

**Official
Approved
Department
Personnel
Standards**



Date: 12/18/2015

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
FULLERTON**

Department of Health Science

Department Personnel Standards

**Approved December 18, 2015, by Provost Cruz for
Implementation with the 2016-2017 Academic Year**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. Preface	2
II. Department Structure	2
III. Scope of Document	2
IV. Department Personnel Committee	2
A. Committee Functions	2
B. Committee Structure	2
C. Election of Committee Members	3
D. Committee Responsibilities	3
E. Chair’s Responsibilities	4
F. Abbreviated Review Files for Third and Fifth Year Probationary Faculty.....	4
V. General Guidelines	5
A. Prospectus	5
B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission	5
C. Portfolio Contents and Organization	5
VI. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion	6
A. Teaching Performance	6
B. Scholarly and Creative Activities	10
C. Professional, University, and Community Service.....	13
VII. Guidelines for Applying Evaluation Criteria in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions	15
A. Retention During Probationary Years	15
B. Tenure Requirements	15
C. Promotion to Associate Professor	16
D. Early Promotion to Associate Professor	16
E. Early Tenure	16
F. Promotion to Full Professor	16
G. Early Promotion to Full Professor	17

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE PERSONNEL STANDARDS

I. Preface

The Department of Health Science (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing high quality programs that contribute to a broad understanding of human health. Emphasis is on the examination of the entire life span from infancy through the older adult years, with special attention to improving the quality of life and human condition in an ever-changing and multi-cultural society. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning and to the establishment of an environment where learning and the expansion of knowledge are central to all activities. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. It is the position of the Department that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department proposes a personnel document, consistent with the University Mission and Goals and with UPS 210.000, which describes the criteria for assessing faculty productivity with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion.

II. Department Structure

The Department of Health Science is led by a Department Chair who is selected via a modified UPS 211.100 procedure approved by the President. The Department offers degree programs in Health Science (B.S., MPH, and Minor), as well as coursework, that contribute to various specializations, professional credentials and certifications, to general education, and to individual physical development and lifelong health and well-being.

III. Scope of Document

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

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

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

B. Committee Structure

The Committee shall consist of three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. All Committee members shall have a higher rank of classification than those being evaluated. No person shall serve as a Committee member during the year in which he/she is being considered for personnel action. The alternate Committee member shall participate on the Committee in the event that a regular Committee member cannot complete the term. Should such a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty.

C. Election of Committee Members

1. The Department Chair will conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot. All tenured faculty who meet the requirements in IV. B., above, are automatically on the slate of potential Committee members except the following: (a) the Department Chair, (b) those who are being considered for personnel action that year, and (c) those who will be on sabbatical leave during any part of that year.
2. Each full-time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for three Committee members, one of whom shall have previously served on the Committee. The three faculty members receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected as “regular” Committee members. The person with the 4th highest number of votes shall be the alternate. In the case of a tie, the last regular member and the alternate shall be decided by the flip of a coin (or by drawing names randomly, should the tie involve more than two people).
3. The Committee shall elect its Chair for a one-year term.

D. Committee Responsibilities

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

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

2. The Committee’s evaluation for each area is to be based on information provided in the Portfolio. Each Committee member utilizes his/her best professional judgment in assessing how well the established evaluation criteria have been met.
 - a. *Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention:*
The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides supportive rationale for rating the probationary faculty member's progress in each category as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the Committee members.
 - b. Faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion: The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides supportive rationale for rating the faculty member’s performance in each category as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VI.
3. After the Committee completes its evaluation, the Committee shall formulate a recommendation that states in writing the reasons for the recommendation relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. All actions taken by the Committee shall be approved by a simple majority vote.

4. Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.
5. The Committee shall submit its evaluation and recommendation statements to the Department Chair in accordance with the published timelines for the personnel action cycle.

E. Department Chair's Responsibilities

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

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

Tenured Chairs not seeking promotion have additional responsibilities. (See UPS 210.000 Section IV. D., Responsibilities of Department Chairs.)

