The guidelines and procedures contained in this document apply to the faculty of the Human Communication Studies Department for use in determining recommendations for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The DPC (Department Personnel Committee) is elected annually by the faculty and consists of an equal number of members from each of the two degree programs within the Department: (1) communication theory and process and (2) communicative disorders.

Each faculty member under review is responsible for preparing a Portfolio ensuring that the file is consistent with the most recent UPS 210.000. The faculty member should attempt to limit the Portfolio itself to one binder. Supporting materials can be included in additional binders as appendices to the Portfolio.

I. Development Plans and Developmental Narratives

Probationary faculty make progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion according to the Department Personnel Standards, UPS 210.000, and either a Developmental Plan or a Developmental Narrative as described below.

A. Development Plan

The Development Plan was discontinued with the approval of the revision of UPS 210.000 that became effective on June 19, 2002. However, any faculty member who has an approved Developmental Plan will continue to address that plan and the goals contained in it as they progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion.

For those faculty who have approved Development Plans, progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion will be measured according to the expectations set forth in UPS 210.000 and the Department Personnel Standards (Reference UPS 210.000, II). The Development Plan shall describe what a faculty member expects to accomplish in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service during probationary years. The Development Plan shall be between 500 and 1500 words.

A new faculty mentor can be appointed at any time if the probationary faculty member makes such a request.

B. Developmental Narrative.

Probationary faculty appointed effective August 22, 2002 will prepare a prospective Developmental Narrative during the first year of employment, as prescribed in UPS
The Developmental Narrative shall identify a set of professional goals that are intended to lead to retention, tenure, and promotion.

The Developmental Narrative will have no formal approval process, will not be reviewed by the department personnel committee, but will be reviewed by the department chair and the dean who will provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to May 1. (Reference UPS 210.000, II)

The Developmental Narrative will be included in the faculty member’s portfolio that is submitted for review during the probationary period. The Developmental Narrative is in addition to and separate from retrospective, self-assessment narratives that have always been part of the portfolio. (Reference UPS 210.000, III.A.3.f)

During subsequent years, the Developmental Narrative may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period. (Reference UPS 210.000, II).

In consultation with the probationary faculty member and the DPC, the Chair shall appoint a faculty member to serve as a mentor to the probationary faculty member in writing the Developmental Narrative.

A new faculty mentor can be appointed at any time if the probationary faculty member makes such a request.

C. Evaluation

Each faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the three categories prescribed by UPS 210.000 (Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Professional, University, and Community Service). All evaluators will use qualitative judgments whenever appropriate in each category. All evaluators will focus on the narratives provided by the faculty member and will evaluate the congruence of claims with the data provided as support.

II. Teaching

Each faculty member is responsible for including the following materials in the Portfolio: (1) a concise narrative, not to exceed 1,000 words, addressing teaching performance and an explicit articulation of pedagogical approach and methods; (2) evaluators’ comments from classroom visitation(s) of teaching; (3) statistical summaries of all responses on Student Rating of Instruction (SRI) forms administered to classes taught during the review period; (4) statistical summaries of grade distributions for all classes taught during the review period; and (5) other materials that provide evidence of teaching performance (these materials should be referenced in the narrative but included in an appendix). All materials used as evidence in support of teaching performance should be summarized in the narrative.

Classroom visitations should be completed on a regular basis (at least two classroom visitations every full performance review period) and will be conducted as prescribed in the “Department Peer Evaluation Guidelines.” Evaluators’ comments should address
issues such as the following: (1) course content, e.g., relationship of class session to course syllabi and assigned readings; the degree to which the content of the presentation is relevant to the subject, reflects current thinking in the discipline, and includes relevant viewpoints; appropriate level of difficulty of the material presented; (2) organization of the presentation, e.g., logical sequence of topics; pace of presentation, inclusion of summaries and syntheses, manages class time effectively; (3) clarity of presentation, explains ideas and information clearly, provides relevant examples and illustrations, answers students’ questions clearly; (4) style of teaching, e.g., stimulates students’ critical thinking, engages students in problem solving, demonstrates professional and ethical behavior; and (5) instructor-student interaction, e.g., engages class members in interaction, creates a healthy and stimulating classroom atmosphere, allows students to respond to each other; and creates an atmosphere in which mutual respect is demonstrated.

