January 17, 2023

To:        Rosario Ordoñez-Jasis, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Literacy and Reading Education

Lisa Kirtman, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Education

From:     Carolyn Thomas, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject:    **Departmental Personnel Standards for the Department of Literacy & Reading Education**

The proposed Departmental Personnel Standards from the Department of Literacy & Reading Education have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.


CT:mc

cc:    Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support
Dr. Carol Lundberg, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. Fernando Rodríguez-Valls, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records

# Official Department Personnel Standards for the Department of Literacy and Reading Education

# Implementation with the 2023-2024 Academic Year
# Last revised 11.21.22

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

According to University Policy Statement 210.002 (6/8/22 version), Section IIIA: Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards… …shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. Methods used by the department in evaluating performance shall be clear, objective, and reasonable. Methods used for quantifying any information shall be as straightforward as possible…Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions.

I.     **Preface**
       The Literacy and Reading Education Department (hereafter called "the Department") is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible that meet the evolving needs of our students, community, and region. The Department is also committed to establishing an environment wherein the creation of knowledge and its organized dissemination are central. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs and effective learning environments is the faculty. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning

by supporting faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community.

The Department will use the standards set out in this document as a guide for faculty preparing the Portfolio for retention, tenure, and promotion, and as the criteria for Portfolio evaluation. Department faculty affirms its position that the interests and needs of students are best served when the faculty represents diverse experiential and academic strengths, creating a mosaic of talent. With this document, the Department intends to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great scope of the functions inherent in the mission of an institution of higher education. Faculty members shall also have the option to include their experiences and evidence of cultural taxation. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

II. **Faculty Responsibilities**

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

A. In the area of teaching, examples of these responsibilities include:
1. Teaching that advances student learning
2. developing and implementing comprehensive syllabi
3. communicating clear expectations to students
4. demonstrating a variety of teaching and assessment strategies
5. modeling effective teaching practices
6. reflecting on teaching practices
7. committing to just, equitable, and inclusive teaching and learning practices

B. In the areas of scholarly and creative activities faculty are expected to engage in activities that shall enhance the overall mission of the professoriate, for example:
1. expanding knowledge that fosters peer/discipline learning
2. applying knowledge to consequential problems in education
3. advancing the reputation of the University.

C. In the areas of professional, university, and community service, examples of these responsibilities include:
1. contributing to the advancement of the learning community
2. increasing opportunities for students in the discipline
3. attending University, College, and Department meetings
4. fulfilling committee assignments
5. fulfilling other College and Department duties as assigned by either the College Dean, or Department Chair
6. supporting the work of the Department, College, and University
7. contributing to the greater community in general through service activities.

III. **Department Mission**

The Department of Literacy and Reading Education faculty believe that reading is a developmental, social, and meaning-making process. Reading is embedded within the broader constructs of literacy. This includes affirming the multiple literacies that permeate students'

homes, schools, and communities. Effective equity-minded specialized literacy professionals must have a thorough knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings and relevant pedagogies of literacy and learning. The Department of Literacy and Reading Education focuses on the need to think critically and creatively and consider possible alternatives so that students are prepared to become advocates for students, families, and their communities. In all courses, the Department is committed to the use of antiracist pedagogy, inclusive models of education, and culturally responsive and sustaining approaches to instruction, in relation to students' intersecting social identities, while engaging with issues of social justice.

Undergraduate courses contribute to the Minor in Literacy Education and the University's General Education program. Graduate courses lead to the MS in Literacy and Reading Education, California Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, and a Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential.

IV.   **Role of the Department Chair in the Personnel Process**
With respect to the personnel process, the following guidelines shall apply:
- Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair may consult with new probationary faculty members concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors in consultation with the faculty.
- The Department Chair shall review the files for faculty unless the Department Chair is not of a sufficient rank to be eligible to review the file or is being considered for promotion themselves. In that case the Dean shall assume the responsibilities of the "Department Chair."

V.   **Department Personnel Committee**
A. **Committee Functions**
The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the "Committee") shall evaluate Portfolios and make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to the members of the Department as specified in UPS 210.000 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

B. **Committee Structure**
All Committee members shall be tenured faculty and shall not be serving as the Department Chair of a department. Committee members shall have a higher rank or classification than those being reviewed. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he/she/they are the subject of the personnel review process. No faculty member shall serve on a personnel committee when that person will be on any type of leave during the year of service.
An alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any circumstances in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete his/her/their term or he/she/they are ineligible to participate.

C. **Election of Committee Members**
The Department Chair shall conduct the election by the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester each year.

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

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

The alternate member shall be the individual who received the highest number of votes among those nominees not elected to the Committee.