F. 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 only three items: (1) an updated Portfolio vita, (2) statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review. When subject to a periodic review, the faculty member shall submit the Abbreviated Review File by the date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically early in the fall semester), review of which shall be completed by a subsequent date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically at, or shortly after, the end of the spring semester). The Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean shall provide a signed statement indicating that the Review File was received, reviewed, and evaluated. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the signed statement, and a copy shall be forwarded to Faculty Affairs and Records for placement in the faculty member's Personnel Action File. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the College Dean may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member's progress.

V. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus

According to UPS 210.000 Section III. A., “During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments s/he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair’s office by the date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically in the first half of the spring semester). The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department/Division Chair and the Dean (or equivalent), who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges,” but prior to a date announced by Faculty Affairs and Records (typically in the latter half of the spring semester). UPS 210.000 further states, “The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews.”

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

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

C. Portfolio Contents and Organization

According to UPS 210.000 Section III. B.:

1. “The Portfolio, including its Appendices, is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. Although the Portfolio itself shall be submitted in hard copy form in a binder, the faculty member may choose to submit the Appendices via the Electronic Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Process (ERTP).”

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

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

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the completeness of the Portfolio and Appendices.

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

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

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

A. **Teaching Performance**

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

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

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

1. **Mandatory Indicators**

To be included in the Portfolio:

- a. Self-assessment (limited to 1000 words) – This shall include a reflective discussion of the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and performance, as well as future goals and directions. The self-assessment statement may include a discussion of teaching objectives, methods, and evaluation procedures (including grading distributions relative to academic standards). Also, it shall address on-going professional activities

with respect to development both within the discipline (professional conferences) and pedagogical development (seminars and workshops). When areas of concern have been identified in previous RTP evaluations, the faculty member shall include in the self-assessment a discussion of specific strategies that have been used to address these concerns.

- b. List of courses taught – This list shall include a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught during the review period. The listing shall include the course number, name, and unit value. If assigned time was received, the weighted teaching unit value shall be listed along with an explanation of the assigned-time activity.
- c. Statistical summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires – Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not be used by any level of evaluation as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. University-provided statistical summaries and compiled reports of qualitative comments for all courses taught during the period of review shall be included in the main portfolio. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data shall also be provided for all service-credit years. If not available, a written explanation, verified by the faculty member's former supervisor, shall be included.

Evaluations of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to questions on SOQs and contained in written comments on these forms. The evaluations shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, content, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, face-to-face vs. online vs. hybrid vs. other formats, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance.

- d. Statistical summaries of grade distribution – Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught. The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each class taught by the faculty member, including grade point average, shall be provided. If the University-provided distributions are not available, the faculty member shall calculate and provide these statistics. The evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught. Grade point averages for courses shall range between 2.3-3.2 for lower division courses, 2.5-3.3 for upper division courses, and 3.2-3.8 for graduate courses. If a course has lower or higher grade distributions, the faculty member shall provide an explanation for higher or lower grade distributions than Department standards and/or include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy the problem.

To be included in the Appendix:

- e. Course syllabi and materials – A representative sample of syllabi and supplemental materials shall be included for each course taught.

- f. Individual Student Opinion Questionnaires – The original, student-completed SOQ forms for each course shall be provided. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data, if available, shall also be provided for all service-credit years. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.

2. Additional Indicators

a. **Pedagogical Approach and Methods**

The primary objective of pedagogy is to help students to learn. Evaluation of teaching performance shall address those factors that contribute to effective pedagogy including the following: the appropriateness of the breadth, depth, and quality of course content to the level of each course taught; the currency of the topics and relevancy of the assignments; and the effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures. Faculty members may contribute to student learning by such activities as: 1) academic advising, 2) development of new courses/curricula or revisions to current courses/curricula, 3) use of innovative approaches for teaching, fostering, and/or assessing student learning, such as development or refinement of teaching techniques, class activities, assignments, means of student assessment, or instructional technologies, 4) organization of pedagogical workshops, 5) mentoring and/or supervision of internships and independent studies, 6) mentoring and/or supervision of student scholar programs (e.g., McNair, Sally Casanova programs), 7) supervision of student theses/projects/comprehensive exams, or 8) other similar activities supporting teaching effectiveness.

