


Cal State Fullerton

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

657-278-2614 | officeofprovost@fullerton.edu | fullerton.edu/acadaffairs

May 31, 2024

TO: Ionel Tifrea
Professor and Chair, Department of Physics

FROM: Amir Dabirian Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs 

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions

CC: Marie Johnson
Dean, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Mark Carrier
Executive Director, Faculty Affairs and Records

Evaluation of your Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed a problem with sections 2 (Personnel Evaluation) and 3 (Criteria for Personnel Actions).

Some current DPS statements are in violation of UPS 210.002 (Section III.A.h) that describes the requirements for DPS. The UPS specifically states,

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.


Revisions of your DPS are in order, if you are not already working on them.

Until DPS revisions are approved through the regular approval process, your currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the problematic portions of sections 2 and 3 cannot be used. (Those sections have been removed from the posted copy of the DPS.)

Thank you.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D. 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).

Department Personnel Standards

Department of Physics

1 Introduction	3
1.1 Portfolio	3
1.2 Election of the Department Personnel Committee	3
1.3 Designation of Mentors	4
1.4 Prospectus	4
1.5 Performance Reviews: Timelines and Outcomes	5
1.5.1 Full Performance Reviews	5
1.5.2 Abbreviated Reviews	5
1.5.3 Tenure and Promotion Review	6
Leave of absence	6
Early Tenure and Promotion	6
1.5.4 Promotion to Professor	7
Early Promotion	7
2 Personnel Evaluation	9
Narrative Summaries	9
Evaluation Procedures	9
2.1 Teaching Performance	11
Teaching Evaluation Criteria	11
Required portfolio materials for Teaching Performance Evaluation:	11
2.1.0 Teaching Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.1.1)	13
2.1.1 SOQ Scores	14
SOQ Bias	14
2.1.2 Classroom Observations	14
Choice of Observer	15
Criteria to Achieve Each Rating	15
Conflicting Reviews	16
Additional Observations	16
2.1.3 Teaching Materials	16
2.1.4 Teaching Development	17
2.1.5 Overall Teaching Evaluation	18
Teaching Materials Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.1.2)	19
2.2 Scholarly and Creative Activities	20
SCA Evaluation Criteria	20
Required portfolio materials for SCA Performance Evaluation:	20
2.2.0 SCA Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.2.1)	22

2.2.1 Publications	23
2.2.2 Grant Activity	24
2.2.3 Student Engagement	24
2.2.4 Additional Evidence	25
2.2.5 Overall SCA Evaluation	25
2.3 University, Professional and Community Service	26
Service Evaluation Criteria	26
2.3.0 Service Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.3.1)	27
2.3.1 Department Service	29
2.3.2 College and University Service	29
2.3.3 Professional Service	29
2.3.4 Community Service	29
2.3.5 Overall Service Evaluation	29
3 Criteria for Personnel Actions	30
3.1 Criteria for Retention	30
3.1.1 Second Year Retention	30
3.1.2 Fourth Year Retention	31
3.1.3 Additional Full Reviews	31
3.2 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor	32
3.3 Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	32
Appendix A	34
Appendix B	37

1 Introduction

This document establishes the personnel standards used by the Department of Physics to review faculty seeking retention, tenure and/or promotion (RTP) action. These Department Personnel Standards (DPS) supplement the University Policy Statements (UPS) governing faculty performance reviews (UPS 210.000 and 210.002), and the CSUF Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

These DPS provide faculty under review, members of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and the Department Chair with performance criteria that shall form the basis for RTP recommendations.

1.1 Portfolio

Faculty seeking RTP action shall prepare and submit a portfolio. The portfolio shall document achievements and ongoing activity in each area of: Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activity; University, Professional, and Community Service. The evidence presented in the portfolio shall be the exclusive basis of the faculty member's evaluation, except where otherwise noted in these DPS.

Within the Department, the portfolio shall be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and Department Chair. Each shall evaluate the portfolio independently and confidentially. Each shall independently prepare a report in which they recommend an appropriate outcome to the RTP action, in accordance with these DPS, and give justifications for this recommendation.

The portfolio shall be prepared and submitted according to the timelines, requirements and protocols described in UPS 210.000, and contain evidence and other materials as specified in these DPS.

1.2 Election of the Department Personnel Committee

The DPC shall consist of three regular members and one alternate member. All tenured faculty members of the Physics Department are eligible to serve on the DPC, except for:

- the Department Chair
- faculty on leave at any point during the academic year
- faculty that are submitting a portfolio for evaluation

DPC members may not review portfolios seeking promotion to a rank higher than their own. If a regular member of the DPC is ineligible to review any portfolio or becomes unable to serve due to an unexpected leave, the alternate member shall serve in their place.