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

**E. Committee Procedures**
1. The Committee shall evaluate the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. In its written evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate's qualifications under each category of the criteria listed in Section VII of this document. The Committee shall formulate a separate recommendation that shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation.
2. The Committee's evaluation for each area shall be based solely on the information submitted in the Portfolio in accordance with UPS 210.000 and the Department Personnel Standards. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for rating the faculty member under review as excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory, with respect to each area of performance.
3. All actions taken by the Committee, including recommendations, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.
4. The Committee members shall sign the evaluation, the recommendation, and the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way the individual members voted.
5. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

**VI. General Guidelines**
**A. Prospectus**
Each probationary faculty member shall construct a Prospectus during his or her initial year of probationary status. The Prospectus shall be comprised of narratives for teaching,

scholarly and creative activities, and service that "describe the faculty member's professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments (s)he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion" (UPS 210.000). Each narrative shall not exceed 500 words. Throughout subsequent revisions of the Prospectus the faculty mentor may also be available for counsel. While having no formal approval process, the Department Chair and College Dean shall review the Prospectus and shall each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College, but prior to May 1. The Committee does not provide feedback on the Prospectus but does view it within the Portfolio contents for all full performance reviews. During subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that shall typically occur during the probationary period. Faculty members' progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion shall be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Standards.

**B**. **Portfolio Preparation and Submission**
It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare and submit the required information and documentation for the Portfolio using the electronic portfolio system in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to attend the workshops held by Faculty Affairs and Records and Faculty Development Center at the beginning of each fall semester as well as college-wide personnel workshops, and to seek assistance from colleagues.

**C.** **Portfolio Organization and Documentation**
   1. The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the standard table of contents as specified by UPS 210.000 and as provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented.
   2. The Narrative Summary (1,000 words maximum for each) for Teaching, Scholarly, and Creative Activities, and Service is the faculty member's retrospective analysis of significant accomplishments for the period of review.
   3. The contents of the Appendices should represent ongoing reflection and a process of sorting and refining over time, emphasizing quality over quantity. Each Narrative Summary shall clearly indicate where in the Appendices supporting documentation can be found.
   4. Faculty members who have been granted service credit must include documentation of accomplishments in all areas (teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service) during those specific years for which the service credit was granted.
   5. Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their full performance review during year two (2) or year four (4) would, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit "Review File." The Review File comprises only two items: (1) an updated curriculum vitae and (2) statistical summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires. When subject to a periodic review, the faculty member shall submit the Review File by October 1. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the appropriate administrator may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member's progress.

**VII. Criteria for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-Time Faculty**

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

**A. Teaching Performance**

The primary mission of this Department's faculty is teaching to ensure a just, equitable and inclusive education for all students. Each faculty member shall demonstrate that his/her/their mastery and currency in the discipline is consistently translated into structuring and implementing effective learning experiences as appropriate to the nature of each course. Mandatory indicators for demonstration of teaching performance are listed below.

**1. Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Teaching Performance**

a) To be placed in the Portfolio:

   i. <u>Narrative Summary</u> of Teaching Performance (maximum 1,000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for teaching shall include the faculty members' retrospective analysis of the following six areas: 1) teaching philosophy and JEIE tenets, 2) pedagogical approach and methods, 3) accomplishments in teaching, 4) an analysis of Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) data, and 5) trends in student feedback, including Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) comments, and 6) professional growth.

   ii. <u>List of Courses Taught</u> A semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, and the unit value.

   iii. <u>Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires</u> If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. If service credit was given, data on student opinions from all years for which credit was given shall be included if evaluations were conducted at the previous institution.

b) To be placed in the Appendix:

   i. <u>Workload</u> Faculty workload shall include activities in a variety of areas in addition to teaching specific courses: for example, adjustments in workload due to undergraduate coordination, graduate advising/coordination, directing HMC Reading Center activities, and other assigned time for course development activities and/or accreditation preparation. The Portfolio shall list and discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.

   ii. <u>Course Syllabi & Materials</u> A representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials prepared by the instructor to demonstrate his/her teaching effectiveness shall be included in the Appendix. A representative selection of course syllabi from each course taught and additional materials prepared by the instructor to facilitate teaching effectiveness shall be included in the Appendix. It is not necessary to include every syllabus or every exam or assignment, especially for multiple sections of the same course taught over the period of review.

iii. <u>Original Student Opinion Questionnaires</u> If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair.

iv. <u>Qualitative Additional Indicators of Effective Teaching</u> The faculty member shall submit carefully selected exemplars of teaching effectiveness, and reflective practice. These materials shall be carefully selected and revised over time to represent the enhancement of one's teaching performance. These may include, but are not limited to, the examples in Table 4 below.

