

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Definitions of terms used herein
 - a. University shall mean California State University, Fullerton (CSUF).
 - b. Department shall mean the Department of Psychology, CSUF.
 - c. Faculty member shall mean a tenured/tenure-track member of the faculty of the Department.
 - d. RTP shall mean retention, tenure, and promotion.
 - e. Standards and/or Standards Document shall mean this Psychology Department Faculty Personnel Standards document.
 - f. UPS 210.000 shall mean the Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures document, University Policy Statement numbered 210.000.
 - g. The Prospectus shall mean a description of the probationary 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 Department standards and UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion.
 - h. The Portfolio and appendices are the functional equivalent of the Working Personnel Action File. It is a cumulative record that shall contain evidence of performance specified in UPS 210.000, for all of the years under review, and various forms required. The Portfolio is compiled initially by the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to be sure the Portfolio is current and complete before it is submitted to the Department Chair or Dean. Evaluations, recommendations, and rebuttals, if any, are added at the various levels of review.
2. Purposes and Scope
 - a. The purpose of this Standards Document is, in part, to set and to publicize the criteria and procedures by which the performance of individual faculty members shall be evaluated for RTP.
 - b. The purpose of this Standards Document is, furthermore, to set and to publicize the rights and the responsibilities of those involved with personnel evaluation matters.
 - c. The policies stated in this Standards Document, having been approved by the Department, are explicitly understood to be binding on all faculty members as well as on all evaluation and review bodies, and it is further

understood that these Standards along with UPS 210.000 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall be the only criteria that may be invoked.

- d. Nothing in this Standards Document may be in conflict with UPS 210.000 or the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

B. DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

1. Responsibilities. Members of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall carry out their responsibilities in accordance with UPS 210.000, and these Departmental Standards.
2. Committee Composition. The committee shall consist of five full-time tenured faculty, all of whom hold the rank of associate professor or full professor. An associate professor may not evaluate anyone applying for promotion to full professor. In order to ensure continuity, after the initial election of two 2-year members and three 1-year members, the Department will each year elect two members to 2-year terms and one to a 1-year term. No person shall serve on the personnel committee when that person will be on any type of leave during the year of service on the committee. According to UPS 210.00 (V.B.3), "If a department does not have the minimum number of eligible faculty required for the DPC, the department may elect one or more tenured faculty for its personnel committee from related disciplines including department chairs from other departments."
3. Election. The Department Chair will distribute a ballot with the names of all eligible faculty members. Voting will be done by rank ordering all names on the ballot (i.e., the number 1 is assigned to the top preferred choice, number 2 to the second choice, etc.). The two persons receiving the most favored rank will be elected to 2-year terms, the third highest person (and the fourth and fifth highest during the first year of this election method) will be elected to a one-year term. The next two highest persons will serve as the first and second alternate members of the committee. Election shall be completed no later than the end of the third week of classes of the fall semester.
4. Responsibilities of Alternate. The alternate(s) shall serve under any circumstance that a member is unable to serve on the committee. Such circumstances include, but are not necessarily limited to: (a) disqualification of a committee member (e.g., an associate professor may not evaluate anyone applying for promotion to full professor), (b) resignation, leave of absence, or sabbatical leave by a committee member, (c) extended illness, (d) a committee member assuming an administrative position in another academic unit or the University administration, and (e) a committee member becoming a member of the University Faculty Personnel Committee.

C. GENERAL GUIDELINES

1. Portfolio preparation and submission. It is the responsibility of each faculty member being considered for personnel action to prepare as completely as

possible the required information and documentation for his/her Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable as published annually by the university.

2. Portfolio organization and documentation. The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member in conformity with the standard table of contents as specified by UPS 210.000 (available from Faculty Affairs and Records). All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented. A standard Portfolio Vitae (i.e., the curriculum vitae to be used in the Portfolio), using American Psychological Association style wherever appropriate, including date and page numbers shall be used.
3. Categories for personnel action. There are three major categories of faculty performance criteria: Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional, University, and Community Service. Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity shall be valued more highly than service.

Service credit awarded to new hires will be honored by the Department. All academic efforts during service credit years will be included in the review for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor.

Evidence of continued scholarly and creative activity since promotion to the rank of associate professor or in the last 5 years assumes particular importance in the case of promotion to the rank of full professor.

In order to assist evaluators in making their judgments, faculty members shall provide documentation as to the quality of the contribution (e.g., editorial review and/or review by experts in the field) and their individual role in collaborative work.

