contribution from two different categories among II.A.5 – 7 during the period (fourth year).

◊ **Satisfactory** – Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of satisfactory teaching; it is expected that candidates shall have addressed weaknesses identified based on past SOQs and student comments; (2) classroom peer reviews must average satisfactory for all categories; (3) supervisor for one completed student thesis proposal; (4) satisfactory rating in II.A.4; (5) one contribution from among II.A.5 – 7 during the period (fourth year).

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.

**B. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty shall demonstrate continuing, regular activities that result (or are judged likely to result, in the case of second- and third-year probationary faculty) in high quality peer-reviewed (when appropriate) scholarly publications, funded grants, or creative performances or exhibits. Quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, press or venue, whether a publication is an article or a note, comment, etc.) and the faculty member’s contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work. Evaluators shall look for patterns of improvement in each evaluation category, especially where the need for improvement was discussed in previous reviews, and for evidence of sustained performance. During the early years (i.e., 1 – 3), the probationary faculty member is expected to establish research facilities, to pursue funding for SCA, and to initiate research. During the later years (i.e., 4 - 5), the probationary faculty member is expected to have an established research program, to have successfully obtained funding for their SCA,
and to have published research results in peer-reviewed journals. Because of variations in the trajectories of successful candidates' research programs and accomplishments, evaluators may exercise some degree of flexibility in their overall evaluation of SCA. In addition to achieving the quantitative goals specified below, candidates are encouraged to include in their portfolios favorable qualitative evidence of SCA performance (e.g., comments on manuscript reviews). Faculty members are encouraged to consult with the DPC on issues regarding SCA.

1. Second probationary year review (for year 1): This is a full review, covering a single year of activity. During the first probationary year the faculty member is expected to have demonstrated progress in establishing their research program.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) initiation of a research program that involves students; (2) at least one contribution from among II.B.1 – 13; (3) one contribution from II.B.14; and (4) two additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) initiation of a research program showing strong potential for student involvement; and (2) two contributions from among II.B.1 – 20.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.

2. Third probationary year review (for year 2): This is an abbreviated review, covering a single year of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after two years of activity, hence evaluators shall look for evidence of growth and progress toward tenure. Performance criteria for this one-year period are:

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) the maintenance of an ongoing research program that involves students; (2) one contribution from II.B.1 – 13; (3) one contribution from II.B.14; and (4) two additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) the maintenance of an ongoing research program that involves students; (2) two contributions from among II.B.1 – 20.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for satisfactory shall be deemed unsatisfactory.

3. Fourth probationary year review (for years 1 – 3): This is a full performance review covering three years of activity. Because this review covers three years,
requirements are cumulative and therefore evaluators shall expect to see strong evidence of growth toward tenure. At least three peer-reviewed, sole, first-, or lead-authored publications (II.B.1, II.B.2) are required for a positive tenure decision (tenure decisions typically occur in the 6th probationary year); hence, timely submittals must be planned accordingly.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) the maintenance of a research program that involves students; (2) one contribution from II.B.1 or II.B.2; (3) two additional contributions from II.B. 1 – 4, 8, 10, or 11 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.8, 10 and 11 shall count); (4) two contributions from II.B.14; and (5) three additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program that involves students; (2) one contribution from among II.B.1 – 4, 10 or 11; (3) one additional contribution from II.B.1 – 6, or 8 – 13; (4) one contribution from II.B.14; (5) two additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.

4. **Fifth probationary year review (for year 4):** This is an abbreviated review, covering a single year of activity. Although this review is for a single year, it occurs after four years of activity, hence evaluators shall look for strong evidence of growth and progress toward tenure. Performance criteria for this one-year period are:

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of an ongoing research program that involves students; (2) two contributions from among II.B.1 – 13 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 8, 12 and 13 shall count); (3) one contribution from II.B.14; (4) two additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of an ongoing research program that involves students; (2) four contributions from among II.B.1 – 19.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet all of the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.
C. Professional, University, and Community Service

