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I. **Preface**

The Department of Reading (hereafter called “the Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible that meet the evolving needs of our students, community, and region. The Department is also committed to establishing an environment wherein the creation of knowledge and its organized dissemination are central. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs and effective learning environments is the faculty. Therefore, the Department seeks to promote excellence in learning by supporting faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession and the community.

The Department will use the standards set out in this document as a guide for faculty preparing the portfolio for retention, tenure and promotion, and as the criteria for portfolio evaluation. Department faculty affirms its position that the interests and needs of students are best served when the faculty represents diverse experiential and academic strengths, creating a “mosaic of talent.” With this document, the Department intends to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great scope of the functions inherent in the mission of an institution of higher education.

II. **Faculty Responsibilities**

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

**A. In the area of teaching, examples of these responsibilities include:**
1. meeting classes
2. holding established office hours at regular times and places
3. participating in Department academic advising procedures
4. attending faculty meetings.

**B. In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, examples of these responsibilities include:**
1. expanding knowledge
2. applying knowledge to consequential problems in education
3. advancing the reputation of the University

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

III. **Department History and Mission**

The Department of Reading was established in the mid 1970s. Its Mission is to provide the highest quality research-based instruction in Reading Education at every level. Undergraduate courses contribute to the University’s General Education program. Graduate courses lead to the MS in Reading Education, California Reading Certificate, and/or a Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential. In an age of increasing demands for a highly literate society, Department faculty strive to engage undergraduate students in the use of effective reading strategies and to matriculate graduate level Reading Educators who are well prepared to implement and direct Reading Education in preschool, elementary, middle, high school, and postsecondary programs.
IV. Role of the Chair in the Portfolio Review Process
A. Appointment of faculty mentors
   Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the department chair shall consult with
   new probationary faculty members appointed in the Fall of 1999 or later concerning appropriate
   faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors.
B. Portfolio review
   The department chair will review the portfolio for faculty unless the chair is not of a sufficient rank
   to be eligible to review the file. In that case the Dean will assume the responsibilities of the “chair”

V. Department Personnel Committee
A. Committee Functions
   The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the “Committee”) shall evaluate portfolios
   and make specific recommendations concerning the retention, promotion, and granting of tenure to
   the members of the Department as specified in UPS 210.000 and the MOU.
B. Committee Structure
   1. All Committee members shall be tenured faculty and not be serving as the Chair of a
      Department.
   2. Committee members must have a higher rank or classification than those being reviewed.
   3. No person shall serve as a member of the Committee during any period in which he/she is the
      subject of the personnel review process.
   4. An alternate member shall participate on the Committee in all deliberations under any
      circumstances in which a regular Committee member is unable to complete his or her term of
      office or he or she is ineligible to participate.
C. Election of Committee Members
   1. The Chair of the Department shall conduct the election of three Committee members and one
      alternate member by the second week of classes in the fall semester each year.
   2. All tenured faculty members of the Department who meet the requirements in section B above
      will be automatically placed on the slate of nominees for the committee.
   3. Individuals wishing to decline shall indicate this in writing prior to the second week of the
      semester.
   4. Nominees of individuals not in the Department shall be made in writing to the Department Chair
      prior to the second week of the Fall semester. These nominees shall make a written declaration
      to the Chair prior to Wednesday of the third week of the semester indicating that they wish to be
      considered.
   5. A ballot of a minimum of four nominees shall be presented to the Department faculty for
      election. The ballot shall be presented in the following manner: nominees from the Department
      shall be alphabetized by last name, with indication of rank; nominee(s) from outside the
      Department shall be listed on the bottom of the ballot, alphabetized by last name, with indication
      of Department affiliation and rank.
   6. Each full-time tenured and tenure track faculty member in the Department shall vote by secret
      written ballot for three members from the list of nominees. In the case of a tie, the committee
      member shall be decided by the flip of a coin by the Chair in the presence of a majority of the
      tenured and tenure track faculty.
   7. The alternate member shall be the individual who received the highest number of votes among
      those nominees not elected to the committee.
D. Committee Chair
   The Committee shall select its Chair for a one-year term.
E. Committee Procedures

1. The Committee shall evaluate the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure and/or promotion. (Here and throughout this document, “The Portfolio” refers to the main Portfolio following the table of contents specified in Figure 1 below and all supportive appendix materials). In its written evaluation, the Committee shall comment upon the candidate’s qualifications under each category of the criteria listed in Section VII of this document. The Committee shall formulate recommendations that shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation.