Members of the DPC shall serve one-year terms. The DPC shall be elected by a secret ballot of the Physics Department. This ballot may occur at a department meeting, or through an electronic

poll. This ballot should occur between the beginning of the Academic Year (1 week prior to the commencement of Fall Semester classes), and the end of the third week of the Fall Semester. All members of the department who are eligible to serve on the DPC shall appear as a candidate on the ballot. The three candidates receiving the most votes shall form the DPC, the candidate with the fourth highest vote total shall be the alternate. Should fewer than four faculty be eligible to serve on the DPC, the Department Chair shall request members of other departments, in a discipline related to physics, to appear on the ballot.

The members of the DPC shall elect a DPC Chair, from among themselves, as soon as practical after the DPC has been elected. The DPC Chair is responsible for organizing and coordinating the activities of the DPC and for liaising with, and representing the DPC to, the Department Chair and (where necessary) any other officer of the university.

1.3 Designation of Mentors

Each probationary faculty member shall be designated a mentor, as soon as practical after they begin their employment. The mentor should normally be a tenured faculty member of the Physics Department. The mentor shall be appointed by the Department Chair, in consultation with the probationary faculty member. Either the mentor or probationary faculty member may request the Department Chair appoint a new mentor at any time.

The mentor shall provide guidance and support to the probationary faculty member, particularly with respect to the RTP process. Such support should normally include reviewing the prospectus and portfolio ahead of submission but may include any other support that either the probationary faculty member, the mentor, or the department chair feels would aid to the probationary faculty member. The Department Chair will also provide similar support and assistance, save that the Department Chair may not review the portfolio ahead of submission.

1.4 Prospectus

During their first year of employment, probationary faculty shall prepare a prospectus that includes narratives for: Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activity, and; University, Community and Professional Service. The prospectus shall describe the faculty member's plans for achieving the requirements for successful tenure action, per the requirements and expectations outlined in this DPS, in each area. Each narrative should be a maximum of 500 words, for a total maximum prospectus length of 1500 words.

There is no formal review of the prospectus. However, the Department Chair shall provide the faculty member feedback on their prospectus before the end of the first year of their employment.

The prospectus should describe an actionable plan for the faculty member to achieve the requirements for tenure by the conclusion of the probationary period, that is consistent with the position description under which the faculty member was hired. The Physics Department recognizes that it is normal for a faculty member's plans to evolve over the course of their

probation, such that final achievements may be significantly different to those described in the prospectus. In general, this will not be considered a negative performance measure when evaluating a portfolio and remains broadly consistent with these DPS.

An exception may be if the DPC or Department Chair feels the faculty member's achievements are entirely inconsistent with plans described in the prospectus, or where the prospectus is entirely inconsistent with the position description under which the faculty member was hired. Unless such a deviation has been approved by the Department Chair, the DPC or Department Chair may recommend a terminal year, regardless of achievements demonstrated in the portfolio. Such an action must be thoroughly justified in the DPC/Department's Chairs reports. In general, apparently serious deviations from the prospectus should be noted at either the 2nd or 4th year full reviews and discussed with the faculty member in question, allowing them an opportunity to address their performance before a faculty member is recommended for termination.

The prospectus shall be prepared and submitted according to the timelines, requirements and protocols described in UPS 210.000.

1.5 Performance Reviews: Timelines and Outcomes

1.5.1 Full Performance Reviews

During the second and fourth years of a probationary faculty member's employment, the faculty member shall submit a portfolio, to be evaluated for retention. The possible outcomes of this evaluation are that:

1. The faculty member is retained for a 3rd or 5th, respectively, probationary year, or;
2. The faculty member is recommended for termination, as follows:
 - a. Faculty in their second year shall be terminated at the end of the year.
 - b. Faculty at any other year shall be retained for one additional "terminal year", at the conclusion of which the faculty member is terminated.

The requirements to achieve retention at each review are described in Section 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of these DPS.

Portfolios submitted for Full Performance Review shall document the cumulative achievements of the faculty member, across the entire probationary period. The portfolio shall be evaluated on all such achievements, except where these DPS specify that only the most recent achievements are applicable.

Required materials for the Full Performance Review are described in UPS 210.000.

1.5.2 Abbreviated Reviews

During the third and fifth years of a probationary faculty member's employment, the faculty member shall submit an Abbreviated Review File, as described by UPS 210.000 (unless a Full

Performance Review is required, see Section 3.1.3). The Review File shall consist of: The faculty member's CV; statistical SOQ summaries, and; grade distribution summaries.