b. **Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**

Each faculty member is expected to show evidence of an ongoing program to maintain and improve teaching effectiveness. This program shall include self-assessment of teaching objectives and methods and student achievement, participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, and familiarity with the pedagogical literature in the faculty member's discipline. When specific weaknesses have been identified in prior evaluation(s), the faculty member shall include in the Portfolio specific plans to remedy these weaknesses.

c. **Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline**

All faculty members are expected to maintain currency in their disciplines by conference participation and/or other interaction with their colleagues. Scholarly and creative activities are expected to be reflected, as appropriate, in teaching methods and in student participation in collaborative research and creative undertakings.

d. **Classroom Visitations**

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

e. **Honors or Awards Recognizing Outstanding Teaching**

Honors or awards recognizing teaching excellence, presented to faculty by CSUF, other universities, government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, professional organizations, or community based organizations or other community groups relevant to the faculty member's area of work, shall be considered evidence of teaching effectiveness.

3. **Rating Criteria**

The overall rating for teaching performance effectiveness shall be based on a combination of: (1) Student Opinion Questionnaire ratings and comments, (2) evaluation of other mandatory information, and (3) evaluation of any additional indicators. Based upon the total evidence provided in both mandatory and additional indicators, the reviewers will rate the faculty member's overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. It shall be noted that a faculty member's teaching performance generally is rated according to the same criteria across all ranks. Reviewers shall use their professional judgment in evaluating the quality of all performance indicators. Course content and materials should broadly comply with Department, College, and University policies and guidelines (e.g., syllabus content requirements, established course learning objectives, relevant University Policy Statements).

Criteria for assignment of ratings for Teaching:

- “Excellent”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has achieved the following: 1) clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; 2) a weighted average of 85% or more of Student Opinion Questionnaires at A and B ratings; 3) grade distributions, as measured by grade point averages, that fall within the Department guidelines; 4) documented evidence of high quality course syllabi and materials; and 5) documented evidence of excellence in at least three additional and different indicators of teaching effectiveness (VI.A.2.a-e) by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.
- “Good”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has achieved the following: 1) clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching; 2) a weighted average of 70-84.9% of Student Opinion Questionnaires at A and B ratings; 3) grade distributions, as measured by grade point averages, that fall within the Department guidelines; 4) documented evidence of high quality course syllabi and materials; and 5) documented evidence of good quality in at least two additional and different indicators of teaching effectiveness (VI.A.2.a-e) by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.
- “Unsatisfactory”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either an “Excellent” or “Good” rating as outlined above.

Overall teaching performance – Based upon the total evidence provided in both mandatory and additional indicators, the reviewers will rate the faculty member's overall pattern of teaching performance as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. It shall be noted that faculty members' teaching performance generally is rated according to the same criteria across all ranks. In accordance with UPS 210.000, the evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, content, required or elective, experimental or traditional, face-to-face vs. online vs. hybrid vs. other formats, etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member's overall level of experience, progress made over time, and his or her efforts to improve teaching performance, as well as details and rationale provided in the narrative that may explain exceptions that stand apart from the overall pattern of teaching performance or that may lend support for a particular rating.

B. **Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty members at every level are expected to engage in **focused, ongoing** scholarly and creative activity. It is the position of the University and this Department that such activity enhances the professional growth and teaching effectiveness of the individual faculty member, contributes to the advancement of the field, provides increased learning opportunities for students, and enhances the overall reputation of the Department and the University. The faculty member shall provide a 1000-word self-evaluation narrative statement describing his/her: (1) scholarly and creative agenda, (2) accomplishments during the period of review, (3) work in progress, and (4) future plans. The self-assessment shall be supported by appropriate documentation, with any collaborative work clearly described in terms of individual contributions in the narrative. Publications on which the faculty member was a major author should be accompanied by a co-author form (available from the FAR office) signed by at least the lead author on the publication and the faculty member. An email or letter from the lead author describing the faculty member's role in the publication may be substituted for a co-author form. In rare cases when the lead author does not respond to repeated requests from the faculty member to provide such documentation, this should be discussed in the narrative and accompanied by documentation (e.g., emails) of faculty requests. Publications on which the faculty member was a minor author do not require a co-author form, letter, or email.