2. The Committee’s evaluation for each area shall be based solely on the information submitted in the Portfolio in accordance with UPS 210.000, and the Department Personnel Standards. The evaluation shall provide a written rationale for rating the faculty member under review as excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate, with respect to each area of performance. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VII.

3. All actions taken by the Committee including recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the Committee.

4. The Committee members shall sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way the individual members voted.

5. The Committee shall return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair.

VI. General Guidelines

A. Developmental Narratives (500 words or less each, for teaching, scholarship, and service)

With the guidance, support and advice of an appointed faculty mentor, each probationary faculty member shall construct Developmental Narratives for the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service during his or her initial year of probationary status. These narratives shall not exceed 500 words each. Throughout subsequent revisions of the narratives the faculty mentor shall also be available for counsel. The Department Chair and College Dean will review the narratives and will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College prior to May 1. The Department Personnel Committee will not review the Developmental Narratives. During subsequent years, the narratives may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will typically occur during the probationary period.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission

It is the responsibility of each probationary faculty member to prepare the required information and documentation for the Portfolio and to deliver the Portfolio to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. Probationary faculty members are urged to attend the workshops held by the Faculty Personnel Committee at the beginning of each fall semester and college-wide personnel workshops and to seek assistance from colleagues.

C. Portfolio Organization and Documentation

1. The Portfolio shall be organized by the faculty member following the standard table of contents as specified in UPS 210.000 (see Figure 1). The numbering, order, and format of this table of contents are required: items may not be added, deleted, or rearranged.

2. Materials for items 1.0 through 7.0 in the main Portfolio, and documentation materials in the Appendix must be complete. All required documentation that is not provided or not available must be explained in a memo.

3. Materials specified in this table of contents should be presented in one tabbed binder.

4. All items listed in the Portfolio shall be appropriately documented in the Appendix.

5. Faculty members who have been granted service credit must include documentation in all areas for these years.

6. To facilitate storage during the review period, the Portfolio binder and all Appendix materials must be presented in no more than two boxes of standard size, provided and labeled by the
Figure 1: UPS 210.000 Required Table of Contents for the RTP Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Table of Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A standard copy of this document, provided to the faculty member by the Department Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Table of Contents of Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The table of contents for appendix items shall be organized to present supporting documentation in the three areas of teaching, scholarly &amp; creative activity, and professional &amp; service activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Approved Department Standards or UPS 210.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Reading Personnel Standards shall fulfill this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Developmental Narratives (500 words or less each, for teaching, scholarship, and service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Developmental Narratives are the faculty member’s prospective intentions for professional endeavors in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service (see section VI. A of this document.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member’s vitae shall be current, and reflect accomplishments and work described in the Portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Narrative Summary: Teaching Performance (1000 words or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Self-Assessment Narrative Summary is the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in teaching, for the period of review (see section VII.A.1.a. of this document.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 List of Teaching Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The list of teaching assignments shall be organized to include information specified in section VII.A.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.20 Sample Form: Student Rating of Instruction Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blank copy of the Student Rating of Instruction form(s) used for courses taught shall be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30 Summaries: Student Rating of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original printouts of the statistical summaries of Student Rating of Instruction forms must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.40 Summaries: Grade Distributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printouts of the summaries of grades given in your classes must be provided. (The university-provided lists of individual student grades should be included in the Appendix, and not in the main Portfolio.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Narrative Summary: Scholarly and Creative Activities (1000 words or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Self-Assessment Narrative Summary is the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in scholarship, for the period of review (see section VII.B.1.A. of this document.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Narrative Summary: Professional, University, and Community Service (1000 words or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Self-Assessment Narrative Summary is the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in service, for the period of review (see section VII.C.1.A. of this document.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix
The faculty member will provide documentation to support the achievements described in the Portfolio. The Appendix should be organized in sections paralleling the Table of Contents above: Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Professional, University, and Community Service activities.
VII. Criteria for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Full-time Faculty

A. Teaching Performance

Each faculty member shall demonstrate that his or her mastery and currency in the discipline is consistently translated into structuring and implementing effective learning experiences as appropriate to the nature of each course. Mandatory indicators for demonstration of teaching performance are listed below.

1. Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Teaching Performance
   a) Self-Assessment Narrative Summary (maximum 1000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for teaching shall be the faculty member’s retrospective analysis of accomplishments in teaching, for the period of the review. The narrative should include an analysis of the statistical summaries and the written comments on the Student Rating of Instruction forms, and synthesize these data with other data provided in the portfolio to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Trends in student written comments on the Student Rating of Instruction forms should be identified, and any significant discrepancies between data from these forms and other data included in the portfolio should be addressed. The self-assessment should also include goals for student learning and instructional strategies and future goals and direction for teaching.
   b) List of Courses Taught A listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review must be provided. The list must include the semester, the Department name, the course name and number and the unit (wtu) value
   c) Workload Faculty workload may include activities in a variety of areas in addition to teaching specific courses; for example, adjustments in workload for the preparation of substantive changes in instructional methods, course development activities, chairing committees, grant preparation, or work to prepare for accreditation. The Portfolio must list and discuss the nature and significance of these various assignments.
   d) Course Syllabi & Materials A representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials prepared by the instructor to facilitate teaching effectiveness must be included in the appendix. Tests, study aids, and other materials, such as advance organizers, video technology, innovative strategies, instructional television concepts and techniques, PowerPoint presentation printouts, evidence of portfolio and case study assessment, etc., may also be included in the appendix.
   e) Statistical Summaries of Student Rating of Instruction Forms The university-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught must be included. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair. If service credit was given, data on student rating of instruction from all years for which credit was given are to be included.
   f) Original Student Rating of Instruction Forms The individual student evaluation forms for all classes taught for the period of review shall be presented as part of the Appendix section on teaching. Organize and label these appendix materials by year, semester, course, and section. The Department Chair will add the forms to the Portfolio when it is received. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.
   g) Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions The university-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester must be provided.
   h) Additional Indicators of Effective Teaching The faculty member is encouraged to submit additional documentation of teaching effectiveness and reflective practice. These may include, but are not limited to, the examples listed in Figure 2 below.
2. Rating Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Two categories of data are used to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness: Student Rating of Instruction forms and additional indicators.

a. **Student Response to Instruction Forms**

   Student Response to Instruction forms use a five-point Likert scale for the quantitative documentation of student ratings of instruction. The University-provided statistical summaries of these forms for all classes for all semesters under review will be used. These summaries convert a student rating of “5” to “A,” a rating of “4” to “B,” etc. The Student Rating of Instruction forms include student written comments, which should be reviewed for trends. Reviewers will use the following criteria to evaluate the statistical summaries of student ratings:

   - **excellent**: 90% or more A and B ratings
   - **good**: 80% – 89% A and B ratings
   - **progressing**: 50% – 79% A and B ratings
   - **inadequate**: Less than 50% A and B ratings

   These criteria are to be used as a general guide, with recognition that these data do in fact represent opinions, submitted anonymously, and with no formal documentation of validity or reliability. In cases where the quantitative rating summaries for one or more courses fall below the range of **good**, the faculty member may provide written comments which, if submitted, the Committee must address in their deliberations for assigning the Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (as specified in item 3 below). For example, special consideration may be extended when unusual teaching assignments and special circumstances (such as the nature and difficulty of the course load) are addressed in the Portfolio with specific documentation. In addition, in cases where Student Rating of Instruction form data extend over several years under review, greater emphasis should be placed on the data for the most recent four semesters. Based upon these criteria, and consideration of the individual case, the reviewers shall evaluate the Student Rating of Instruction form data, and render a rating of **excellent**, **good**, **progressing**, or **inadequate**.

b) **Additional Indicators**

   The faculty member shall provide additional documentation of teaching effectiveness. This documentation should be carefully selected and revised over time to illustrate continual professional development in the area of teaching. Examples of additional indicators of reflective practice, thoughtful course design and implementation, use of innovative teaching approaches and/or assessment tools, and on-going development of teaching skills are provided in Figure 2.