The result of an Abbreviated Review is always that the faculty member is retained for a fourth or sixth probationary year, respectively. The faculty member shall receive feedback on the Review File from both the DPC and Department Chair, but all such feedback shall be advisory.

1.5.3 Tenure and Promotion Review

During the sixth year of the probationary faculty's employment, the faculty member shall submit a portfolio for tenure and promotion. The possible outcomes of this evaluation are:

1. The faculty member receives tenure and is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, beginning in the seventh year of their employment
2. The faculty member receives a terminal year.

The portfolio shall document the cumulative achievements of the faculty member across the entire probationary period. The portfolio shall be evaluated on all such achievements, except where these DPS specify that only the most recent achievements are applicable.

The requirements to achieve tenure are described in Section 3.2 of these DPS.

Leave of absence

The final year of the probationary period is normally the sixth year of employment. Per UPS 210.000 III.K.9, faculty that experience interruptions to their normal career development during the probationary period may request for a leave of absence and an extension to their probationary period.

Protocols for requesting a leave of absence and extension of the probationary period, and conditions under which such a request may be granted, are given in UPS 210.000 III.K.9.

Early Tenure and Promotion

Probationary faculty may request tenure and promotion at any review ahead of the sixth year. Requests for tenure and promotion ahead of the sixth year shall be deemed "early tenure and promotion".

If the faculty member requests early tenure and promotion during a Full Performance Review year, they shall submit their portfolio for Full Performance Review, as scheduled. The possible outcomes of this review are that:

1. The faculty member receives early tenure and is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, beginning in the next year of their employment
2. The faculty member is retained for a 3rd or 5th probationary year, at the rank of Assistant Professor
3. The faculty member receives a terminal year.

If the faculty member requests early tenure and promotion during an Abbreviated Review year, the faculty member shall submit a Full Performance Review portfolio in place of the normal Abbreviated Review. The possible outcomes of this review are:

1. The faculty member receives early tenure and is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, beginning in the next year of their employment
2. The faculty member is retained for a 4th or 6th probationary year, at the rank of Assistant Professor

The requirements to achieve early tenure and promotion are higher than those required for tenure and promotion in due course. These requirements are described in Section 3.2 of these DPS.

An unsuccessful request for early tenure and promotion shall not prejudice the evaluation of the portfolio for retention, or any future RTP requests by the faculty member.

1.5.4 Promotion to Professor

After a minimum of four years of service as Associate Professor, faculty may request promotion to the rank of Professor. Faculty seeking promotion to Professor shall submit a portfolio similar to that required for a Full Performance Review. The portfolio shall list all accomplishments to be considered. Accomplishments that were considered for granting of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may not be considered again for the granting of promotion to the rank of Professor.

The possible outputs of this evaluation are:

1. The faculty member is promoted to the rank of Professor, to take effect at the beginning of the next academic year.
2. The faculty member is maintained at the rank of Associate Professor.

Faculty may request promotion anytime after four years of service as Associate Professor. Faculty that are unsuccessful in seeking promotion to Professor may resubmit for promotion during the next academic year, or any year thereafter, without prejudice.

There is no time limit over which accomplishments may be considered towards promotion to Professor (provided they were not also considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor). However, the faculty member's portfolio must demonstrate an *overall* sustained commitment to these DPS. The interpretation of "sustained commitment" is at the discretion of the portfolio evaluator, provided the interpretation is reasonable and consistent with the common meaning of that phrase.

The requirements to achieve promotion are described in Section 3.3 of these DPS.

Early Promotion

Faculty may request promotion to the rank of Professor before the completion of four service years as Associate Professor. Requests for promotion prior to this shall be deemed requests for

“early promotion”. Faculty that seek early promotion must submit a Full Review portfolio for the request to receive consideration. Early promotion evaluations have the same possible outcomes as due course promotion requests.

The requirements to achieve early promotion are higher than those required for promotion in due course. These requirements are described in Section 3.3 of these DPS.

2 Personnel Evaluation

In accordance with the criteria described in these DPS, faculty shall receive a rating of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing* or *Beginning* in each area of:

- Teaching
- Scholarly and Creative Activities
- University, Professional and Community Service

The faculty member's ratings in each of these three areas shall collectively determine the outcome of their RTP action. This section describes the requirements to achieve any rating in each area. Section 3 describes how the three ratings result in any RTP action.

Performance evaluations shall be based solely on the evidence provided in the portfolio, unless otherwise specified in these DPS.

