



University Policy Statement

UPS 210.002
TENURE AND PROMOTION
PERSONNEL STANDARDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table with 2 columns: Section Title and PAGES. Includes sections I. DEFINITIONS (2-3), II. FACULTY PERSONNEL STANDARDS (3-14), and III. DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE PERSONNEL PROCESS OUTSIDE THE REVIEW CYCLE (13-15).

I. DEFINITIONS

A. SCOPE

1. This document establishes the minimum standards that govern retention, promotion, and granting of tenure (RTP) for probationary faculty, and the promotion of tenured faculty in the absence of approved Departmental Personnel Standards.
2. The procedures in this document govern the process for developing, revising, and approving Departmental Personnel Standards.
3. The standards in this document apply to instructional, library, and counselor faculty. Appropriate criteria for each group of faculty are specified in Section II below.
4. The content of this document is subject to Board of Trustees policies; the California Administrative Code, Title 5; California Education Code; the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA); and other applicable State and Federal laws.
5. Throughout this document, the word *shall* indicates mandatory action; the word *may* indicates permissive action.

B. APPOINTMENT

Appointments of faculty are of two kinds:

1. Probationary Status

A probationary faculty member is normally given a two-year appointment.

Tenure-track faculty members are considered probationary faculty until they are awarded tenure or terminated. Probationary faculty members may be terminated for performance by decision of the President at the end of their second probationary year without further employment at the University. Faculty members who receive a termination notice during their third to sixth probationary year shall have a final, additional year of employment, called a terminal year. The probationary period is normally six years with either tenure or a final terminal year awarded before the end of the sixth year.

2. Tenured

Tenured faculty members are subject to Full Performance Reviews when they apply for promotion to Professor.

C. RANKS

Probationary and tenured teaching faculty members are appointed as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Probationary and tenured library faculty members are appointed as Senior Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian, equivalent to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, respectively. Probationary and tenured counselor faculty are appointed as Student Services Professional-Academically Related (SSP-AR) levels one, two, or three, equivalent to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, respectively.

D. SERVICE CREDIT

1. When prior service credit has been granted in accordance with UPS 210.001 Recruitment of Tenure-Track Faculty, Full Performance Reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion shall include documentation of accomplishments during those specific years for which the service credit was granted.
2. In evaluations for retention, tenure, and promotion, accomplishments during service credit years shall be weighed in reasonable proportion to those achieved during probationary years at CSUF. However, accomplishments during service credit years shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion and/or tenure.

E. TENURE

1. Tenure establishes the right to continued permanent employment except when such employment is voluntarily terminated or is terminated by the University pursuant to the CBA or law.
2. Probationary faculty members shall normally be considered for tenure during the sixth probationary year, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed.
3. A written request for tenure that occurs in any year except the sixth probationary year shall be considered a request for early tenure. Probationary faculty who do not receive early tenure may be reappointed to probationary status.
4. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in an administrative position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be awarded only after an evaluation and recommendation from the appropriate DPC, Department Chair, Dean or equivalent; Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), and appropriate Vice President.

F. PROMOTION TO A HIGHER RANK

1. A probationary faculty member shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time as the tenure decision. A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. Under exceptional circumstances and in accordance with approved personnel department standards, a faculty member may be considered for early promotion after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF. Promotion of a tenured faculty member to Professor shall normally be considered during their fifth year in rank, with promotion being effective at the beginning of the sixth year.
2. Promotion consideration prior to having completed four years in rank shall be defined as "early." A tenured faculty member may request that they not be considered for promotion during their fifth year in rank by submitting a written request to Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) no later than the end of the second week of classes of the fall semester. After requesting that their file not be considered, tenured faculty may request promotion consideration in a future academic year by submitting a written request to Faculty Affairs and Records no later than the end of the second week of classes of the fall semester.

G. EARLY PROMOTION AND/OR EARLY TENURE

In order to be considered for early promotion or early tenure, the eligible faculty member shall apply in writing to Faculty Affairs and Records no later than the end of the second week of classes of the fall semester.