2. **Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness**

Four categories of data are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness: Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance, Student Opinion Questionnaires Statistical Data, Student Feedback (including Student Opinion Questionnaires Written Comments) and Additional Indicators.

a) <u>Narrative Summary</u> of Teaching Performance (maximum 1,000 words)

The self-assessment shall go beyond a simple description of course content and pedagogy and provide a comprehensive assessment of how faculty members enact Just, Equitable, and Inclusive teaching. Evaluation of the <u>Narrative Summary</u> of Teaching Performance will consider the clarity and completeness of the narrative summary of teaching performance, including a retrospective analysis of the faculty's:

1) teaching philosophy and JEIE tenets;

2) pedagogical approach and methods to ensure student success and future goals and direction for teaching;

3) Additional Indicators and other accomplishments in teaching; when appropriate, non-instructional assigned time activities.

4) an analysis of trends in Student Opinion Questionnaire data;

5) trends in student feedback (must include Student Opinion Questionnaire comments, and may include unsolicited student feedback, student reflections, midpoint evaluations, etc.) indicating elements in effective instruction such as knowledge of the field, responsiveness, competent use of teaching approaches, creation of a positive environment that contributes to equitable learning for all students, and/or selection of quality instructional materials;

6) professional growth in JEIE and the discipline

| Table 1: Teaching Narrative | |
|---|---|
| Excellent | Good |
| All required six elements are present with clarity, deep reflection, supporting details, and organized structure. Teaching accomplishments are **clearly** linked to supporting documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. | All required six elements are present. . Teaching accomplishments are linked to supporting documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. |

| Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|
| Most required elements are present, though at least one of the elements is not addressed. Further explanations/details are needed. Teaching accomplishments are generally linked with supporting evidence documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices, but there may be weakevidence or unclear links to evidence in at least one area. | Failed to address key required elements. Several teaching accomplishments are weakly linked to supporting evidence documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. Some of the information is insufficient/inaccurate/unverifiable. |

b) <u>Student Opinion Questionnaires Statistical Data</u> use a five-point Likert scale for the quantitative documentation of student evaluation of instruction. The University-provided statistical summaries of these forms will be used. For the period under review, the following criteria will be used to evaluate the average student opinions of all courses:

| Table 2: Student Opinion Questionnaires Statistical Data | |
|---|---|
| excellent | 90% or more As and Bs |
| *good* | 80% - <90% As and Bs |
| *needs improvement* | 70% - 79% As and Bs |
| *unsatisfactory* | Less than 70% As and Bs |

The students' perceptions of a teacher are an important—though not decisive—means of assessing the quality of teaching. These criteria are to be used as a general guide, with recognition that these data do in fact represent opinions, submitted anonymously, and with no formal documentation of validity or reliability. Student opinions of instruction contribute 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 and evaluation of SOQ data or summaries should be fair and equitable. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments. The faculty member shall provide a narrative of teaching performance that addresses student evaluations and comments and their efforts to improve or maintain teaching performance. In cases where the quantitative or qualitative rating summaries for one or more courses fall below the range of good, the faculty member may provide written rationale in the narrative, which, if submitted, the DPC shall consider in its deliberations for assigning the Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (as specified below). For example, special consideration may be extended when unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (such as the nature and difficulty of the course load) are addressed in the Portfolio with specific documentation. The evaluation shall also 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, for example, courses focusing on anti-racism, minoritized communities, critical literacy, etc. The evaluation also shall take into account efforts to improve teaching performance. Based upon these criteria, and consideration of the individual case, the reviewers shall evaluate the Student Opinion Questionnaire data and render a rating of *excellent*, *good, needs improvement,* or *unsatisfactory.*

c) Student Feedback **(must include SOQ Written Comments)**

| Table 3: Student Feedback | |
| --- | --- |
| Excellent | Good |
| PTrends in positive statements clearly identified, with **very few neutral and negative comments**. Student comments substantiate that the faculty member developed an **exceptional** environment conducive to learning. Such comments are consistent across classes and over time. | Trends in positive statements mostly identified, with **som**e neutral and a few negative comments. Student comments suggest the faculty member developed a positive environment conducive to learning. Such comments are consistent across classes and over time. |
| Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory |
| Mixed comments, consisting of some positive and neutral comments along with some negative comments that tend to persist. Some student comments suggest that the faculty member was not always successful in developing a positive environment conducive for learning. Such comments show a weak trend of improvement across classes and over time. | Some positive comments, many negative and neutral statements. Many comments indicate faculty member failed develop a satisfactory environment conducive for learning. Many negative comments across several classes, with repeated comments on problematic issues appearing over time. |

| Table 4: Examples of Additional Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness |
| --- |
| <ul><li>Course outlines with clearly defined objectives which are aligned to program learning outcomes, instructional approaches, and assessments</li><li>Peer and Department Chair observations of instruction (Please see UPS 210.080 for University policy around class observations).</li><li>Analysis of student work samples illustrating attainment of instructional learning goals and objectives</li><li>Innovative and accessible educational technology appropriate to the learning experience</li><li>Evidence of pedagogy that promotes just, equitable, and inclusive educational practices</li><li>Evidence of pedagogy that includes anti-racist or social justice frameworks</li><li>Evidence of innovative pedagogical practices or teaching approaches and strategies that meets students' needs</li><li>Video of exemplary lessons</li></ul> |