---

**Figure 2: Examples of Additional Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**

- Course outlines with clearly defined goals, and alignment of goals with instructional Course outlines with clearly defined goals, and alignment of goals with instructional approaches and assessments
- Course-specific evaluation inventories
- Peer observations of instruction
- Positive trends in the student comments on the Student Rating of Instruction forms, indicating strengths in elements of effective instruction such as knowledge of the field, competent use of teaching approaches and techniques, and/or selection of quality instructional materials
- Student work samples illustrating attainment of instructional goals
- Evidence of innovative teaching practices such as team or collaborative teaching or distance learning
- Use of innovative pedagogical practices or teaching approaches
- Use of technology to enhance instruction
- Video and/or audio tapes of exemplary lessons
• Thesis/project advisement or committee member for master’s degree students
• Academic advisement, mentoring activities, and/or fieldwork coordination
• Accepted new course proposals
• Evidence of teaching effectiveness, or teaching materials illustrating effective course design and implementation (e.g., visual aids, handouts, PowerPoint presentations)
• Evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching and classroom research
• Evidence of formative assessment and adjustment of instruction
• Evidence of professional development related to teaching and/or assessment

Reviewers will use the following criteria to rate the additional indicators of teaching effectiveness:

- **excellent** Provides strong and varied evidence (four or more well documented indicators) of effective teaching that is sustained over time
- **good** Provides varied evidence (three well documented indicators) of effective teaching progressing
- **progressing** Provides limited evidence (one or two acceptable indicators) of effective teaching inadequate
- **inadequate** Provides no acceptable evidence of effective teaching, and progress toward effective teaching is not evident

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

3. **Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness.** An overall rating of teaching effectiveness will be assigned, based on the professional judgment of the reviewers. Primary consideration will be given to evidence of high quality instructional practices and rigorous standards for student performance as evidenced in the portfolio. The overall rating will be based on the reviewers’ evaluations of both VII.A.2.a. (Student Rating of Instruction forms), *taking into consideration the faculty member’s written comments regarding these, if provided*, and VII.A.2.b. (Additional Indicators of instructional effectiveness). The reviewers shall render an overall rating of teaching effectiveness as either: **excellent**, **good**, **progressing**, or **inadequate**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Figure 3:</strong> Criteria for Overall Rating of Teaching Effectiveness based on Student Rating of Instruction data (SRI) and Additional Indicators (AI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>progressing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inadequate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Faculty engagement in scholarly and creative activities is essential to university level teaching and service. Such activities contribute to the advancement of the field, complement teaching, contribute to the overall quality of the Department, the College, the University or community, contribute to the dissemination and application of knowledge in schools and districts, and sustain professional growth of the faculty member.
1. **Portfolio Requirements for Documentation of Scholarly and Creative Activities**
   a) **Self-Assessment Narrative Summary** (maximum 1000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for scholarly and creative activities shall be a retrospective analysis of accomplishments in scholarship, for the period of the review. It must include a well-defined, focused research agenda that is clearly evident and documented in an on-going body of work.
   b) **Scholarly Publications** consist of scholarly work that appears in peer-reviewed books, chapters in edited books, journal articles, and other forms of peer-reviewed media. Documentation must include a copy of the book, article, or material. If these are in press and therefore not yet available in print, then a letter of acceptance and commitment to publish must be provided. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to delineate the nature of the contribution of scholarly and creative activities to the field of study. Peer review comments should be included whenever possible, as well as the acceptance rate for the journal if appropriate. For co-authored works, a statement should be given regarding the precise contributions of each co-author.
   c) **Pragmatic Scholarship** consists of publication of the results of significant scholarly work that adds knowledge to the field. Grant projects, policy analyses, program evaluations, and contracts/consultantships are examples of such activities, and may be reported in non peer-reviewed materials such as public press articles, newsletters, or brochures prepared for lay audiences. In documenting pragmatic scholarship, the faculty member must delineate the nature of the contribution of the pragmatic scholarship activity to the field of study.
   d) **Scholarly Presentations** are peer-reviewed papers, presentations, poster sessions, panel discussions for professional meetings, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or convocations. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to delineate the importance of the scholarly presentations to a theoretical framework and advancement of the field of study.