II. FACULTY PERSONNEL STANDARDS

A. REQUIREMENTS

1. General Principles

Advancement of learning is central to the mission of California State University, Fullerton. We therefore seek to develop and maintain a faculty actively engaged in furthering learning.

A productive instructional faculty member engages in the following three complementary aspects of professional life:

- teaching both in and out of the classroom, that advances inclusive and equitable student learning and utilizes inclusive and equitable pedagogical practices;
- scholarly and creative activities that foster peer/discipline/community learning; and
- service/professional work that supports the advancement of the learning community.

A productive library faculty member engages in the following three complementary aspects of professional life:

- performance as a librarian in accordance with the Assignment of Responsibilities.
- scholarly and creative activities; and
- library, university, professional and community service that supports the advancement of the learning community

A productive counselor faculty member shall engage in the following three complementary aspects of professional life:

- mastery and currency in professional counseling that employs a variety of counseling modes and assessment methods.
 - involvement in department, university and community service activities with clearly defined objectives
 - well-defined and focused professional and scholarly activities that are committed to continued growth and accomplishment, and that produce counseling-related accomplishments
- a. Each faculty member is expected to make suitable contributions in all three of the appropriate above areas to become a contributing citizen in our community of learners.
 - b. For all RTP actions, performance shall meet approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document for a positive decision to be made.
 - c. Departmental Personnel Standards should state the necessary levels of performance for positive decisions for tenure and promotion in a manner that specifies the total requirements. The DPS may also include specific language regarding the frequency of the activities.
 - d. For instructional faculty, teaching should be the most important criterion for retention, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
 - e. These standards state the necessary levels of performance for positive decisions. Levels of performance required for promotion to Professor should be equal or greater than the performance required for promotion to Associate Professor.
 - f. These standards shall serve as guidelines for development and interpretation of Departmental Personnel Standards. For departments without approved Departmental Personnel Standards, the standards in this document shall be the basis to evaluate faculty performance.

2. Requirements for Retention

The goal of the RTP process is to support, identify, and reward 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. A probationary faculty member is required to show appropriate accomplishments, growth, and promise in each of the three areas of review. 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.

3. Requirements for Tenure

- a. 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 the faculty member's 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 the approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document.

- b. The decision to grant tenure shall be based solely on an evaluation of the faculty member's performance as documented by the evidence contained in the WPAF and Appendices. Tenure is expected if the faculty member's accomplishments are of sufficient quality and meet expectations stated in the approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document. When concerns have been expressed in earlier review cycles, a candidate for tenure is expected to have addressed these concerns specifically in the narrative.
- c. 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 distinction in all three areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue. In order to be considered for early tenure, the eligible faculty member shall apply in writing to Faculty Affairs and Records on or before the end of the second week of classes of the fall semester.

4. Requirements for Promotion

- a. Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.
- b. A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation.
- c. The University expects that the tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Promotion to Professor requires that the tenured faculty member has displayed accomplishments that meet the expectations for promotion stated in the approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document. The decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained commitment to the standards described herein.
- d. Departments are encouraged to consider offering different paths to promotion to Professor (e.g.: exceptional performance in teaching and service, and satisfactory performance in research)
- e. Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor. The WPAF shall be submitted by October 1 of the sixth probationary year for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Therefore, the review period for promotion to professor begins October 2 of the sixth probationary year. Any materials added to the WPAF during the review process (i.e., after October 2) for promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.
- f. Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained commitment to teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of Excellent.
- g. A candidate for promotion may withdraw their promotion request without prejudice at any level of review prior to the final decision. The withdrawal request must be submitted in writing to FAR. If the withdrawal request is submitted prior to October 1 or the faculty member fails to submit a WPAF by October 1, the candidate may be eligible to serve on the DPC.