The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activity may be evidenced through: (1) creation of new knowledge, (2) integration of knowledge, and/or (3) dissemination of knowledge. It is expected that over the period of review faculty members' scholarly and creative endeavors shall result in **high quality, peer-reviewed** pieces of work – i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles or other comparable works. The Department recognizes that although book chapters, books, and edited volumes typically undergo a different process from that of peer-reviewed journal articles, in many cases they can represent high-level scholarly activity that also may include important contributions to practice. Therefore, books authored by the faculty member, edited volumes, and invited book chapters also shall be rated as Level III publications if they are of high quality, comprise significant scholarly contributions, and are published or in press with a scholarly publisher. (Note: tenure and/or promotion requires a minimum of three peer-reviewed journal articles.) The Department Personnel Committee will determine whether a scholarly work is high quality, comprises significant scholarly contributions, and is published or in press with a scholarly publisher, based upon documentation provided by the faculty member in the Portfolio. Examples of indicators of quality and significant scholarly contributions include, but are not limited to,

journal acceptance records, publication distribution figures, journal impact factors, other measures of citation frequency by others, the scope of the publication (regional, national, or international), the quality of the editorial board and review process (blind vs. non-blind), and the extent of the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored work. Examples of scholarly publishers include, but are not limited to, university presses, government agencies, reputable nongovernmental and international agencies, and presses with a documented record of publishing high quality scholarly works (e.g., Sage, Elsevier, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Jones & Bartlett). Grants submitted, especially those awarded, shall strengthen performance in this category. These may be parent grants, competitive supplements, or other competitive formats. Other indicators adding support to the faculty member's scholarly and creative accomplishments are works in progress and other non-peer-reviewed publications and achievements.

The quality of the scholarly and creative work shall be the primary consideration in the evaluation process. Quantity of output will also be considered, mainly as it pertains to meeting or exceeding minimum counts at different levels of performance. When a scholarly or creative activity is of a particularly high level of quality, comprises an especially large amount of content, or has made a major impact on the discipline or on professional practice, it may be appropriate to assign additional weight to it (e.g., to assign a single activity the weight and equivalent count of two or more activities). In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document the importance of their work, their contributions in the case of co-authored works, as well as the quality of their publications and the outlets where their work appears.

It is the position of the Department that collaborative research/scholarly and creative efforts are of benefit to the institution as well as to the individual. **For tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and creative category shall include at least three high-quality peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be first authorship, and the other two at least major author.** Books, edited volumes, or invited book chapters published or in press with a scholarly publisher, on which the faculty member had at least major authorship (or major editor, only for edited volumes), shall be rated as Level III publications, but shall not count toward the minimum three-journal article requirement for tenure and/or promotion. However, books, edited volumes, and invited book chapters shall be counted in determining the level of scholarly performance – i.e., “Excellent” vs. “Good” vs. “Unsatisfactory.” A major author is defined as a co-author who made major contributions to key aspects of the scholarly activity documented in the publication (e.g., research study, evaluation, review, project) and the paper, book, or chapter. A major editor (edited volumes only) is defined as an editor or co-editor of a book or volume that contains several chapters by different authors, and whose work included at least conceptualizing the volume, inviting authors, organizing the volume, writing a section that synthesizes content from multiple authors, and ushering the volume through publication. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document major contributions to the publication (e.g., formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the study design, planning or conducting the data analysis, interpreting the results, writing a major portion of the publication).

As with all evaluation categories, a faculty member's scholarly and creative contribution shall be rated as **excellent, good, or unsatisfactory**. The following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several “hierarchical” indicators of performance. In general, **Level I** includes evidence of work in progress and on-going activity. **Level II** includes accomplishments that are an important part of one's scholarly agenda, such as

scholarly presentations and lectures, article and book reviews, and external fund-raising, but generally are one step below that of **Level III**. **Level III** includes the publication of one's work in high quality, peer-reviewed journals, and in scholarly books, chapters, edited volumes, or other comparable outlets; as well as obtaining major external grants.