4. Criteria. A rating of “Satisfactory” or “Exceeds expectations” in all three categories is required for a positive recommendation for normative-time tenure and/or promotion.
5. Professional responsibilities. As full-time employees of CSUF, members of the Department are expected to meet their professional responsibilities (as defined in the CBA and their hiring contract) as they apply to each of the evaluation categories. In the area of teaching, these responsibilities include, for example, holding assigned office hours and meeting classes at the assigned times and places. In the area of service, these responsibilities include, for example, attendance at department meetings, advisement responsibilities, and carrying out committee and other departmental duties as assigned by the department chair. Evaluators shall take into consideration the extent to which faculty members have met their professional responsibilities when evaluating performance.

D. THE PROSPECTUS

The Prospectus is intended to assist the faculty member and the Department to articulate expectations and ways that these expectations can be met. The Prospectus does not replace UPS 210.000 or Department standards, but instead serves as a planning tool and guide to the faculty member, Department, and college.

1. During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. 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 Department Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion.
2. The Prospectus is separate from and in addition to the retrospective, self-assessment narrative submitted in subsequent years. The Prospectus shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member's Portfolio that is submitted for each full performance review during the probationary period.
3. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean who will each provide written feedback.
4. Sequence of review:
 - a. The first-year faculty member shall submit a draft Prospectus to the Department Chair by February 28 of the first year in the tenure-track position.
 - b. The Chair shall provide the faculty member with comments and recommendations, if any, for revision.
 - c. The faculty member shall submit the revised Prospectus to the Chair for forwarding to the Dean and shall receive feedback by May 1.
5. During subsequent years, the faculty member may revise the Prospectus to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.
6. The Department Chair and the probationary faculty member's mentor, if the faculty member chooses to have one assigned, shall provide guidance, advice, and support to probationary faculty in preparing the Prospectus.

E. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

1. Teaching Narrative. In accordance with UPS 210.000 the faculty member shall provide a narrative in which (s)he reflects on his/her ongoing pedagogical strategies and techniques. This narrative shall include responses to student feedback and be documented by supporting evidence whenever possible. If the faculty member has received negative feedback in previous reviews, (s)he shall specifically address those criticisms. The narrative shall include a reflective review of the faculty member's teaching philosophy, performance, goals, and directions of his/her future teaching

2. Mandatory Evidence

- a. Course Syllabi and Materials: In order to aid in the evaluation of pedagogical approach and methods, the Teaching Appendix shall include representative syllabi, tests, handouts, or other pertinent class materials.
- b. Student Opinion Questionnaires: The Portfolio shall include a blank SOQ form, statistical summaries for each course; the Teaching Appendix shall include the actual raw data. The questionnaires shall be administered in accordance with the UPS policy on administration of SOQ (220.000) which ensures that faculty members do not see the results of evaluation until after they have submitted their grades.
- c. Grade Distribution Data: The faculty member shall include grade distributions from all classes taught during the period of review and any material which may help interpret the grade distribution data.
- d. Classroom Visitation Report: In the “Other Relevant Material for Teaching Performance” section of the Teaching Appendix, the faculty member shall include at least one classroom visitation report by a member of the Department Personnel Committee during the review period. This report should address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods, as indicated by UPS 210.000. (breadth and depth? currency?)
- e. Mentoring Activity. Faculty members are expected to actively participate in the mentoring of graduate and/or undergraduate students. Faculty should include evidence of mentoring activities in the “Other Relevant Material for Teaching Performance” section of the Teaching Appendix. These include the following activities:
 1. Classroom mentoring. Support for students in coursework (e.g., holding study or review sessions, providing extra study materials, meeting individually with students about coursework, providing self-assessment tools to students). These can be documented by emails, office hour or review session sign-in sheets, etc.
 2. Research mentoring. Support for student research (e.g., research papers or presentations that include students as authors, supervising/chairing Master’s theses and independent studies, being a committee member for Master’s theses).
 3. Career/academic mentoring. Support for students’ professional development (e.g., advising students on internships and programs of study, helping with applications to graduate school, writing letters of recommendation).

3. Optional Evidence

- a. Development and effective use of educational technology (e.g., videos, computer-assisted instruction, computer programs, and web-assisted instruction) and/or teaching innovations.
- b. Organization or participation in seminars or special training sessions devoted to improving one's knowledge and use of effective instructional methods.
- c. Participation in projects such as the Aging Studies Minor, Master's Program, teaching special courses, etc.
- d. Research projects that are related to improving or evaluating the faculty member's teaching.
- e. Written summaries of conferences with personnel committee members in which the instructor discusses teaching methods and materials.
- f. Letters from faculty members who are acquainted with the instructor's teaching abilities.
- g. Letters from students.
- h. Other evidence: the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee will judge the appropriateness or suitability of other items suggested by the faculty member as evidence of teaching performance during the personnel evaluation process.