Narrative Summaries

As a part of the faculty member's portfolio, the faculty member shall include 1000-word Narrative Summaries for each area of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and University, Professional and Community Service. Faculty shall describe in each narrative:

- their achievements during the review period;
- their progress towards achieving the tenure requirements described in these DPS (for probationary faculty seeking retention);
- their efforts to consider criticisms or suggested improvements, and what effect those efforts have had on their performance in the relevant areas.
- self-assessment and self-reflection of their performance;

The Narrative Summaries should also supply any additional context, argument or detail concerning the data and evidence presented in the portfolio, that the faculty member considers may help evaluators fully understand and properly evaluate the portfolio.

The Narrative Summaries shall be prepared and submitted according to the requirements and protocols described in UPS 210.000.

Evaluation Procedures

In each of the proceeding sections, the evaluation criteria for each area are summarized in the Teaching Evaluation Matrices, Tables 2.1.1 (Teaching), 2.2.1 (Scholarly and Creative Activities) and 2.3.1 (University, Professional and Community Service). Where necessary, further information about evaluation in any category is given in the text.

The achievements outlined in each table assume that the faculty member has had some reasonable opportunity to make contributions in the relevant categories. If, due to circumstances outside of the faculty member's control, the faculty member has been prevented from offering a

contribution in any given area, the evaluators may take this into consideration. Faculty members should discuss any such factors in the relevant Narrative Summary.

Through all categories of evaluation, the Department recognizes that 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. This is referred to as “cultural taxation.” Faculty members are encouraged to discuss their experience with identity-related activities in each category of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and University, Professional and Community Service.

When evaluating the portfolio, evaluators shall consider whether a faculty member has been disadvantaged in any evaluation category, whether due to cultural taxation or any other factor outside of the faculty member’s control. If the evaluator concludes that this is the case they may make an appropriate correction to the faculty member’s rating, in the category where they were disadvantaged. Evaluators shall have discretion as to whether such a correction is warranted, and what the appropriate correction is. Any such correction may only result in the faculty member being rated in a higher category than they would otherwise have been. Where applied, evaluators shall describe in their report what evidence they perceive that justifies such a correction, and how the appropriate correction was determined.

“Review period” refers to either the entire probationary period (for faculty seeking retention or tenure), or the period of accomplishments to be considered for promotion to Professor (minimally the previous four academic years). Where an Associate Professor seeks promotion after an extended period at that rank, all achievements since they were last awarded promotion shall be included in the portfolio and may be considered by the evaluators, but achievements of the prior 4 years shall carry greater weight than older achievements.

2.1 Teaching Performance

The Physics Department's primary function is to promote learning among the CSUF student body. The Physics Department offers a wide range of courses, including: courses at the undergraduate and graduate level; courses targeting physics majors and service courses; discussion and laboratory courses. Physics Department faculty make teaching contributions across several types of courses offered by the department.

Faculty shall strive to continuously improve in Teaching performance at all stages of their careers. Faculty shall seek to incorporate high-impact teaching practices into their classroom activities, such as through inclusion of their research into their teaching curriculum, or through use of modern, research-based physics pedagogies.

The primary goals of Physics faculty, with respect to teaching, are to promote student mastery of physics and to foster student retention in the discipline. In furtherance of both objectives, faculty shall show sensitivity to student learning needs, especially with respect to continuously changing patterns of student preparation, background, culture, gender, ethnicity, and personal identity.

Teaching Evaluation Criteria

Faculty teaching performance shall be assessed using the following four categories:

- Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) scores
- Classroom visitations
- Teaching Materials
- Teaching Development

Faculty shall receive a rating of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing*, or *Beginning* for each category, as well as an overall rating for Teaching.

The requirements to achieve any rating in any category (and overall) for Teaching Performance are given in the Teaching Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.1.1). The conditions required to achieve any given rating are the same regardless of what action the faculty member seeks (except where otherwise noted).

Additional details regarding each category can be found in the text of this section.

Required portfolio materials for Teaching Performance Evaluation:

Per UPS 210.000, the portfolio shall minimally include the following materials related to teaching performance:

- Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance (see Section 2)
- List of all classes taught during the review period
- A blank copy of the Department SOQ form (see Section 2.1.1 and Appendix A)
- Statistical summaries of SOQs (see Section 2.1.1)
- Statistical summaries of grade distributions, for all classes instructed during the review period (required by UPS 210.000, but not otherwise considered by these DPS).