- Dissertation, thesis, or project advisement or committee member for master's or doctoral degree students
- Study abroad activities
- Service-learning activities
- Community-engaged learning opportunities
- High impact practices (HIPS) as evidence for a classroom environment that encourages student interaction and engagement
- Sustained student mentoring activities
- HMC Reading Center Director responsibilities
- Graduate or undergraduate coordinator responsibilities
- Organization and facilitation of pedagogical seminars and workshops for students, colleagues, or a related targeted audience
- Independent study projects directed by the faculty member
- Accepted new course proposals
- Honors or awards related to teaching
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness, or teaching materials illustrating effective course enhancement, course design, implementation, and learning goal assessments (e.g., visual aids, handouts, PowerPoint presentations, scoring rubrics)
- Evidence of formative assessment and adjustment of instruction (such as course-specific evaluation, inventories)
- Evidence of professional development

Reviewers will use the following criteria to rate the additional indicators of teaching effectiveness for the period under review:

| Table 5: Additional Indicators | |
|---|---|
| *excellent* | Provides strong, varied, and/or sustained evidence (five or more well-documented additional indicators of effective teaching per year that is sustained over time. |
| *good* | Provides varied evidence (four well-documented indicators per year) of effective teaching |
| *needs improvement* | Provides limited evidence (three acceptable indicators per year) of effective teaching |
| *unsatisfactory* | Provides fewer than three acceptable indicators of effective teaching, and progress toward effective teaching is not evident |

Based upon these criteria, the reviewers shall evaluate the Additional Indicators and render a rating of *excellent*, *good*, *needs improvement, or unsatisfactory*.

3. Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness. Reviewers will weigh the Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance, SOQ Statistical Data, Student Feedback/SOQ Written Comments and Additional Indicators equally for each period under review to determine an overall

rating of teaching effectiveness. Primary consideration will be given to evidence of sustained high-quality instructional practices and rigorous standards for student performance as evidenced in the Portfolio.

| **Table 6:  Criteria for Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness based on the Narrative Summary, SOQ Statistical Data, SOQ Written Comments, Additional Indicators (AI)** | |
|---|---|
| *excellent* | The narrative summary of teaching, SOQ statistical data, SOQ and/or other written comments/feedback, and AI rated all rated *excellent*. **No *good, needs improvement* or *unsatisfactory ratings.*** |
| *good* | The narrative summary of teaching, SOQ statistical data, SOQ and/or other written comments/feedback or AI rated any combination *good or excellent*. . **No *needs improvement* or *unsatisfactory.*** |
| *needs improvement* | The narrative summary of teaching, or SOQ statistical data or SOQ and/or other written comments/feedback or AI rated *needs improvement.* |
| *unsatisfactory* | The narrative summary of teaching, SOQ statistical data, SOQ and/or other written comments/feedback, and/or AI rated *unsatisfactory.* |

B.  **Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments**

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activities is essential to university-level teaching and service. Such activities (a) contribute to the advancement of the field, (b) complement teaching, (c) contribute to the overall quality of the Department, the College, the University, or community, (d) contribute to the dissemination and application of knowledge in schools and districts, (e) extend the meaning or application of existing knowledge, (f) promote currency of knowledge, methodology, and the spirit of critical inquiry, and (g) sustain professional growth of the faculty member.

The phrase "scholarly and creative activity" as used here relates primarily to the Carnegie Foundation report by Ernest Boyer regarding the "scholarship of discovery" and the "scholarship of integration" i.e., to the production of new knowledge and/or to the extension or application of existing knowledge. The Department recognizes and strongly values multiple types of scholarship including the "scholarship of teaching" and the "scholarship of application/professional service" (to use Boyer's terminology), with all areas addressed in their own respective sections of UPS 210.000 and in the Department of Literacy and Reading Personnel Standards.

Examples of common, acceptable methods for advancing knowledge are many, including traditional experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research, and meta-analysis and other types of literature reviews and analysis. Integration and application of knowledge also

can be demonstrated through publication of innovative curriculum, policy, and program development and through books/textbooks/media that synthesize knowledge.