Level I

- Research studies or other scholarly projects in progress
- Papers, books, chapters, or edited volumes submitted for publication
- Abstracts or papers submitted for presentation at professional conferences or meetings
- Presentations in Department research seminars
- Grant proposals submitted
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Level II

- Peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences or meetings
- Invited/commissioned scholarly papers, reports, professional documents, presentations, and lectures
- Tutorials, guidelines, other professional or community training materials
- Published peer-reviewed abstracts or papers published in conference proceedings
- Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)
- Published book reviews
- Chapters, books, edited volumes (non-scholarly publishers)
- Other articles, reports (non-peer-reviewed)
- Peer-reviewed publications accepted, with required changes
- Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)
- Significant contributions to minor grants received, including intramural grants *
- Honors or awards recognizing outstanding scholarly activity, presented to faculty by CSUF, other universities, government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, professional organizations, or community based organizations or other community groups relevant to the faculty member's area of work
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Level III

- Articles published or in press (as lead author or major author) in major peer-reviewed scholarly journals **
- High quality books, edited volumes, and invited book chapters, published or in press (as lead author/editor or major author/editor) with scholarly publishers, that comprise significant scholarly contributions
- Significant contributions to major, externally funded grants awarded; or two or more minor grants that together are equivalent to the level of a major grant (e.g., as Principal Investigator, Co-PI, or equivalent role) *
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

* A major, externally funded grant is defined as funding awarded by an agency external to CSUF that has a total value of at least \$100,000, or has a high level of prestige, or was highly competitive, as determined by the Department Personnel Committee based upon faculty explanation in the narrative and supporting documentation. All other grants shall be considered minor. If the grant is a multi-institution grant with the CSUF faculty member as a sub-contractor, then the total grant award amount to all institutions may be taken into account. A combination of two or more minor grants to which the faculty member has

provided significant contributions that together are equivalent to the level of a major grant, in terms of dollar amount, level of prestige, or level of competitiveness, shall be equivalent to a major grant, as determined by the Committee based upon faculty explanation in the narrative and supporting documentation.

** Although multiple indicators are listed in Level III, it shall be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly and creative work in the field and, thus, are expected to be part of a faculty member's accomplishments at each level of review.

Criteria for assignment of ratings for Scholarly and Creative Activity:

- “Excellent”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least one high quality indicator in Level I, five or more high quality indicators in Level II and four or more high quality indicators in Level III, thus surpassing the requirements for a rating of “Good.” **For tenure, a faculty member shall have three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications, one of which shall be first author, and the other two, at least major author.**
- “Good”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least one high quality indicator in Level I, at least three high quality indicators in Level II, and at least three high quality indicators in Level III. **For tenure, a faculty member shall have three high quality peer-reviewed journal publications, with at least one being first author, and the other two, at least major author.**
- “Unsatisfactory”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either “Excellent” or “Good” ratings outlined above.

Note: Exceptions to the above ratings are possible. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration should be given. Additionally, the list of scholarly activity examples above is not exhaustive. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe scholarly activities not listed here and provide rationale for the level of service that they propose. The documentation of such exceptions will be considered and evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee during Portfolio reviews.

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

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

following represents a sample breakdown of typical service activities into hierarchical categories.

Level I

- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at conferences, professional meetings, workshops
- Minor guest lectures (i.e., relatively short preparation time, low level of effort)
- Minor pro bono consultant activities (i.e., relatively short preparation time, low level of effort)
- Other service judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Level II

- Active membership on Department, College, or University committees
- Active membership on professional committees
- Course lead in Department
- Reviewer of professional journals, conference papers/abstracts, books, or grant applications
- Program planner or session organizer/moderator/chair at professional conferences
- Workshop/seminar coordinator
- Conference/workshop presentations (separate from research/scholarly presentations – e.g., delivering pedagogical presentations, continuing education courses/workshops)
- Organizer of minor functions/workshops/seminars/panels/events in university (including CSUF), professional, or community settings
- Major pro bono consultant activities (i.e., relatively long preparation, high level of effort)
- Participation/discussant on advisory boards, professional/community panels
- Participation in professional, government, non-governmental, or community efforts/events related to policy change
- Major guest lectures, presentations, and trainings (i.e., relatively long preparation, high level of effort)
- Media interviews
- Internship supervisor (separate from student interns assisting with faculty scholarly activities)
- Faculty advisor for campus student organization or equivalent
- Planning, accompanying, advising, and/or mentoring students in educational programs (e.g., study abroad programs, domestic educational trips)
- Honors or awards recognizing outstanding service presented to faculty by CSUF, other universities, government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, professional organizations, or community based organizations or other community groups relevant to the faculty member's area of service
- Other service judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Level III