Establishment of satisfactory teaching and SCA performance should be the primary focus of probationary faculty members. At the same time, faculty members are expected to be active participants in departmental affairs (governance, development, and student affairs) and gradually to participate in College of NSM (CNSM) and university service as well. They also are expected to become involved in professional activities that will lead to increased recognition and interaction with professional peers. It is important for faculty members to look ahead and strive to meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory levels of Service, in order to be recommended for tenure. Hence, by the sixth probationary year (the typical year for a tenure decision), the faculty member is expected to have achieved at least the minimum requirements for Service listed below. Note that for committee work, the number of contributions equals the numbers of years served on all committees. In addition to the quantitative goals, specified below, favorable qualitative evidence of service is encouraged throughout the Service record. Less-than-favorable qualitative indicators may be considered as detracting from the quantitative accomplishments of the faculty member. Evaluators reserve the right to exercise some degree of flexibility in the overall evaluation of Service.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) one contribution from II.C.1 or 2; (2) four additional contributions from at least three different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (3) ten contributions from among II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in four; (4) two contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) two contributions from different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (2) five contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in two; (3) one contribution from II.C.10 or 11.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.
IV. GRANTING OF TENURE

Promotion and granting of tenure normally co-occur for a probationary faculty. A recommendation to grant tenure is based on the candidate’s cumulative record from their time of appointment (including service credit; see UPS 210.002) and demonstrates a willingness of the department and university to commit to a long-term relationship with the faculty member.

Regular Promotion and Granting of Tenure

In the normal RTP cycle, evaluation for tenure takes place during the candidate’s 6th probationary year. Hence, the evaluation shall be based on the cumulative record of years 1 – 5. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to demonstrate a sustained and consistent record of accomplishment and to strive continually to meet the department’s goal that all faculty members—regardless of rank—attain and sustain excellence in each evaluation category. A positive tenure decision requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that meet the expectations stated in the DPD. Tenure can be recommended when a minimum overall level of performance of Satisfactory is achieved, as presented and documented in the Portfolio and guided by goals set forth in the faculty member’s Prospectus.

The decision to grant tenure shall be based solely on an evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as documented by evidence contained in the Portfolio and Appendices. When concerns have been expressed in earlier review cycles, a candidate for tenure is expected to have addressed those concerns specifically in the narrative.

A. Teaching

The faculty member being considered for tenure shall have established a sustained level of performance and accomplishment in teaching as related to the criteria established in section II, and specifically indicated below:

◊ Excellent – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of excellence in teaching; (2) average classroom peer reviews of excellent in all categories; (3) supervision of five student theses, two of which have been completed; (4) excellent rating of II.A.4; (5) nine contributions from II.A.5 – 7, with at least one contribution in each category.
◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of satisfactory teaching; (2) average classroom peer reviews of satisfactory in all categories; (3) supervision of three student theses, one of which has been completed; (4) satisfactory rating of II.A.4; (5) five contributions from at least two different categories among II.A.5 – 7.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet any of the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.

**B. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Research, scholarly, and creative activities shall demonstrate a sustained level of growth and accomplishments that represent contributions to the discipline. These contributions shall relate to categories outlined in section II.B.1 – 20, and specifically indicated below. Peer-reviewed publications (quality of research and journal to be assessed by evaluators), extramural grants funded (quality and significance of grant to be assessed by evaluators), and presentations of research results at scientific meetings are considered the most important measures of a viable and sustained research program. Faculty members are encouraged to consult with the DPC on issues regarding SCA.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) ONE contribution from II.B.1 plus THReE additional contributions from II.B.1 or II.B.2; (3) one extramural research grant proposal funded (II.B.10) by a national or international organization (e.g., NSF, ACS-PRF); (4) three additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 4, 8, 10 or 11 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.8, 10 and 11 shall count); (5) eight contributions from II.B.14; and (6) five additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) THREE contributions from II.B.1 or II.B.2 in at least 2 different journals; (3) one extramural grant or contract funded (II.B.10 or 11), or two extramural grants or contracts submitted (II.B.12 or 13) and two intramural grants funded (II.B.16); (4) two additional contributions from II.B.1 – 4, 8, 10 or 11 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.8, 10 and 11 shall count); (5) five contributions from II.B.14; and (6) four additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet any of the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.
C. Professional, University, and Community Service

Professional, university and community service activities shall demonstrate a satisfactory level of accomplishments within the professional and university communities. An active role in departmental affairs is expected. Assuming leadership roles in service activities, particularly in professional societies/organizations, is considered to be more important than simply being a member or passive participant. Note that for committee work, the number of contributions equals the numbers of years served on all committees (half years are permitted).