1. **Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments**
    a) <u>Self-Assessment Narrative Summary</u> (maximum 1,000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for scholarly and creative activities shall be a retrospective analysis of accomplishments in scholarship for the period of the review. It must include a well-defined, focused research agenda that is clearly evident and documented in an ongoing body of work.
    b) <u>Scholarly Publications</u> consist of scholarly work such as peer-reviewed books, chapters in edited books, and journal articles. Documentation must include a copy of the work. If these are in press and therefore not yet available in print, then a letter of acceptance and commitment to publish must be provided. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to delineate the nature of the contribution of scholarly and creative activities to the field of study. Documentation of peer review, galley pages, copies of final printed versions of publication, letters of review, and evaluation of performances are expected.
    c) <u>Pragmatic Scholarship</u> consists of grants awarded, engaged scholarship projects, policy analysis, program evaluation, service as a member of a research project, contracts/consultantships that result in significant reports that add knowledge to the field, public press articles, books, and other non-peer-reviewed materials prepared for the "lay" or "practitioner" audience, and other comparable scholarly activities and other forms of scholarship with an emphasis on the practical aspects of knowledge. In documenting pragmatic scholarship, faculty should include a written record of the project and the identifiable benefits to the field. Publications related to such activities, including dissemination products (e.g., summary reports, program evaluation, and recordings), are encouraged in this category.
    d) <u>Scholarly Presentations</u> are peer-reviewed papers, presentations, poster sessions, panel discussions for professional meetings, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or convocations. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to delineate the importance of the scholarly presentations to a theoretical framework and advancement of the field of study.

*In cases of abbreviated review, faculty should demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely.

2. **Characteristics of a Focused Research Agenda**
    The following characteristics of a research agenda are not listed in order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how his/her/their work meets some or all of these criteria.
    a) *Work that has a conceptual or theoretical basis.* This typically is accomplished through reference to related scholarly literature, summarizing what has been done in the past and indicating how the new work advances knowledge and/or practice.
    b) *Work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or that extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge*. Examples of research designs for advancing knowledge include experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research, and meta-analyses. Knowledge may also be advanced through

creation of approaches, methods, and techniques that translate theory into practical applications. Knowledge may be applied through development of materials that synthesize existing knowledge, such as innovative curricula and program development.

c) *Work that is externally reviewed by peers*. The faculty member must verify the quality of the peer-review process. Reviewer comments shall be included.

d) *Work that is published in respected sources*. Publication sources may be books, journals, and/or other media. The faculty member should provide documentation of the quality, scope, and importance of the journal or book.

| Table 7: Scholarship Narrative | |
|---|---|
| Excellent | Good |
| A very clear retrospective analysis of all accomplishments in scholarship for the period of the review. It includes a well-defined, focused research agenda and is documented in an ongoing body of work. Scholarly accomplishments are clearly linked to supporting documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices | All required elements are present with details. Scholarly accomplishments are linked to supporting documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. |
| Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory |
| Most required elements are present, though at least one of the elements is not addressed.. Further explanations/details are needed. Scholarly accomplishments are generally linked with supporting evidence documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices, but there may be inadequate evidence or unclear links to evidence in at least one area**.** | Failed to address key required elements. . Several scholarly accomplishments are weakly linked to supporting evidence documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. Some of the information is insufficient/inaccurate/unverifiable. |

3. **Rating Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments**
   It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an ongoing, focused, and in-depth program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the review process leading to tenure and promotion.

   In addition to the criteria and definitions outlined above, reviewers will consider the nature, complexity, and contribution to the field of each scholarly publication in evaluating the faculty member's documentation of scholarly and creative accomplishments provided in the Portfolio. The impact of scholarly and creative activity is measured by its overall quality and potential to contribute to a field of study or to benefit students. It is incumbent upon the faculty member under review to clearly delineate such evidence in his or her Portfolio. Copies of all significant publications or creative activities for the period of review shall be included in the Appendices.

It is expected that the faculty member shall demonstrate an on-going, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the entire review process leading to tenure and promotion. Based on the totality of the evidence presented, reviewers shall rate the faculty member's overall scholarly and creative activity as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.** Table 7 outlines expectations for progress towards tenure for each year of full review.

*excellent*  An excellent self-assessment and an exemplary record of scholarly activity. Exemplary is defined as one high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publication in the year of review following the first probationary year for a total of four[1]. *In addition,* one high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grant, or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period is required for a total of four. A large, high-quality, externally-funded grant, as defined per the guidelines that follow, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities.

A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship project, as defined by the criteria established by the College of Education may also be used for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of *excellent* in scholarly and creative activities. Engaged scholarship cannot be used to achieve a rating of *good* or lower. A meaningful, high-quality, engaged scholarship project, as defined per the guidelines that follow, may be substituted for one high-quality peer-reviewed publication for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. A maximum of two high-quality engaged scholarship projects can replace two peer-reviewed publications.

The criteria for a meaningful high-quality engaged scholarship project is below.

There are two types of high-quality engaged scholarship:

1. A large, high-quality, <u>grant</u> includes all of the following criteria:
   - Multi-year funding, operating on a multi-year grant cycle with total award of $50,000 or more,

---

[1] The period under review for the promotion to Full Professor begins Oct. 2.