A. Mandatory Indicators for Evaluation of Teaching Performance

1. Course Content
   a. Most current syllabus for each different course taught during the review period, including learning objectives, assignments and requirements, and grading criteria
   b. Selected examples of assignments, handouts, and reading lists
   c. Selected examples of exams and quizzes

2. Classroom Teaching
   a. All student ratings of instruction, including raw data forms and statistical summaries
   b. Reports of classroom visitations by department colleagues

3. Grading Practices
   a. Statistical summary of grade distributions from all classes taught at C.S.U.F. during the review period
   b. Rationale for grading practices in accordance with the department “Grade Distribution Policy”

4. Non-Classroom Teaching - evidence of involvement in student advising and formal or informal mentoring

B. Optional Indicators for Measuring Teaching Effectiveness

1. Classroom Teaching: materials such as teaching awards and unsolicited, signed student letters

2. Teaching Innovations
   a. Information regarding instructional grants
b. Research conducted that relates to teaching in the discipline

c. Specific tools, instruments, devices, workbooks, and methods of
   instruction implemented in the classroom

d. New course proposals

3. Non-Classroom Instruction

   a. Information regarding involvement with M.A. theses and/or graduate-level
      directed research

   b. Information regarding directed independent studies

C. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Performance

Evaluation of teaching shall be based upon the total evidence reflected by student ratings
of instruction and other mandatory and optional indicators. Using a scale that includes
the ratings “Superior,” “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory,” teaching
performance is evaluated as a composite of all standards listed below.

1. Qualitative indicators of instruction: All teaching indicators, mandatory and
   optional, shall be qualitatively assessed and evaluators shall render a rating of
   “Superior,” “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory” using the criteria below:

   a. Course content is of appropriate depth for the course level, and the content
      reflects recent trends in the discipline

   b. Teaching strategies are effective, and there is evidence of significant
      successful effort to improve teaching effectiveness continuously

   c. Evaluation of student learning is both rigorous and valid, and in
      accordance with the department “Grade Distribution Policy”

   d. Breadth is shown through the ability to teach a variety of courses

2. Student ratings of instruction (SRI). Department-sanctioned student opinion
   forms utilize a five point rating scale ranging from “A” (4) to “E” (0). Student ratings of
   instruction contribute to the evaluation of faculty members’ teaching effectiveness but
   should not be used as the sole measure. Overall patterns for the duration of the evaluation
   period shall be considered more informative than isolated course evaluations. The
   following table will be used to evaluate instructor effectiveness based on the statistical
   summaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Overall Mean SRI</th>
<th>Overall Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>3.50 or higher</td>
<td>And 80% A’s or B’s, with at least 50% A’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3.20 - 3.49</td>
<td>And 70% A’s and B’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>2.90 - 3.19</td>
<td>And 50% A’s and B’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Below 2.90</td>
<td>And Fewer than 50% A’s and B’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rating system is used as a guideline: Written student comments included on the
rating forms will be used as an aid to interpret quantitative reports of student opinions.
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 vs. traditional pedagogy, major vs. G.E., etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member’s overall level of experience and his or her efforts to improve teaching performance.

3. Composite rating of teaching effectiveness: Based on a composite evaluation of the SRI data and other indicators, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching effectiveness as either: “Superior,” “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory.” The composite rating shall incorporate both SRI and qualitative measures. In the assessment of qualitative and quantitative information, qualitative information will be given primacy.

III. Scholarly and Creative Activities

The Department expects that faculty members will show on-going development in scholarly and creative activities as demonstrated in two ways: (1) evidence of a systematic research program, and (2) progression from third-level and second-level activities to first-level scholarly and creative activities as described below. Scholarly/creative efforts may be published in traditional print form or equivalent electronic publication format. Faculty members shall provide evidence of the value or importance of their scholarly and creative contributions to the field by including the following indicators as available and appropriate: (1) relative prestige of journals in which one’s work appears; (2) acceptance/rejection rates of journals, paper panels, or interest groups at conferences; (3) competitive rankings of work accepted for publication or presentation, where such rankings are available; (4) honors or awards bestowed on one’s work; (5) frequency with which one’s work is cited by other scholars; (6) book reviews of one’s work; and (7) letters from journal editors or associate editors acknowledging the value of one’s work. These indicators should be used by the faculty member to support the case for work assigned to the three different levels below. The Department also recognizes the value of creative activities, provided such activities contribute to the development of knowledge in the field and are directly related to the study of communication theory and process or communicative sciences and disorders.

The members of the departmental personnel committee will consider indicators to assess the prestige of a given journal: affiliation with a national scholarly or professional organization, large circulation relative to other journals in the field, rigorous acceptance standards and wide citation.