B. CRITERIA for EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

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

Faculty members belonging to traditionally underrepresented groups (such as women and faculty of color) may experience additional demands on their time over and above the usual demands made of all faculty members. For example, female students may seek out female faculty members over male faculty members for mentorship or advice. This phenomenon has been termed “cultural taxation.” As part of its ongoing dedication to diversity, equity, and inclusion, CSUF is committed to recognizing cultural taxation when it

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

Mentoring students—and particularly engaging them in research and other scholarly and creative activities—is an especially valuable form of faculty work. It therefore also deserves consideration in the evaluation process. Examples include supervising a student’s thesis, project, presentation, or performance, publishing work with a student, supporting students to present their work at conferences, engaging undergraduates in research (for example, as part of an independent study), and coaching students to participate in competitions (particularly when students receive recognition at said competitions). Other forms of mentorship may include career, academic, and club advising. These lists are not exhaustive.

1. Teaching

a. General Guidelines for Assessing Teaching Performance

CSUF strives for inclusive equitable and anti-racist teaching and learning environments where student learning is central. In this anti-racist, non-discriminatory, equitable, and inclusive environment, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content, and review of their materials, and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills to contribute to society.

A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in the discipline, teaches effectively, and enables students to learn.

Approved departmental personnel standards shall address how teaching will be considered in the evaluation process, the criteria that will be used to assess teaching performance, and potential sources of evidence that can be used to assess performance in each criteria. The evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance. The evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

All evidence shall be included in the WPAF and Appendices (see Part III.B.).

b. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance

A faculty member’s teaching performance should be assessed using the criteria below. The examples and sources of evidence provided in the tables below are for illustrative purposes and are not meant to be comprehensive.

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiry.	Syllabi, classroom observation reports (see UPS 210.080), narrative summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments, student opinion questionnaires, effective LMS pages
Provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, student opinion questionnaires, effective LMS pages

Sets clear communication guidelines with students (UPS 300.004)	Narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses, syllabi
Manages class time well	Classroom observation reports, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses
Creates a classroom environment that encourages student interaction and engagement	Classroom observation reports, narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses, effective LMS pages, high impact practices (HIPS)
Clarity of presentation	Classroom observation reports, sample slide presentations, recorded lectures, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses, effective LMS pages
Creates a classroom environment that contributes to equitable learning for all students	Syllabi, classroom observation reports, effective and accessible LMS pages

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Course objectives and learning goals are clearly defined and made clear to students at the start of the course.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, student opinion questionnaires
Assessments and grading practices are clearly related to course goals.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, narrative summary, student opinion questionnaires
Class time is well organized and effectively used to meet goals	Syllabi, classroom observation reports, narrative summary, student opinion questionnaires
Course content emphasizes students' acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments narrative summary, peer review
Syllabus is understandable and comprehensive	Syllabi; peer review

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Uses a variety of appropriate teaching/learning strategies in the classroom.	Classroom observation reports, narrative summary,
Instructional methods and approaches are appropriate to course learning goals and student outcomes.	Syllabi, narrative summary, peer reviews
Accessible technology appropriate to the learning experience is used to enhance student participation.	Syllabi, narrative summary, peer review, student opinion questionnaires
Assignments help advance course learning goals and contribute to achieving student outcomes.	Project/assignment details, examples of student work/projects/assignments, peer review

Pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter and consider student needs.	Syllabi, classroom observations, examples of student work/projects/assignments, FDC workshops, peer review
--	--

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Academic goals, expectations, and/or competencies appropriate to the course.	Syllabi, narrative summary, assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics
Effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing, other assessments, and grading procedures are evident.	Syllabi, narrative summary, student writing and projects, student opinion questionnaire comments
Grading system is fair, transparent, and conducive to learning.	Assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Familiarity with pedagogical developments	CV, narrative summary
Engages in some form of continuous improvement of teaching	Narrative summary
Actively solicits and uses student feedback in course development and revision	Narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses
Continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment(s).	CV, narrative summary, FDC workshops
Addressing weaknesses identified in past evaluations via concrete plans	Narrative summary
Developing new courses	CV, narrative summary
Organization of pedagogical workshops	CV, narrative summary
Supervision of student research and other forms of mentorship	CV, narrative summary, letters of support
Developing service learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, and/or semester abroad courses.	CV, narrative summary, letters of support