2. **Characteristics of a Focused Research Agenda**
   The following characteristics of a focused research agenda are not listed in order of importance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how their work meets some or all of these criteria.
   a) *Work that has a conceptual or theoretical basis.* This typically is accomplished through reference to related scholarly literature, summarizing what has been done in the past and indicating how the new work advances knowledge and/or practice.
   b) *Work that results in new knowledge being added to the field and/or that extends the meaning or application of existing knowledge.* Knowledge may be added to the field through research; examples of research designs for advancing knowledge include experimental/quantitative studies, qualitative/ethnographic studies, historical and philosophical research, single-subject designs, descriptive research, and meta-analyses. Knowledge may also be advanced through creation of approaches, methods, and techniques that translate theory into practical applications. Knowledge may be applied through development of materials that synthesize existing knowledge, such as innovative curricula, and program development.
   c) *Work that is externally reviewed by peers.* The faculty member must verify the peer-review process. This may include copies of reviewer comments.
   d) *Work that is published in respected sources.* Publication sources may be books, journals, and/or other media. The faculty member should provide documentation of the quality, scope, and importance of the journal or book.

3. **Rating Criteria for Scholarship**
   It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate an on-going, focused program of scholarly work. Scholarly publication that stems from a sustained program of focused work over the review period is required to complete the review process leading to tenure. In addition to the criteria and definitions outlined above, reviewers will consider the nature, complexity and contribution to the field of each scholarly publication in evaluating the faculty member’s documentation of scholarly and creative accomplishments provided in the portfolio. Based on
these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render a rating of excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate.

**excellent** A comprehensive self-assessment and an exemplary record of scholarly activity. Exemplary is defined as one peer-reviewed book, published by a major publisher, in any three years, or an average of one high-quality peer reviewed article published or in press per year of review following the first probationary year; and an average of one high quality pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period.

**good** A comprehensive self-assessment and good performance in scholarly activity. Good is defined as an average of one high-quality peer reviewed article published or in press for each two years of review following the first probationary year, and an average of one high quality pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period.

**progressing** A marginal self-assessment, and/or modest performance in scholarly activity, with a poorly focused scholarly agenda. Modest is defined as an average of one high-quality peer reviewed article published or in press for each two years of review following the first probationary year, and/or an average of fewer than one pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year during the same time period.

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

C. Professional, University, and Community Service

It is expected that the faculty member will contribute to the ongoing refinement and development of communities of learning through service to the profession, the university, and the community. Professional service has much in common with scholarly and creative activities, though the audience for professional service activities is broader. Professional service activities may:

- complement teaching by allowing the instructor to draw from applied experience
- promote the discipline in the context in which it is applied
- bring recognition as a leader to the faculty member from her/his peers
- enhance the reputation of the University and opportunities for its students

University service is the faculty member’s participation in committee, project, and student advisory activities of the department, college and university. Through university service, faculty contribute to the implementation and evolution of the structure and climate of our own learning community.

Community service is the faculty member’s involvement in activities that contribute to the betterment of the local region. As a member of the College of Education, particularly, faculty members are expected to represent the university in the schools, districts, and other educational communities within our service area.

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

   a) Self-Assessment Narrative Summary (maximum 1000 words) The self-assessment narrative summary for Professional, University, and Community Service shall be a retrospective analysis of accomplishments in these areas, for the period of the review. It must include a well-defined, focused research agenda that is clearly evident and documented in an on-going body of work.

   b) Additional evidence of service shall be provided and evaluated by indicators such as those listed in Figure 3 (not listed in order of importance). It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to show how their work addresses indicators such as these in each of the three categories of service.
Figure 4: Indicators of Professional, University, or Community Service

**Professional Service**
- Leadership roles in state, regional, and national professional organizations
- Editing professional journals
- Reviewing manuscripts for books, professional journals or conferences
- Providing private practice or consultations relevant to the field
- Attending and presenting at professional meetings and workshops (which may not be peer reviewed or theoretical in nature)
- Reviewing grant proposals
- Invited membership in state or national policy committees and forums
- Engaging in other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the professional community.

**University Service**
- Active participation in System-wide, University, College, and/or Department committees and activities
- Active involvement as faculty advisor or liaison with student groups
- Formulation of, or participation in, programs, institutes, symposiums or workshops
- Active membership on advisory boards within the University or community
- Lecture/staff development given to university audiences and other university classes

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

2. **Rating Criteria for Professional, University, and Community Service**
   It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate on-going service in some combination of all of the three service areas detailed above. Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render a rating of excellent, good, progressing, or inadequate.