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) one contribution from II.C.1 or 2; (2) four additional contributions from at least three different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (3) ten contributions from II.C. 8 or 9, with a leadership role in four; and (4) two contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) two contributions from different categories of II.C.1 – 7; (2) five contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in two; and (3) one contribution from II.C.10 or 11.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.

Table 2 is a matrix that illustrates the sufficiency permutations between Service and the combined academic performance in Teaching and SCA from Table 1. Note that tenure typically is denied when Service is Unsatisfactory.
Table 2. Matrix for assessing tenure/early tenure for probationary faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Tenure not recommended</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure</td>
<td>Recommend Tenure -or- early Tenure and/or promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion**

Early tenure and promotion may be granted in cases when a faculty member demonstrates a record of distinction in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service, and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard timeline. The candidate’s record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all three areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained commitment to teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of Excellent.
V. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Promotion to Professor shall be recommended for a faculty member who has demonstrated that he/she is a teacher/scholar of distinction. The affected faculty member shall demonstrate that he/she has a sustained record of growth and accomplishments as a teacher/scholar and has built a solid regional, national, and/or international scientific reputation. The review period is the time interval since promotion to Associate Professor.

Regular Promotion to Professor

In the normal RTP progression, the eleventh year is the review year for promotion to Professor, hence the evaluation shall be based on the cumulative record of years 6-10. In cases involving longer review periods, the entire post-promotion record shall be considered, but emphasis shall be placed on quantitative accomplishments during the last five years of the review period. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to demonstrate a sustained and consistent record of accomplishment and to continually strive to meet the department’s goal that all faculty members, regardless of rank, attain and sustain excellence in each evaluation category; promotion to Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards of UPS210.002 and this DPD (see UPS 210.002, II.A.5.c).

A. Teaching Performance

For the faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor, the department expects them to be an exemplary teacher, with a sustained record of performance and accomplishment in teaching as related to the criteria defined in section II, and specifically indicated below.

◊ **Excellent** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of excellence in teaching; (2) average classroom peer reviews of excellent; (3) supervision of six student theses, three of which have been completed; (4) excellent rating of II.A.4; (5) one contribution from both II.A.5 and 6; and (6) six contributions from II.A.7.

◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) Student Opinions Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic pattern of satisfactory teaching; (2) average classroom peer reviews of satisfactory; (3) supervision of four student theses, two of which have been completed; (4) satisfactory rating of II.A.4; (5) one contribution from either II.A.5 or 6; and (6) four contributions from II.A.7.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities
After receiving tenure, the faculty member is strongly encouraged by the department to develop a leadership role in SCA. The faculty member must demonstrate continued growth in the level of scientific productivity through the continuation of a research program that involves students.

Primary contributions during the review period (i.e., since the last promotion) should be from the areas described in section II.B.1 – 7, with emphasis on peer-reviewed publications, successful grant proposals, and presentation of research results at scientific meetings.

◊ Excellent – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) ONE contribution from II.B.1 and THREE additional contributions from II.B.1 or II.B.2; (3) one extramural research grant proposal funded (II.B.10) by a national or international organization (e.g., NSF, ACS-PRF); (4) three additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 4, 8, 10 or 11 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.8, 10 and 11 shall count); (5) eight contributions from II.B.14; and (6) five additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ Satisfactory – Minimum requirements are: (1) maintenance of a research program involving students; (2) one contribution from II.B.1 and TWO additional contributions from II.B.1 or II.B.2, for a total of three publications; (3) one extramural grant or contract funded (II.B.10 or 11), or two extramural grants or contracts submitted (II.B.12 or 13) and two intramural grants funded (II.B.15); (4) two additional contributions from II.B.1 – 4, 8, 10 or 11 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.8, 10 and 11 shall count); (5) five contributions from II.B.14; and (6) four additional contributions from among II.B.1 – 20 (only one contribution from each of the categories II.B.5 – 9, and 12 – 20 shall count).