4. Evaluation of Teaching – Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Full Professor

a. Pedagogical Approach and Methods

Pedagogical approach and methods will be evaluated based on the extent to which the tenured/tenure-track faculty member:

- (i) includes in his/her classes course content that maintains appropriate depth and breadth for the level of each course taught,
- (ii) maintains currency and relevance in topics and assignments, and
- (iii) assesses students' learning effectively and fairly.

An exceeds expectations rating shall require the faculty member to clearly explain in the teaching narrative and document in the Portfolio the ways in which s(he) clearly demonstrates *exemplary* pedagogy, assessment, and currency in the field.

A satisfactory rating shall require the faculty member to clearly explain in the teaching narrative and document in the Portfolio the ways in which s(he) demonstrates quality pedagogy, assessment, and currency in the field.

A needs improvement rating shall be given if a faculty member demonstrates quality instruction in at least two of the three areas listed above and provides a course of action to improve the third area.

An unsatisfactory rating shall be given if the faculty member fails to demonstrate quality instruction in at least two of the three areas listed above.

b. Student Opinion Questionnaires

Overall teaching effectiveness is assessed using the average of questions 1-5 of the student opinion form adopted by the Department. This evidence is provided by the “Totals” score reported in the “Mean” column from the SOQ form for each class. Any written comments by students shall be included in the Teaching Appendix and will be used to clarify the average rating and to provide information concerning specific strengths and weaknesses in the teaching performance. The rating scale for each question consists of a 5-point scale ranging from a low of 0 to a high of 4, with 4 representing the most positive rating of teaching effectiveness. The evaluated mean shall be based on the weighted average of all classes taught during the period of review. Faculty can compute this overall average by (1) Weighting the mean for each class (individual class mean * number of respondents for that class), (2) summing all of the weighted means, and (3) dividing the sum by the total number of respondents across all classes. Faculty should include a table summarizing their calculation of the weighted average. Ratings will be guided by the ranges below.

<u>Mean</u>	<u>Rating</u>
3.40+	Exceeds expectations
2.75-3.39	Satisfactory
2.00-2.74	Needs improvement
Below 2.00	Unsatisfactory

The DPC and Chair will also consider SOQ ratings in context, taking into account things such as subject matter, modality of instruction (online vs. in person), class size, session of instruction, course level, student written comments, and grading standards. The faculty member should provide documentation for any such contextual evidence.

c. Mentoring Activity

An exceeds expectations rating shall require evidence of active participation in all three areas of mentoring: classroom mentoring, research mentoring, and career/academic mentoring. A satisfactory rating shall require evidence of active participation in two areas of mentoring. A needs improvement rating shall require evidence of active participation in one area of mentoring. An unsatisfactory rating shall be given if there is insufficient evidence of active participation in any of the mentoring areas.

5. Overall Evaluation of Teaching

The three criteria (pedagogical approach and methods, SOQs, and mentoring) shall be weighted equally. An exceeds expectations rating shall require the faculty member to (a) receive an “exceeds expectations” rating in at least two of the three evaluation areas and no less than “satisfactory” on the other and (b) show evidence of activity on at least three different categories of optional evidence. A satisfactory rating shall require the faculty member to (a) receive at least “satisfactory” in two of the three evaluation areas and at least “needs improvement” on the other and (b) show evidence of activity on at least two different categories of optional evidence. A needs improvement rating shall require the faculty member to (a) receive at least “needs improvement” in two of the three evaluation areas and (b) show evidence of activity on at least one category of optional evidence. An unsatisfactory rating will be given if the faculty member receives a “unsatisfactory” rating in two of the three evaluation areas.

F. SCHOLARLY and CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Scholarly and creative activity shall include any activity that results in an original contribution to the field of psychology.

1. Scholarship Narrative. The faculty member shall provide a narrative concerning the ongoing program of scholarly and creative activity in which s(he) has been engaged since appointment in their current rank. This narrative should include briefings regarding the plan, execution, and accomplishments of the scholarly endeavors. The narrative will be especially helpful for those faculty members who are pursuing scholarly and creative activities but have not yet gained visibility through publications. The narrative should be documented by supporting evidence.
2. Mandatory Evidence
 - a. Scholarly Publications. The faculty member shall demonstrate continuing, regular activities that result (or are judged likely to result, in the case of second and third year probationary faculty) in high-quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications. The faculty member shall publish theoretical and/or empirical material in reputable, peer-reviewed journals. This includes already published or in-press articles as well as papers accepted for publication. The Chair and the DPC shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, press or venue, whether a publication is an article or a note) and the faculty member’s contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work. Order of authorship is less important than evidence of significant conceptual contribution. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the extent of his/her contribution in collaborative research.
 1. Documentation of scholarly and creative work is required. This documentation shall include a complete citation in APA format of each scholarly and creative work; a copy of each scholarly or creative work published since the faculty member’s

appointment; and copies of letters of acceptance for those completed works that are “in press” or otherwise in the process of publication. For works presented in a medium other than print, the copy may be in a form suitable for evaluation. Work that has been accepted for publication or presentation after a peer-review or jury process shall be distinguished from work that was not subject to a peer review or jury process.