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Gives final exam or project, if required by the instructor, on the date/time assigned by the University (see UPS 300.005).	Syllabi
Maintains office hours (see UPS 230.020).	Syllabi, student opinion questionnaires
Syllabus meets university and college requirements (see UPS 300.004).	Syllabi

When evaluating the faculty member's teaching performance and currency through the application of the criteria listed above, departments may vary in how they use evidence in the WPAF. Where quantitative evidence is used in the application of criteria for teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency, departments should strive to maintain an appropriate balance between quantitative and qualitative evidence.

c. Student Opinion Questionnaires

While use of standardized Student Opinion Questionnaires is required as part of the evaluation process, any data gathered from SOQs must be considered within a broader constellation of artifacts and should follow evidence-based guidelines and best practices.

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

If departmental personnel documents specify SOQ score ranges that characterize instruction as “exceeds expectations,” “satisfactory,” etc., then they shall also detail how other measures of teaching effectiveness are evaluated, including peer evaluations, quality of teaching materials and assessments, self-reflections, etc. This is to avoid the cognitive bias that overweighs quantitative measures relative to qualitative measures.

It is important to note that for SOQ ordinal scales frequency distribution and dispersion are more appropriate measures than averages. Any analysis of SOQ ranges should take into account unique characteristics of courses such as level, class size, format, content, etc. Faculty members who believe their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching are encouraged to carefully explain their scores, and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be noted by the reviewers.

d. Grade Distributions

Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught as evidenced by their syllabi, assignments, samples of graded student work etc. Grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. Academic rigor shall be assessed based on readings, assignments, samples of student work, rubrics, etc.

2. Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments

a. General Criteria

Each faculty member shall establish a record of scholarly/creative endeavor that generates, integrates and/or disseminates knowledge. When appropriate, these endeavors shall be integrated with teaching, actively involve students, and attract external support. A successful faculty member has a well-defined and focused scholarly/creative agenda and is committed to continued growth and accomplishment in these areas. Each department shall state in its standards those scholarly and creative activities, consistent with this document that are appropriate indicators of

professional growth for its faculty. The evaluations, at all levels, should take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

b. Specific Criteria

1. Accomplishments

Faculty shall demonstrate continuing, regular activities that result (or are judged likely to result, in the case of second- and third-year probationary faculty) in high quality peer-reviewed (when appropriate) scholarly publications, funded grants, or creative performances or exhibits.

Quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, press or venue, whether a publication is an article or a note and whether a performance or exhibition is regional, national, or international in scope) and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work.

Candidates shall include documentation of all accomplishments, including a complete citation in their CV, in the style customary to the faculty member's discipline, for each scholarly and creative work; a copy of each scholarly or creative work published during the review period; 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 as appropriate to the discipline 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.

Documentation of the peer-review or jury process must be included as documentation in the WPAF. The Departmental Personnel Standards may state specific criteria for when a scholarly or creative work is considered complete (e.g., when it is accepted for publication or presentation without revision, when it is published online, when it is published in print, etc.) In absence of these criteria, scholarly or creative works shall be considered to have been completed when they have been accepted for publication or presentation without further revision.

2. On-Going Activities

Faculty may further demonstrate their contributions with evidence of professional recognition of their contributions to the discipline. Evidence may include book or article prizes; non-refereed invited papers, exhibits, and performances; comments and replies; book reviews; and evidence of citations of the faculty member's published work. Documentation should be provided for scholarly and creative work in progress. This documentation may include copies of intramural and extramural grant proposals, grant award letters, abstracts of papers presented at professional meetings, papers currently being reviewed for publication, copies of manuscripts in preparation, etc.

3. Professional, University, and Community Service

a. General Criteria

A successful faculty member is collegial and actively involved in professional, University, and/or community activities. Each faculty member shall contribute to the profession, to the University, and to the community through appropriate professional and service activities. Faculty should clearly define objectives for their involvement in each service activity (e.g., developing mutually beneficial working partnerships, serving the needs of the profession and/or external community, enhancing the campus' role as a regional center, and/or strengthening institutional effectiveness and collegial governance, maintaining and improving the quality of the learning environment).

Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall address those professional, University, and community service activities that are appropriate indicators of service contribution for its faculty. The evaluation should take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

Activities shall be related to one's profession at Cal State Fullerton. Documentation shall be specified in DPS documents and provided for all significant accomplishments.

b. Service Activities

All faculty members shall contribute to faculty governance and participate in professional or academic organizations. Contributions may include serving as a member or leader of department, college, or University committees; organizing conference sessions; serving on organization boards or committees; sponsoring student organizations; developing/facilitating internships, service learning opportunities, or community-engaged learning opportunities; being a discussant of presented papers; and participating in other related activities. Evaluation shall assess the quality, duration and significance of service. Faculty may demonstrate further service contributions by engaging in such activities as serving on system-wide committees, serving the faculty bargaining unit, serving the community through application of knowledge in the discipline, sponsoring student organizations, participating in educational equity and outreach efforts, being interviewed by the media, and authoring publications pertinent to the University's objectives.

C. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF LIBRARY FACULTY

The Department believes that the best way to maintain a superior Library is to support and assist faculty in becoming effective, experienced, and excellent librarians. The review process provides an opportunity for the recognition of areas of strength and achievement of a Library faculty member as well as recommendations for potential improvement. In evaluating supporting documentation, evaluators shall consider the quality of accomplishments as well as the quantity.

Evaluators shall make judgments about the level of performance of each Library faculty member. The three areas in which Library faculty shall be evaluated for the purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion are: 1) Performance as a Librarian; 2) Scholarly/Creative Activities; and 3) Library, University, Professional, and Community Service.

The Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR) specifies expectations for performance with assignments that shall correlate closely with activities expected of librarian faculty unit employees to qualify for retention, tenure, and promotion and, following tenure, activities expected of librarian faculty unit employees in order to maintain their role as contributing members of the bargaining unit. According to the CBA (section 20.9), such assignments shall be made by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the librarian faculty unit employee. All AORs covering the period of review must be included in all reviews.

The Library Department shall develop Departmental Personnel Standards that detail appropriate activities in each of the three areas as indicators of professional accomplishment. These standards shall require levels of performance commensurate with those required by law, the CBA, University policy and Section II of UPS 210.002. Once approved, the DPS shall be the sole document of evaluation.

1. Performance as Librarian

Performance as Librarian is the most important area of evaluation for Library faculty undergoing a retention, tenure, and/or promotion review. The Performance as Librarian narrative with its supporting documentation is the primary basis of the evaluation. The narrative shall describe, but is not limited to, the librarian's activities under each of the areas of librarian performance in the AOR and shall not exceed 1,000 words.

2. Scholarly/Creative Activities

Library faculty are expected to engage in scholarly/creative activities that contribute to knowledge or further understanding of the discipline of library science, academic discipline(s), and/or special assignments in which the Library faculty member has expertise.

Scholarly/creative activities are important for retention, tenure, and promotion. A successful library faculty member will have a well-defined and focused scholarly/creative agenda and will be committed to continued growth and accomplishment. The Scholarly/Creative Activities narrative (together with the accompanying documentation) is the primary tool for evaluation of performance in this area. The narrative of no more than 1,000 words should consist of a concise discussion of the activities that transpired during the review period.

Scholarly/creative activities include peer-reviewed and other publications, presentations, grants, and other high quality creative activities. Works that are peer-reviewed carry the greatest weight. The librarian should state clearly if a publication, presentation, or other scholarly/creative activity is in progress, submitted, accepted, published, or otherwise completed and include supporting evidence. Works that are published, presented, or accepted for publication or presentation carry greater weight than works submitted or in progress.

Collaborative research and publication are encouraged; however, evaluators shall evaluate such co-authored publications based on the level of involvement by the Library faculty member. A co-authorship form is required for activities of this type.

The Evaluators shall assess the rigor, academic value, and relevance of the activities and determine the level of performance after reviewing the faculty narrative and accompanying documentation pertaining to scholarly/creative activities.