Each faculty member shall include a concise narrative of creative and scholarly activity and how the work contributes to a systematic program of research. The narrative, which shall not to exceed 1,000 words, should include: (1) a list of work that has been published, presented, or accepted during the review period; (2) a written evaluation of each work; and (3) a description of work in progress. In the case of multiple authors, the faculty member’s evaluation of the work shall include an assessment of her or his contribution and/or the faculty member shall submit the multiple author forms or their equivalents. It is expected that the faculty member’s narrative will summarize her or his
research and creative activities agenda(s). The common theme(s) running through the faculty member’s work shall be identified in the narrative.

A. First-Level Activities

1. Refereed journal articles
2. Author of a scholarly book; “in press” books require galley proofs
3. Refereed articles in nationally/internationally distributed conference proceedings
4. Edited scholarly book or special issue of a journal
5. External grant proposals funded
6. Presentations at regional or national conventions that are selected as top papers in a division, or which receive other officially recognized honors or awards
7. Refereed chapters in a scholarly book or monograph

B. Second-Level Activities

1. Non-refereed journal articles
2. Non-refereed articles in nationally/internationally distributed conference proceedings or in published working papers ["Working papers" are scholarly volumes published by universities and research institutes to disseminate current research on an annual or more frequent basis. Examples include: Haskins Laboratories Status Report on Research, UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics, NCVS Status and Progress Report (NIDCD of NIH), and Quarterly Status and Progress Report, i.e., Institutionen för tal, musik och hörsel, Sweden]
3. Chapters in scholarly books
4. Invited presentations or publications
5. Presentations at regional or national conventions
6. Internal grant proposals funded or external grant proposals awarded without funding
7. Published debate critiques
8. Annotated bibliographies accepted for publication
9. Creation of educational and/or professional materials (e.g., audiotape, videotape, computer software)
10. Standardized instruments published and commercially available (e.g., Fullerton Language Test for Adolescents, Stuttering Severity Instrument)
11. National distribution of educational and/or professional materials (e.g., videotape series)

C. Third-Level Activities

1. Published book reviews that make a scholarly contribution
2. Presentations at state or local conferences
3. Development of experimental forms for a research or clinical instrument
4. Accepted contributions to forums or newsletters
5. Internal/External Grant proposals submitted
6. Material completed but not submitted and/or material submitted for publication but not accepted
D. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarly and Creative Activities

Using the scale of ratings “Superior,” “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory,” scholarly and creative activities shall be evaluated using the three criteria listed below. Overall performance in scholarly and creative activities shall be based on a composite of the individual ratings.

1. Continuous and systematic progression of activity from one level to the next (e.g., conference papers to publications, grant proposals to funded grants)
2. Achievement that includes high quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications
3. Evidence that scholarly and creative activities contribute to the discipline

A rating of “Superior” shall be given for ten second-level and/or first-level activities during the RTP review period. The activities must include at least four peer-reviewed journal articles, of which first authorship must be accorded on two publications.

A rating of “Excellent” shall be given for seven second-level and/or first-level activities during the RTP review period. These activities must include at least three peer-reviewed journal articles, of which first authorship is accorded on two publications.

A rating of “Satisfactory” shall be given for five second-level and/or first-level activities. These activities must include first authorship on at least two peer-reviewed journal articles (“in press” or published).

A rating of “Unsatisfactory” shall be given for scholarly activity judged to be of insufficient quality and/or quantity.

IV. Professional, University, and Community Service

It is expected that faculty members will demonstrate continuous service. Some of the indicators of the level of involvement include: (1) the amount of time devoted to professional organizations and committee assignments; (2) the amount of responsibility or degree of prestige associated with service; and (3) the degree of visibility afforded the individual, the department, the school, and the University through the faculty member’s service.

The faculty member under review shall prepare a concise narrative, not to exceed 1,000 words, that evaluates and summarizes service, including a complete listing of service activities and the level at which each belongs. The narrative should include a careful presentation of evidence for assigning activities to the second-level and the first-level.

The narrative should summarize how the professional activities completed contribute to the faculty member’s professional growth and to the professional organization(s). As part of the narrative, a complete list of activities with accompanying dates and places should be provided. Data supporting the quality should be included wherever possible.
Service activity falls into one of three levels depending on the amount of time and effort, the level of skill or leadership, and the degree of benefit to the department, school, University, profession, or community.