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the status of the journal by providing evidence such as journal impact factor, citation rate, rejection rate, circulation rate, or other pertinent evidence.
 3. It is also the responsibility of the faculty member to document the extent of his/her contribution in collaborative research. The faculty member may elect to use the co-author disclosure form available from Faculty Affairs and Records.
3. Optional Evidence. Heavier weighting will be given to evidence for which a favorable review is provided. Published work shall be weighted more highly than unpublished work.
- a. Scholarly books and/or textbooks, either published or accepted for publication.
 - b. Peer-reviewed chapters in edited books or peer-reviewed entries in handbooks/encyclopedias, either published or accepted for publication.
 - c. Grants funded by private or federal extramural agencies.
 - d. Large grant proposals (\$100,000.00+) submitted to the University, governmental agencies, or private agencies. Proposals must be presented along with ratings and/or reviews received from the granting agency, or solicited peer reviews from a qualified scholar in the field pertaining to the quality of the proposal.
 - e. Grants funded by the University: Grants that have been approved or which have been accepted but not yet funded may be presented. Such grant proposals should, wherever possible, be accompanied by reviews. For grants that are in progress or grants that have been completed, a progress report of the findings should be provided.
 - f. Chapters in edited books or entries in handbooks/encyclopedias that have not been peer-reviewed.
 - g. Conference presentations: Communication of new research findings and/or ideas in paper or poster presentations and invited colloquia addresses may be presented. Copies of addresses or presentations should be provided. Faculty should note that some papers and posters may be better offered as evidence of teaching or professional activity rather than research activity.
 - h. Works under review, including research reports, theoretical papers, critical reviews, books, contributions to edited works.

- i. Other evidence: The appropriateness or suitability of other items suggested by the faculty member as evidence of scholarly and creative activity will be judged by the Department Chair and the DPC during the personnel evaluation process.

Not included are activities such as attending seminars, workshops, practicum courses, internship programs, or other activities in which the main goal is to increase the faculty member's awareness of already available knowledge and techniques. These are examples of Professional Activity and should be used as evidence of that category of faculty performance.

It is not acceptable to simply list scholarly and creative activity without supplying the committee with enough evidence to evaluate the end results of that activity, list research projects that are currently "in progress" without providing enough details to evaluate the possible merit of that research, or provide any other unreviewable or undocumented activity.

4. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity – Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Full Professor

A rating of exceeds expectations shall require at least six items from the list of evidence, at least four of which must be research publications in refereed journals, during the period of review. One of the first four optional categories of evidence may substitute for one peer-reviewed publication. A rating of satisfactory shall require at least five items from the list of evidence, at least three of which must be research publications in refereed journals, during the period of review. One of the first four optional categories of evidence may substitute in place of one peer-reviewed publication. A rating of needs improvement shall require at least four items from the list of evidence, at least two of which must be research publications in a refereed journal, during the period of review. A rating of unsatisfactory shall be given in the absence of at least two publications in a refereed journal.

G. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY, and COMMUNITY SERVICE

Service activity is required and valued by the Department as a means of involving faculty members in the inner workings of the Department, College, and University, and promoting the Department, the College, and University to the community at large. Therefore, the Department encourages participation in Departmental, College, and University committees as well as service to the community through participation in community programs. This is especially true for promotion to Full Professor; it is expected that faculty who have attained the rank of Associate Professor will invest significant energy supporting the work of the Department, College, and University by actively participating in committees and meetings in the Department, College, University, and professional arenas.