- Chair of Department, College, or University committees
- Major academic program coordinator (e.g., coordinator of Department undergraduate program, MPH program)
- Center or lab director
- Elected or appointed office or service position in national or regional professional association
- Active membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
- Chair or equal co-Chair of national/regional professional or community committees
- Program Chair for a professional conference/workshop
- Organizer of major functions/workshops/seminars/panels/events in university (including CSUF), professional, or community settings (i.e., relatively long preparation, high level of effort, large impact, or reaching a significant number of people)
- Major political, advocacy, community organizing, professional engagement, communicating with policymakers, or other equivalent work that has led demonstratively to health-related policy change at the local, regional, national, or international level
- Other major service activities judged by peers to be of comparable significance

Note: The list of service examples above is not exhaustive. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe service activities not listed here and provide rationale for the level of service that they propose. It is the responsibility of the Department Personnel Committee to consider and evaluate such contributions.

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

- “Excellent”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least one indicator in Level I, four or more high quality indicators in Level II, three or more high quality indicators in Level III, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of “Good” by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.
- “Good”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least one indicator in Level I, several (three or more) high quality indicators in Level II, and at least two high quality indicators in Level III by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.
- “Unsatisfactory”** Appropriate rating when a faculty member has not met the standards for either “Excellent” or “Good” ratings outlined above.

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

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

A. Retention during Probationary Years

A recommendation for retention is contingent upon making sufficient progress toward the requirements for tenure and promotion in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. For teaching, sufficient progress for second and third year faculty means demonstrating any needed improvements in SOQ scores or grade distributions, and for fourth and fifth year faculty, it means demonstrating any needed improvements in SOQ scores or grade distributions plus at least one additional indicator of teaching effectiveness (VI.A.2.a-e). For scholarly and creative activities and service, sufficient progress for second and third year faculty means achieving at least one Level II indicator (in each of the scholarship and creative activities and service categories), and for fourth and fifth year faculty, it means achieving at least one Level II indicator and one Level III indicator (in each of the scholarship and creative activities and service categories).

B. Tenure Requirements

A person recommended for tenure shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in either teaching or scholarly and creative activities, with no less than a “Good” rating in the other two categories.

C. Promotion to Associate Professor

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

D. Early Promotion to Associate Professor

Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may be considered for promotion after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF. According to UPS 210.000, “early Promotion to Associate Professor requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceed the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and the Department Personnel Standards.”

E. Early Tenure

According to UPS 210.000, “early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceed the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and the Department Personnel Standards.”

F. Promotion to Full Professor

According to UPS 210.000, after a minimum of four years of service as an Associate Professor, a tenured faculty member may apply for regular promotion to Professor and shall submit a Portfolio and Appendices for full review. According to Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR), the first year in rank is counted from the date the faculty member receives official notice of promotion to Associate Professor. The period between submission of Portfolio materials for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and official promotion to Associate Professor, therefore, is effectively “Year Zero.” All teaching, scholarly, and service activities completed by the faculty member after submission of Portfolio materials for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, including those completed during “Year Zero,” shall be counted toward promotion to full professor.

There is no time limit on submitting a Portfolio to be considered for promotion to Professor. UPS 210.00 states, "In cases where there has been a lengthy period since promotion to Associate Professor, the most recent five years of evidence shall normally be emphasized in evaluating a record of continuing performance, but shall not exclude consideration of total productivity over the entire Associate period."

The decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record of sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all categories, using the same evaluation criteria for levels of performance as those for tenure (noted above). At a minimum, a person recommended for promotion to Full Professor shall be evaluated as "Excellent" in two categories with no less than "Good" in the third category.

G. Early Promotion to Full Professor

According to UPS 210.00, "Promotion consideration prior to having completed four years in rank shall be defined as 'early.'" A faculty member applying for early promotion to full professor shall submit a written request using the appropriate University form. The same evaluation criteria for levels of performance as those for tenure (noted above) shall be used. According to UPS 210.000, "early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of "Excellent."