◊ Unsatisfactory – Failure to meet the criteria for satisfactory shall be deemed unsatisfactory.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

The faculty member should demonstrate recognition of their stature as a teacher/scholar through a balanced spectrum of professional, academic, and community service activities and accomplishments. Note that for committee work, the number of contributions equals the numbers of years served on all committees.

◊ Excellent – Minimum requirements are: (1) three contributions from among II.C.1 and 2; (2) six contributions from II.C.3 – 7; (3) twelve contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in six; and (4) three contributions from II.C.10 or 11.
◊ **Satisfactory** – Minimum requirements are: (1) two contributions from among II.C.1 and 2; (2) four contributions from among II.C.3 – 7; (3) eight contributions from II.C.8 or 9, with a leadership role in four; and (4) two contributions from II.C.10 or 11.

◊ **Unsatisfactory** – Failure to meet the criteria for Satisfactory shall be deemed Unsatisfactory.

Table 3 is a matrix that illustrates the sufficiency permutations between Service and the combined academic performance in Teaching and SCA with respect to promotion to Professor. Note that promotion shall not be recommended if any category is evaluated as Unsatisfactory.

**Table 3. Matrix for assessing promotion to Professor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Combined Performance in Teaching and SCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1 or 2 Unsatisfactory ratings*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Promotion not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Promotion not recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers before “Satisfactory ratings”, “Unsatisfactory ratings”, and/or “Excellent ratings” represent the number of each rating for Teaching and SCA. For example, Satisfactory in Teaching and Excellent in SCA is “1 Excellent rating and 1 Satisfactory rating”.

**Early Promotion to Professor**
Early Promotion to Professor may be recommended for faculty who have received Excellent ratings in Teaching, SCA, and Service and have met the normal progression requirements for promotion (see UPS 210.002 for timing eligibility). UPS 210.002 (section II.A.5) states that “Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth.” Thus, the faculty member must have a consistent and sustained record of excellence in all categories to be considered for early promotion to Professor.
### Appendix 1

Example Summary Table for Classes Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Sched. #</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Mean SOQ score:</th>
<th>Grade Distributions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>GEOL 101</td>
<td>18823</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.15±0.52</td>
<td>2.72±0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>GEOL 321</td>
<td>18924</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.64±0.91</td>
<td>2.89±0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>GEOL 510T-1</td>
<td>18421</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.89±0.13</td>
<td>4.0±0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2

### PORTFOLIO EVALUATION FORMS

### TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>#contributions / score / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1 SOQs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2 Classroom Peer reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.3 Student Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.4 Expectations regarding student achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.5 Pedagogical approach and method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.6 On-going professional development as teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.7 On-going professional development in discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION: Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

**Qualitative Assessment of Teaching:**
### Appendix 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCA</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>#contributions / score / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.B.1</td>
<td>First/Lead author – paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.2</td>
<td>First/Lead author – paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3</td>
<td>First/Lead author – peer review book/chapter/symp volume/map/guidebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.4</td>
<td>Co-author on peer-reviewed paper. Not first/lead author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.5</td>
<td>First or co-author on submitted peer reviewed paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.6</td>
<td>First or co-author on paper not accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.7</td>
<td>First or co-author on paper in late stage of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.8</td>
<td>First or co-author on <strong>accepted</strong> contract report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.9</td>
<td>First or co-author on <strong>submitted</strong> contract report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.10</td>
<td>PI on funded extramural grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.11</td>
<td>Co-PI on funded extramural grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.12</td>
<td>PI or co-PI on submitted extramural grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.13</td>
<td>PI or co-PI on unfunded extramural grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.14</td>
<td>First or Lead authorship on published conference abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.15</td>
<td>Co-author on published abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.16</td>
<td>PI or co-PI on funded intramural grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.17</td>
<td>First or co-author on non-peer-reviewed publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.18</td>
<td>Presenter of technical workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.19</td>
<td>PI or co-PI on unfunded intramural grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.20</td>
<td>Construction/calibration equipment, establishing research lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION: Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

Qualitative Assessment of SCA:
### Appendix 2 (continued)

#### SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>#contributions / score / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.C.1</td>
<td>Organizer, convener, chair of symposia, session at meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.2</td>
<td>Officer, active participant for professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.3</td>
<td>Reviewer for manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.4</td>
<td>Reviewer for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.5</td>
<td>Leader/co-leader of field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.6</td>
<td>Presenter of seminars to academic or professional groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.7</td>
<td>Consultant activity to public or private organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.8</td>
<td>Participation in department governance/committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.9</td>
<td>Participation in CNSM/Univ governance/committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.10</td>
<td>Presentations to university or community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.11</td>
<td>Participation in community activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION:** Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

**Qualitative Assessment of Service:**
Appendix 3

RANGE OF GPAs FOR GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES COURSES

Grading in courses taught by Department faculty is expected to follow a consistent pattern falling within the Normal Expected GPA Range for the specified course categories indicated in the following table. However, it is recognized that occasionally the grading in a course may justifiably fall outside of the appropriate Normal Expected GPA Range. In such cases, a brief explanation should be provided with the documentation of grade summaries in the faculty member’s Portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE COURSES</th>
<th>NORMAL EXPECTED GPA RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education courses</td>
<td>101, 101L, 310</td>
<td>2.25-3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-, 300-level courses for both general education students and majors</td>
<td>201, 305, 333, 335, 340, 376</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level courses for majors</td>
<td>303AB, 321, 360, 375, 380</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level courses for majors</td>
<td>401, 404, 406, 420, 456, 481A</td>
<td>2.75-3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-level graduate courses</td>
<td>500, 501AB, 510T, 535T, 575T</td>
<td>3.0-4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4
DEFINITION OF TERMS (in alphabetical order)

CONTRACT
A funded agreement between the University and another external entity to complete a set of specified tasks for the economic benefit of a private, state, or local agency for compensation paid.

GRANT
Funding provided by an independent agency or institution for completion of nonproprietary scientific research, educational research, or the acquisition of equipment whose primary purpose is scientific research. Grants may have some benefit for the industrial community; however, the primary purpose of a grant should be to provide new insight into Earth processes that is of interest/use to other researchers and the public at large.
Definition of a Grant, University of Virginia: “Financial support provided for research study designed and proposed by the principal investigator(s). The granting agency exercises no direct control over the conduct of approved research supported by a grant.”

PEER-REVIEW
Publications in nonproprietary journals, volumes, books, or other written venues shall be critically reviewed by peers, as chosen by the editor or publisher of the written venue. Peers shall be experts in the field of the scientific research being submitted for publication and shall have no stake--academic, financial, or otherwise--in the successful or unsuccessful outcome of the review process. Peer reviews shall go beyond simple checklists and contain detailed critical evaluations of the submitted material.

RESEARCH
Research in the geological sciences is the scientific investigation of natural processes and/or the results of natural processes that occur or have occurred over the span of Earth’s history. All research involves: 1) formulation of a question or hypothesis; 2) collection and analysis of pertinent data; 3) evaluation of the hypothesis in light of both new data and pertinent literature; and 4) generation of conclusions supported by data collected in the study and from the literature. Geological research often has practical applications; however, the practical application of geological knowledge alone does not constitute “research” unless the application provides some new, nonproprietary insight into Earth processes that is of interest/use to other researchers.
Research in geological education involves the same approaches as the investigation of natural processes; that is, the formation of an education-related question, the collection and analysis of data, evaluation of the question in light of the data and past research, and supported conclusions.

The ultimate test of whether any Research, scholarly, and creative activity constitutes research is that the results are publishable in a nonproprietary journal, volume, book, or other written venue that submits all manuscripts to rigorous, third-party peer review.

**LEAD AUTHORSHIP**

Lead Authorship, sometimes known as senior or corresponding author, as defined in this document, refers to the person who leads a study and makes a major contribution to the study. A lead author may be the thesis advisor of the leading student co-author(s). Lead authorship may be documented using the Co-authorship Disclosure Form available from FAR or comparable letters. Faculty member authors are reminded to be especially aware of their responsibility to safeguard the rights of undergraduate and graduate students when publishing the results of research.