A. First-Level Activities

An activity at the first-level generally requires more time, responsibility, or leadership than does an activity at the second-level. Such activities bring exceptional benefits to the department, college, University, profession, or community. Community service that brings more recognition or other benefits to the department, college, or University than to the faculty member, e.g., organizing conferences, is at the first-level. Listed below are selected examples of first-level service:

1. Association office holder
2. Editor of a regional or national journal
3. Editing professional newsletter
4. Selecting contents for a section of a journal
5. Professional convention paper selection
6. Receiving honors and awards
7. Service on an active University committee
8. Developing, administrating, and/or contributing to outreach efforts that serve the community through application of knowledge of the discipline (e.g., the Speech and Hearing Clinic, the Center for Children who Stutter, Town Hall Meetings, and the Southern California Urban Debate League)
9. Any non-research grant
10. Professional service: Organizing conferences and conference sessions, serving on organizational boards and committees, being a discussant of presented papers, and being a member in professional organizations
11. Serving as a journal editor
12. Acquiring professional licenses, credentials, or certificates
13. Participation in internal or external program reviews
14. Providing leadership on university committees

B. Second-Level Activities

An activity at the second-level generally requires more time than does an activity at the first-level, or it involves significantly more responsibility and leadership. Typical examples are chairing an active departmental committee or college-level committee. Community service that brings more recognition to the individual faculty member than to the Department, College, or University, e.g., public lecture or public office, is at the second-level. Listed below are selected examples of second-level service:

1. Chairing a department or college committee
2. Serving on Academic Senate
3. Serving on University committees
4. Chairing graduate committees
5. Program reviews
6. Planning programs or conferences
7. Professionally related consulting
8. Short courses at conferences
9. Invited speeches, lectures, and presentations
10. Statewide/national task force or selected boards
11. Conducting workshops
12. Presentation of oral debate critique before an audience
13. Advising student groups
14. Working with peer advisement
15. Producing publications relevant to university goals that are not traditional academic publications
16. Consulting with community or private groups
17. Developing web pages designed to increase University contact with the community
18. Reviewing books or manuscripts for publication or reviewing grants
19. Providing testimony to governmental or regulatory bodies
20. Editorial board or Associate Editor for journal

C. Third-Level Activities. Listed below are selected examples of third-level service:

1. Participation on departmental and college committees
2. Attendance at professional meetings, workshops, or other professional development
3. Association committee member
4. Association member
5. Subject of mass media interview regarding the field and its applications
6. Attendance at faculty meetings
7. Advising students
8. Serving on graduate committees
9. Working with independent studies

D. Criteria for Evaluating Service

A rating of “Superior” shall be given for exemplary performance in depth and/or breadth of service. In general, two first-level activities during the review period, and multiple examples of high-quality third-level and/or second-level activities are expected for a rating of superior. For associate professors, superior service should include participation in University-wide service.

A rating of “Excellent” shall be given for a sufficient amount of service judged to be of high quality. Generally, one first-level activity during the review period, and several third-level and/or second-level activities are expected for a rating of excellent.

A rating of “Satisfactory” shall be given for a sufficient amount of service judged to be of satisfactory quality. In general, three examples of second-level activities are expected for a rating of satisfactory and several examples of third-level activity.

A rating of “Unsatisfactory” shall be given for service activity judged to be of insufficient quality and/or quantity.
V. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

For promotion and/or the granting of tenure, a faculty member must be evaluated as at least “Satisfactory” in each of the three categories and “Excellent” either in Teaching Performance or Scholarly/Creative Activities.

VI. Criteria for Decisions on Early Tenure or Early Promotion

Early tenure refers to a decision on tenure that is made prior to the faculty member’s sixth year of service at the University. Early promotion refers to a decision on promotion that is prior to the completion of time normally spent in one’s current rank. In accordance with University policies, promotion to full professor requires that a faculty member be tenured. Early tenure and promotion are separate decisions and the DPC will vote on each action separately.

1. The following criteria are established for early tenure or early promotion to associate professor:

   A faculty member must be rated 'Superior' in scholarly and creative activities or teaching performance and at least 'Excellent' in all other categories of evaluation. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

2. The following criteria are established for early tenure for untenured associate professors or professors:

   A faculty member must be rated 'Superior' in scholarly and creative activities or teaching performance and at least 'Excellent' in all other categories. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

3. The following criteria are established for untenured associate professors requesting early tenure and early promotion to professor. The following criteria also apply to tenured associate professors requesting early promotion to professor:

   A faculty member must be rated 'Superior' in scholarly and creative activities and teaching performance and at least 'Excellent' in all other categories. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.
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