1. Service Narrative. The faculty member shall provide a narrative concerning the ongoing program of service activity in which s(he) has been engaged since appointment in their current rank. This narrative should include briefings regarding the activities and accomplishments of the service. Faculty shall use the narrative to highlight special involvement in service activities. For instance, faculty should denote types of committees (e.g., ad hoc, standing) or special positions (e.g., chair). The narrative should be documented by supporting evidence whenever possible in the “Professional, University, and Community Service Activities” and “Other Relevant Material for Service Activity Performance” sections of the Service Appendix.
2. Documentation. In order to aid in the evaluation of service, documentation in the form of representative materials such as programs, attendance lists, evidence of membership or similar materials shall be included.
3. Evidence. The following evidence may be used in evaluating activities related to professional, university, and community service.
 - a. Membership and/or offices held on committees at the Department, College and/or University levels.
 - b. Attendance at Department, College, and/or University meetings.
 - c. Other roles or services (e.g., Graduate Study Advisor).
 - d. Lectures or addresses given to University audiences, aside from regular teaching responsibilities.
 - e. Advisement of students beyond that required for classes and official office hours.
 - f. Sponsorship or advisement of student organizations.
 - g. Attendance and/or participation at conventions or meetings of professional societies.
 - h. Reviewing articles or books for professional journals (this, of course, includes being an editor for such a journal) or publishing companies.
 - i. Holding offices in or performing special services for professional organizations.
 - j. Attendance at seminars, workshops, courses, lectures, practice, etc., that improve the faculty member’s professional capacities.
 - k. Pursuing and/or completion of internships, post-doctoral training, and acquiring professional licenses.
 - l. Active membership in professional organizations.
 - m. Acting as advisor to groups (e.g., business or governmental agencies).

- n. Service to the community (e.g., lectures to community groups, assuming active or honorary positions of note in community organizations, special services rendered in community groups, or participation in special community activities).
- o. Awards recognizing excellent service to the Department, College, University, or community.
- p. Other evidence: The appropriateness or suitability of other items suggested by the faculty member as evidence of service activities will be judged by the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee during the personnel evaluation process.

4. Evaluation of Service – Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor

An exceeds expectations rating shall require active participation on more than one Department/College/University committee for a minimum of one year on each, and sufficient evidence of activity on at least three other categories of service during the period of review.

A satisfactory rating shall require active participation on at least one Department committee for a minimum of one year and sufficient evidence of activity on at least three other categories of service during the period of review.

A needs improvement rating shall require sufficient evidence of activity on at least three categories of service during the period of review.

An unsatisfactory rating will be given if the faculty member does not demonstrate sufficient evidence of activity on at least three categories of service during the period of review.

5. Evaluation of Service – Promotion to Full Professor

An exceeds expectations rating shall require participation on several Department/College/University committees, with at least four other categories of service during the period of review. The narrative and supporting documentation must demonstrate significant investment of time and effort.

A satisfactory rating shall require active participation on more than one Department/College/University committee, with at least three other categories of service during the period of review. The narrative and supporting documentation must demonstrate sufficient investment of time and effort.

A needs improvement rating shall require participation on at least one Department committee and sufficient evidence of activity on at least three other categories of service during the period of review.

An unsatisfactory rating will be given if the faculty member does not participate on at least one Department committee and does not demonstrate sufficient evidence of activity on at least three categories of service during the period of review.

The Chair and the DPC will take into consideration workload associated with committee assignments. Service on multi-year committees and those deemed more labor intensive (e.g., search, Personnel Committees, Goals & Directions) will be weighted more heavily.

H. REQUIREMENTS FOR RETENTION

The goal of the RTP process is to produce faculty members who qualify for tenure after their probationary employment. To be retained during the probationary period, a faculty member is required to demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely. This progress shall be judged relative to the Department Standards and UPS 210.000. A probationary faculty member is required to show appropriate accomplishments, growth, and promise in each of the three areas of assessment. Moreover, when weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement. The decision to retain (reappoint) a probationary faculty member is an affirmation that satisfactory progress is being made toward tenure; therefore, a probationary faculty member shall not be retained if the cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.

I. OVERALL EVALUATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A “Satisfactory” rating or better in each of three areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Professional, University, and Community Service, as defined in this document, would result in a recommendation for tenure.

J. OVERALL EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A “Satisfactory” rating or better in each of the three areas Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Professional, University, and Community Service, as defined in this document, would result in a recommendation for promotion.

K. REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION

1. Promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.
2. Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. All requirements specified in UPS 210.000 must be met before a positive recommendation can be made for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member must receive a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Professional, University, and Community Service, as defined in this document.

3. Promotion to Full Professor. Because the professorate entails continual growth and reassessment, 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, and future potential throughout their careers. Therefore, the decision to grant promotion to the rank of professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained vitality and commitment to the standards described above.

4. Early Promotion to Full Professor. All requirements specified in UPS 210.000 must be met before a positive recommendation can be made for early promotion to Full Professor. In addition, the faculty member must receive a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Professional, University, and Community Service, as defined in this document.