3. Library, University, Professional and Community Service

All Library faculty members shall be actively involved in service activities in support of the Department, the Library, the University, the CSU, the profession, and the wider community. These contributions shall have well-defined objectives that support Library and University mission and goals, be aligned, where possible, with the librarian's professional and subject expertise, and emphasize quality over quantity. Library faculty service shall be evaluated by a narrative of no more than 1,000 words and supporting documentation.

For service activities that extend over multiple years (e.g., membership on a committee, term as Department Chair), service for one year is considered to be one activity, service for two years is considered to be two activities, and so on.

Evaluators shall assess service activities by considering: the impact on the Department, the Library, the University, and the community, the time commitment required, the preparation required, the degree of leadership demonstrated, and the extent to which the activities support the Library's and University's mission and goals.

D. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF COUNSELOR FACULTY

1. Professional Counseling Performance

Evidence shall be demonstrated through competence in each of the following areas in which the Counselor faculty member has participated:

- Counseling Services (individual and group, and/or crisis interventions),
- Case Management (per job description)
- Formal Case presentation
- Ethics (credentialing approval)
- Culturally informed practices

Documentation shall include: statistical summaries of student feedback, peer feedback on case conference; evidence demonstrating maintaining current knowledge related to best practices; and evidence demonstrating current knowledge related to culturally informed practices. Documentation

may also include informal feedback (cards, letters, emails) from campus or community partners and evidence related to consultations.

2. Service to the Department, University and Community

Evidence shall be demonstrated through competence in each of the following areas of service with clearly defined objectives for that involvement at the following levels:

- Department
- University
- Community (local, state, and national)

Consideration shall be given to public service contributions that relate directly to one's mental health position, and to committee and individual activities to enhance the goals of the mental health community, University, and department. These activities may include committee participation at department, University, and community levels; participation in training and supervision (clinical and non-clinical) activities at department, University, and community levels, individual and group projects directed toward department, University, and community goals; and mentoring of colleagues; and contributions to the community at large such as organizational leadership and presentations.

3. Professional and Scholarly Activities

Evidence shall be demonstrated through competence in each of the following areas in which the Counselor faculty member has participated:

- To students
- To the University
- To the community

Documentation shall include at least one of the following: statistical summaries, formal feedback, informal feedback (cards, letters, emails) from campus or community partners; assessment provided by members of the University or professional community; inclusion of presentation materials; inclusion of recorded presentations; marketing materials; publishing of books or articles in professional or scholarly journals; evidence of professional duties within organizations related to mental health; evidence and outcomes of quality assurance/program evaluation/needs assessment studies completed within department, university or community.

III. DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE PERSONNEL PROCESS OUTSIDE THE REVIEW CYCLE

A. DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL STANDARDS FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

1. Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards shall be consistent with Section II of this document and 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.
2. Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. If agreement on standards has not been reached, or there are no approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or Departmental Personnel Standards are not in compliance with this document or the CBA, personnel decisions in the department shall be controlled by the standards in Section II of this document. FAR shall notify departments and colleges (the Department Chair or Program Coordinator and the College Dean) when the Departmental Personnel Standards are out of compliance.
3. An essential component of the initial approval and subsequent review of Departmental Personnel Standards is the College Personnel Standards Review Committee (CPSRC). Each college shall elect its own CPSRC. The CPSRC is not a peer-review committee and all tenured faculty are eligible to serve. The CPSRC should comprise no fewer than five and no more than seven members. The chair

and the majority of the CPSRC should participate in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion training once per appointment. The CPSRC is charged solely with the review of Departmental Personnel Standards and does not review the files of faculty undergoing evaluation of any kind whether within the RTP process or in a Post Tenure Review. In the absence of a CPSRC, the Faculty Personnel Committee shall serve in that role.