- A proposal that has a conceptual or theoretical basis (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work in an area showing what has been done in the past and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in this area,
- A proposal that is externally reviewed by peers, with faculty providing documentation of the peer-review process. The peer-review process should reflect the competitiveness of the grant. One of the best ways of providing such documentation, especially for grants that are unfamiliar to most reviewers, are actual copies of reviewer comments provided with the text of the grant,
- Evidence that the impact of the grant shall be substantial (e.g., number of candidates impacted, number of partner districts impacted, evidence of university and/or preK-12 collaboration, letters of support).

2. A meaningful, high-quality engaged scholarship <u>project</u> that includes the following five criteria (faculty are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence):
   - A clear rationale of the need for the work addressed and for the strategies and/or tools with which the work is carried out (the plan must be supported by evidence-based practices).
   - Work should have a conceptual or theoretical basis (i.e., is conducted within the context of existing peer-reviewed knowledge). Normally, this is accomplished through a review of related work, showing what has been done in the past, and providing a rationale as to why additional work is needed in the area.
   - Multiple forms of evidence shall be provided by the faculty member that demonstrates both the quantitative and qualitative impact of the project. A clear impact on a district/community partner is required. These could include a letter from partners, data collected, etc.
   - A description of the evaluation process and outcomes that includes: research questions informed by and situated within the literature, an analysis of findings that are contextualized within the particular community/district/school/classroom needs and the discipline, and implications that illustrate the practical ways in which the project shaped or is shaping lived realities for the better and directions for future work. Evaluation results and implemented changes based on this evaluation must be completed and disseminated before the faculty member can submit this work for the RTP process.

- Evidence of dissemination activities and feedback from stakeholders must be included. Dissemination must include a broad audience.

*good*    A good or excellent self-assessment and good performance in scholarly activity. *Good* is defined as three high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications published or in press for the period under review following the first probationary year, *and* three high-quality pragmatic scholarly products or scholarly presentations for the period under review.

*needs improvement*    A limited self-assessment with a poorly focused scholarly agenda and/or modest performance in scholarly activity. *Needs improvement* is defined as two high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications published or in press for the period under review following the first probationary year, *and* two high-quality pragmatic scholarly products or scholarly presentations for the period under review.

*unsatisfactory*    A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment and/or a record of scholarly and creative activity falling below that defined above as *needs improvement*.

| Table 7:  Criteria for Scholarship | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PY | Excellent | Good | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory |
| 2 | A comprehensive self-assessment and an exemplary record of scholarly activity. Excellent is defined as <br>• a submission of a manuscript for peer-review, or one accepted/ published peer-reviewed scholarly publication. <br>• In addition, one high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity or scholarly presentation during the same time period is required. | A good self-assessment and good performance in scholarly activity. Good is defined as either a <br>• submission of a manuscript for peer-review, or one accepted/ published peer-reviewed scholarly publication <br> OR <br>• one high-quality pragmatic scholarly product, funded grant, or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period. | A limited self-assessment performance in scholarly activity. Needs Improvement is defined as <br>• a manuscript in progress <br> OR <br>• In addition, a draft of one high-quality pragmatic scholarly product, grant proposal, or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period. | A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment and/or a record of scholarly and creative activity falling below that defined above as Needs Improvement |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A large, high-quality, <u>grant</u> and/or a high-quality engaged scholarship <u>project</u> may be substituted for high-quality peer-reviewed publications for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. | | | |
| 4 | A comprehensive self-assessment and an exemplary record of scholarly activity. Excellent is defined as<br>● at least two accepted/ published peer-reviewed scholarly publications.<br><br>● In addition, a combination of any of the following, for a total of at least two: a high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grants, or scholarly presentations.<br><br>A large, high-quality, <u>grant</u> and/or a high-quality engaged scholarship <u>project</u> may be substituted for high-quality peer-reviewed publications for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. | A good self-assessment and good performance in scholarly activity. Good is defined as<br>● at least one accepted/ published peer-reviewed scholarly publication.<br>OR<br>● At least one of the following: a high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grant, or scholarly presentation | A limited self-assessment and performance in scholarly activity. Needs Improvement is defined as<br>● either one accepted/ published peer-reviewed scholarly publication<br>OR<br>● one of the following: a high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grant, or scholarly presentation. | A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment and/or a record of scholarly and creative activity falling below that defined above as<br>Needs Improvement |

| 6 | A comprehensive self-assessment and an exemplary record of scholarly activity. Exemplary is defined as<br>● four high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications in press.<br><br>● In addition, a combination of any of the following, for a total of at least four: a high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grants, or scholarly presentations.<br><br>A large, high-quality, <u>grant</u> and/or a high-quality engaged scholarship <u>project</u> may be substituted for high-quality peer-reviewed publications for the purpose of meeting Department standards for a rating of excellent in scholarly and creative activities. | A good self-assessment and good performance in scholarly activity. Good is defined as<br>● three high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications in press.<br><br>In addition, a combination of any of the following, for total of at least three: a high quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grants, or scholarly presentations. | A limited self-assessment and performance in scholarly activity. Needs Improvement is defined as<br>● two high-quality peer-reviewed scholarly publications in press.<br>● In addition, a combination of any of the following, for a total of at least two: a high-quality pragmatic scholarly activity, funded grants, or scholarly presentations | A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment and/or a record of scholarly and creative activity falling below that defined above as Needs Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|---|