   **excellent** A comprehensive self-assessment of service, and a well documented record of sustained and substantial involvement in an average of two or more activities in each of the three areas of service per year of review following the first probationary year, and including at least one sustained contribution at the University level or higher.

   **good** A comprehensive self-assessment of service, and a well documented record of sustained and substantial involvement in four or more activities, distributed among the three categories of service per year of review following the first probationary year.

   **progressing** A marginal self-assessment of service, and/or fewer than four documented activities of acceptable quality in the three categories of service.

   **inadequate** A marginal or unacceptable self-assessment of service, and/or fewer than three documented activities of acceptable quality in the three categories of service.

VIII. **Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

A. **Criteria for Retention of Probationary Faculty**
   Retention during the probationary years shall be based upon the individual’s progress in meeting the criteria for the granting tenure. In order to be retained, the probationary faculty member must be rated, at minimum, good in the area of teaching and one other area; and progressing in the remaining area, and making obvious progress toward a rating of good in this third area.
B. Criteria for Granting of Tenure

1. Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure during their sixth probationary year, with tenure beginning their seventh year, if awarded, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed.
2. The granting of tenure is the most significant personnel action that the University takes, because it represents an affirmation that the probationary faculty member will be an asset to the University over his or her entire career. Therefore, a positive tenure decision requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that meets the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Departmental Personnel Standards.
3. The decision to grant tenure shall be based solely on an evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as documented in the Portfolio. Tenure is expected if the faculty member’s accomplishments are of sufficient quality and meet expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Departmental Personnel Standards.
4. In order to receive tenure, a faculty member must have received a doctorate in an appropriate field of study from an accredited university. If the dissertation is listed in the Portfolio as a published document, it should be included in the appendix section. If the dissertation is listed as an unpublished document, it need not be included in the appendix.
5. Based on these criteria and definitions, reviewers will render determination regarding the granting of tenure. To achieve tenure, the faculty member must be rated excellent in the area of teaching or scholarship, and at least good in the other two areas. Figure 5 summarizes the foregoing criteria for ratings in the three areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating**</th>
<th>Teaching: SO***</th>
<th>Teaching: AI***</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>90% and higher A or B</td>
<td>4 or more well-documented Indicators, sustained over time</td>
<td>One book in any three years, or an average of one scholarly publication per year; and an average of one pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year</td>
<td>Sustained and substantial involvement in an average of 2 or more activities per year in each of the 3 areas of Service, and at least one sustained contribution at the University level or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>80-89% A and B</td>
<td>3 well documented Indicators</td>
<td>Average of one scholarly publication each two years and an average of one pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year</td>
<td>Sustained and substantial involvement in an average of 4 or more activities per year, distributed among the 3 areas of Service per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressing</td>
<td>50-79% A and B</td>
<td>1-2 documented Indicators</td>
<td>An average of one scholarly publication for each two years and/or an average of fewer than one pragmatic scholarship product or scholarly presentation per year</td>
<td>Fewer than an average of 4 activities per year of acceptable quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>Fewer than 50% A and B</td>
<td>No documented Indicators</td>
<td>Scholarly activity falling below that defined above as progressing.</td>
<td>Fewer than an average of 3 activities per year of acceptable quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This chart is provided for reference purposes. Full wording of each category of criteria in the foregoing sections of this document takes precedence over these abbreviated versions.

** A prerequisite for excellent or good ratings is a comprehensive self-assessment in each area: teaching, scholarship, and service.

C. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

1. Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.
2. Early tenure, and/or early promotion to Associate Professor requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that strongly indicate that the faculty member will, by the completion of the probationary period, and including documentation of service years, achieve a rating of excellent in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
3. Promotion to Full Professor shall be based on a record that indicates commitment to the standards described above. The University expects that tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in all three areas of performance, and that successful faculty members will display accomplishments, growth, and future potential throughout their careers. This will be evidenced by maintaining a rating of excellent in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, and at least good in the third area.

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

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

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

7. For faculty requesting consideration for promotion to the rank of Full Professor the period of review will be based on the previous five years of service, unless the faculty member is requesting an early consideration for promotion to Full Professor.

Figure 6 summarizes these criteria for promotion and tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 6: Criteria for Promotion and Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good in teaching and one other area, and progressing in the other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>