4. The process for developing and approving Departmental Personnel Standards shall be as follows:
 - a. Proposed Departmental Personnel Standards or revisions to previously approved standards shall be drafted by the Department Personnel Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair. Copies of the draft document shall be distributed by the Department Chair to all members of the department. Department members shall have the opportunity to suggest, in writing, amendments to the draft. The members of the department shall vote on this document. Faculty are allowed to submit dissenting opinions which will accompany the report to the CPSRC. No later than September 20 of the academic year prior to the academic year in which they are to go into effect, these departmentally approved standards, revisions, and any minority report or dissent shall be forwarded by the Department Chair to the CPSRC.
 - b. The primary purpose of review by the CPSRC is to ensure that the standards conform to the standards of the college, this document, and to the provisions of the CBA and to check for coherence and precision. If the CPSRC does not approve the standards, the CPSRC shall meet with the chair of the DPC to suggest revisions. Upon approval by the CPSRC the Departmental Personnel Standards shall be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for review and approval.
 - c. The primary purpose of the Dean's review of the standards is to check them for conformity to the standards and practices of the University as specified in this document and in the body of previously approved standards. No later than December 1, the Dean or appropriate administrator shall recommend to the appropriate Vice President either (1) approval, without modification; (2) approval, with modifications or concerns as specified; or (3) disapproval, with reasons specified. The Dean shall forward their recommendation to Faculty Affairs and Records for transmission to the appropriate Vice President.
 - d. Should the Dean recommend disapproval or should the Vice President be considering disapproval of proposed standards, a conference shall be held, no later than February 10, among the DPC, the Department Chair, the Dean, the CPSRC, and the appropriate Vice President to discuss revision of the standards. Following this conference, the department shall consider revisions, which shall be approved by vote of the department faculty. No later than March 1, the department shall submit suitably revised standards to the Vice President with a memorandum indicating any modifications and rationale for them.
 - e. All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). The Vice President shall issue such approval or disapproval in writing stating the reasons for disapproval, no later than March 30. Should the Vice President disapprove, the department shall have the opportunity to submit suitably revised standards no later than April 30. The Vice President shall approve or disapprove such revised standards no later than May 15.
 - f. Upon approval by the Vice President, Departmental Personnel Standards shall be in effect without further review until the department revises them or until the Vice President withdraws approval of them. Approval shall be withdrawn after consultation with the appropriate Dean and the CPSRC and only on the grounds that the standards do not conform to University policy.
 - g. Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall normally be formally reviewed by the department as part of the program performance review or an accreditation process. Exceptions to this timeline may be granted in consultation with FAR. The outcome of this formal review may be proposed revisions or reaffirmation of the existing standards. In either event a summary of the discussion shall be forwarded to the CPSRC.

- h. Departmental Personnel Standards shall not conflict with law or University policy. In no case may Departmental Personnel Standards require lower substantive levels of performance than those required by law, University policy, or Section II of this document.
- i. Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.
- j. Departments shall not change their standards without going through the approval process described herein.
- k. Departments shall consider that changes to personnel standards should not adversely affect faculty during the RTP process.

B. STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRES

1. All departments shall adopt one or more instructional evaluation forms to ascertain student opinions of instruction. The same form shall be used in all classes of the same kind: e.g., undergraduate course sections, lab course sections, internships, seminars, etc.
2. All forms utilized for personnel actions shall include adequate space for written student comments. Students shall be informed at the time of evaluation that they have the right to include written comments.
3. The questions included in the instructional evaluation forms shall align with the criteria for evaluating teaching performance, as stated in the approved Department Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document.
4. The policies and procedures for the administration of SOQs are defined in UPS 220.000.
5. Each department shall develop fair and equitable guidelines for the evaluation of teaching performance so that Student Opinion Questionnaires (or summaries) submitted in the WPAF can be interpreted.
6. The CPSRC recommends approval of department Student Opinion Questionnaire forms to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If that committee determines that forms in use do not meet the requirements of this document or criteria in the approved DPS, it shall recommend modifications to the department.
7. Any changes in Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be reviewed by the CPSRC which then advises the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Source: Faculty Affairs Committee and
Diversity & Inclusion Committee

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 8, 2022
Supersedes: UPS 210.002 dated 6-3-21
and ASD 21-75