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

It is expected that the faculty member will contribute to the ongoing refinement and development of communities of learning through service to the profession, the University, and the community.

Professional service has much in common with scholarly and creative activities, though the audience for professional service activities is broader. Professional service activities may:
- complement teaching by allowing the instructor to draw from applied experience;
- promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied;
- bring recognition as a leader to the faculty member from his or her peers; and
- enhance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students.

As with the area of scholarship, the quality, quantity, and impact of one's contributions all

need to be considered in the context of the potential benefits and in light of prevailing professional standards.

University service is the faculty member's participation in committee, project, and student advisory activities of the Department, College, and University. Through University service, faculty members contribute to the implementation and evolution of the structure and climate of our own learning community.

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

1. **Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Professional, University, and Community Service**

   a) <u>Self-Assessment Narrative Summary</u> (maximum 1,000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for professional, University, and community service shall be a retrospective analysis of accomplishments in these areas, for the period of the review. It must include a well-defined, focused service agenda that connects, when appropriate, to teaching and scholarship agendas, and is documented in an ongoing body of work. Evidence of service shall be recognized and evaluated by such indicators as listed below. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how the work addresses some or all of these indicators.
   b) Additional evidence of service shall be provided and evaluated by indicators such as those listed in Table 4. These lists are not exhaustive, nor are items presented in rank order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how his or her work addresses indicators such as these in each of the five categories of service, including time demands and personal contributions.
   c) The Department recognizes that some activities require substantially more time and energy than others. For instance, writing a substantial portion of an accreditation document or serving on the Academic Senate or a standing University committee is more demanding than membership on an advisory board that meets once a semester. The faculty member shall provide documentation of the degree of involvement and the importance of the service.

| Table 8: Service Narrative | |
| --- | --- |
| Excellent | Good |
| A very clear retrospective analysis of all accomplishments in the areas of professional, | All required elements are present with details. Service accomplishments are linked to |

| | |
|---|---|
| University, and community service for the period of the review. It includes a well-defined, focused service agenda that connects, when appropriate, to teaching and scholarship agendas, and is documented in an ongoing body of work. Service accomplishments are clearly linked to supporting documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. | supporting documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. |
| Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory |
| Most required elements are present, though at least one of the elements is not addressed. Further explanations/details are needed. Service accomplishments are generally linked with supporting evidence documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices, but there may be inadequate evidence or unclear links to evidence in at least one area**. | Failed to address key required elements. Several service accomplishments are weakly linked to supporting evidence documentation in the Portfolio and Appendices. Some of the information is insufficient/inaccurate/unverifiable. |

| **Table 9: Indicators of Professional, University, or Community Service** including but not limited to the following: |
|---|
| **Professional Service**<br>● Leadership roles in local, state, regional, national, and international professional organizations<br>● Editing professional journals<br>● Reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals, or conferences<br>● Providing consultations relevant to the field<br>● Presenting at professional meetings and workshops (which may not be peer reviewed or theoretical in nature)<br>● Reviewing grant proposals<br>● Invited membership in state or national policy committees and forums<br>● Engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community<br>● Acquiring professional licenses, credentials, and certificates<br>● Providing professional training to others<br>● Receiving professional honors, awards, and/or special recognition<br><br>**University, College, and Department Service**<br>● Active participation in University, College, and Department committees and activities<br>● Representing the University in system-wide committees, working groups, task forces, etc.<br>● Active involvement as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups<br>● Actively supporting the RTP process for untenured faculty (e.g., serving as a faculty mentor)<br>● Actively supporting the recruitment efforts of new students into our Department<br>● Actively supporting the pursuit of higher education of CSUF students<br>● Actively supporting the recruitment and retention of historically underserved students into the |

Department, College, and University
- Formulation of, or participation in, programs, institutes, symposiums, or workshops
- Active membership on advisory boards within the University or community
- Lecture/staff development given to University audiences and other University classes
- Faculty mentoring
- Student mentoring
- Sponsoring student organizations

**Community Service**
- Participation in community groups such as involvement with public school or community-based programs
- Special services to the community, such as task forces, workshops, and lectures
- Service to school districts, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, and the wider community and region

2. **Rating Criteria for Professional, University, and Community Service**
   It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate ongoing service in some combination of *all of the five service areas*. The Department defines University service to include involvement which is distributed across the Department, College and University levels. Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render a rating of *excellent*, *good*, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.

   | | |
   |---|---|
   | *excellent* | A comprehensive self-assessment of service and a well-documented record of substantial involvement in one or more activities in each of the areas of service 1) Professional; 2) University; (3) Department; (4) College; and (5) Community, per year of review following the first probationary year, for a total of five activities per year. In addition, at least one of the activities at the University or above (e.g. CSU system-wide committees) levels should be substantial and sustained. The Department defines substantial and sustained as ongoing participation in an activity that allows the faculty to make consistent, and growing, contributions to the organization or group. |
   | *good* | A comprehensive self-assessment of service and a well-documented record of sustained and substantial involvement in four or more activities, distributed among at least four categories of service per year of review following the first probationary year for a total of four. |
   | *needs improvement* | A limited self-assessment of service, and/or fewer than four documented activities of acceptable quality distributed among the five categories of service per year of review following the first probationary year. |
   | *unsatisfactory* | A rating of unsatisfactory shall be rendered for any level of activity that is below the standard for needs improvement. |

VI. **Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**
   A. **Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty**
      Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual's progress in meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary

faculty member must be rated, at minimum, *good* in two areas, and *needs improvement* in a remaining area, and making documented progress toward a rating of *good* in these areas. A terminal year will be given when the faculty member is rated *needs improvement* or *unsatisfactory* in two or more areas.

**B. Full Performance Reviews and Abbreviated Reviews**

Probationary faculty members shall be subject to Full Performance Reviews during their second, fourth, and sixth years of service before they can be re-appointed a third or fifth probationary year or granted tenure. If a probationary faculty is rated *needs improvement* in either teaching, scholarship or service, a Full Performance Review will be requested for probationary years three or five when, typically, only an Abbreviated Review would be required.

Faculty members with satisfactory evaluations in their Full Performance Reviews during year two or four would, in the following year (year 3 and 5, respectively) submit a Review File. The Review File comprises two items: (1) an updated curriculum vitae and (2) statistical summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires for the period since the last Full Performance Review.

**C. Criteria for Granting of Retention, Promotion and Tenure**
1. A faculty member shall normally be considered for tenure during his/her/their sixth probationary year, with tenure beginning his/her/their seventh year, if awarded, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed.
2. The granting of tenure is the most significant personnel action that the University takes because it represents an affirmation that the probationary faculty member will be an asset to the University over their entire career. Therefore, a positive tenure decision requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that meet the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Standards.
3. The decision to grant tenure shall be based solely on an evaluation of the faculty member's performance as documented in the Portfolio. Tenure is expected if the faculty member's accomplishments are of sufficient quality and meet expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Departmental Personnel Standards.
4. In order to receive tenure, a faculty member must have received a doctorate in an appropriate field of study from an accredited university.
5. Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render determination regarding the granting of tenure. To achieve tenure, the faculty member must be rated *excellent* in the area of teaching or scholarship, and at least *good* in the other two areas.
6. Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.
7. Early tenure 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 *excellent* in all three areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.
8. Promotion to Full Professor shall be based on a record that indicates commitment to the standards described above. The University expects that tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in all three areas of performance, and that successful

faculty members will display accomplishments, growth, leadership, and future potential throughout their careers. This will be evidenced by maintaining a rating of *excellent* in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, and at least *good* in the third area. The decision to grant promotion to the Rank of Full Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment described herein.

9. The period under review for the promotion to Full Professor will include the period since the submission of the file to promotion to Associate Professor to Oct. 1. This includes a minimum of four years of service as a tenured Associate Professor. The Portfolio and its Appendix shall be cumulative and representative of performance for this entire period.

10. Accomplishments documented in the Portfolio or its Appendix for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.

11. Early promotion to Full Professor shall be based on a record that clearly indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described above. This will be evidenced by a documented record of accomplishments, that achieves a rating of *excellent* in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

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

Table 10 summarizes these criteria for promotion and tenure.

| Table 10: Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Retention and Recommendation for a PY3 or PY5 Abbreviated Review** | **Recommendation for a PY3 or PY5 Full Performance Review** | **Tenure and Promotion to Associate** | **Early Tenure** | **Promotion to Full Professor** | **Early Promotion to Full Professor** |
| *Good* in two areas, and *needs improvement* in the third, and making documented progress toward a rating of *good* in this third area. | *Needs improvement* in either teaching, scholarship or service. | *Excellent* in teaching or scholarship and *good* in the other two areas. | *Excellent* in teaching, scholarship, and service, and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard timeline | *Excellent* in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and at least *good* in the third. | *Excellent* in teaching, scholarship, and service over a sustained period. |