- Tabulated SOQ scores, showing the percentage of A and B scores in each class instructed, and the overall percentage of A and B scores across all classes instructed, over the period indicated in Table 2.1.1 (see Section 2.1.1)
- Raw SOQ data, for all classes instructed during the review period, including comments (see Section 2.1.1 and Appendix A).
- Syllabi for all classes instructed during the review period.
- Representative samples of classroom materials
- Copies of classroom observations (Appendix B)

2.1.0 Teaching Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.1.1)

	Rankings			
Category	Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
SOQ Scores	>85% A and B, across all classes since the previous Full Review	> 75% A and B across all classes, since the previous Full Review	>65% A and B across all classes taught since the previous Full Review	Discussion of SOQ scores received
Classroom Observations	Consistently <i>Exemplary</i> observations (see Section 2.1.2 and Appendix B)	Consistently <i>Accomplished</i> observations (see Section 2.1.2 and Appendix B)	Consistently <i>Developing</i> observations (see Section 2.1.2 and Appendix B)	Consistently <i>Beginning</i> observations (see Section 2.1.2 and Appendix B)
Teaching Materials	<i>Exemplary</i> materials since the previous Full Review (see Section 2.1.3 and Table 2.2)	<i>Accomplished</i> materials since the previous Full Review (see Section 2.1.3 and Table 2.2)	<i>Developing</i> materials since the previous Full Review (see Section 2.1.3 and Table 2.2)	<i>Beginning</i> materials since the previous Full Review (see Section 2.1.3 and Table 2.2)
Teaching Development	At least 3 criteria satisfied OR 2 criteria satisfied, with 1 Type b)	2 Type a) criteria satisfied OR; 1 Type b) criteria satisfied	1 Type a) criteria satisfied	no criteria satisfied
	Criteria that may demonstrate teaching development include: Type a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attendance at a teacher training/development workshop (may repeat up to 2 times) ● Teaching courses at the lower-division, upper-division, and graduate level ● Employing novel and research-based pedagogies ● Inclusion of research, or other high-impact practices, in classroom activities Type b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Textbook authorship ● Design a new class ● Develop a lab manual 			
OVERALL	<i>Exemplary</i> in 2 categories, including at least 1 of SOQ Scores and Classroom Observations, and at least <i>Accomplished</i> in all remaining	At least <i>Accomplished</i> in any 3 categories and at least <i>Developing</i> in 4th	At least <i>Developing</i> in any 3 categories	<i>Beginning</i> in 2 or more categories

2.1.1 SOQ Scores

Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) are the primary mechanism for student evaluation of teaching performance. SOQ's have both a quantitative and qualitative component. This section deals with the quantitative component of SOQ's, qualitative evaluations are considered in Section 2.1.3 (Teaching Materials).

SOQ forms ask students to respond to different statements regarding their instruction, using a five-point scale ranging from "A" (highest ranking) to "E" (lowest ranking). Faculty members are expected to develop and maintain minimum threshold scores for their teaching performance. Threshold scores to achieve any given rating in this category are given in Table 2.1.1.

The portfolio shall include SOQ data for all classes instructed during the Review Period. This allows evaluators to assess ongoing teaching development. However, only classes taught since the previous full review (or previous 4 academic semesters, whichever is longer) shall be considered in evaluating the Teaching Performance, as per Table 2.1.1.

An example SOQ Form is given in Appendix A.

SOQ Bias

Student evaluation of teaching, as expressed through SOQ scores, is an important reflection of teaching performance. However, the Physics Department recognizes that SOQ scores are on occasion biased by cultural factors including (but not limited to) racial, gender, and linguistic biases. Evaluators shall be sensitive to the effect of cultural biases when interpreting a faculty member's SOQ data.

Faculty that perceive cultural bias affecting their SOQ scores are encouraged to discuss this bias in their Teaching Narrative Summary. Evaluators shall also consider any other evidence of bias affecting SOQ data that they perceive, whether or not such bias is raised by the faculty member themselves. Such evidence may be drawn from outside of the portfolio, provided the source of the evidence is clearly identified in the evaluation report.

Should evaluators conclude that a faculty member's SOQ scores are affected by cultural biases, they may apply an appropriate correction to the SOQ Scores rating described in Table 2.1.1. Any such correction may only result in the faculty member receiving a higher rating than they would otherwise. Where applied, evaluators shall describe in their report what evidence they perceive that justifies such a correction, and how an appropriate correction was determined. The evaluators should include the original rating, the corrected rating, and a reason why they did so.

2.1.2 Classroom Observations

Faculty seeking RTP action shall receive at least one classroom observation, by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the Physics Department (or other member of the DPC) per academic year, for the two years prior to their submission of a portfolio. The portfolio must further include observations by at least two different observers. The DPC shall remain abreast of faculty

observation needs, in support of any upcoming RTP actions. These observations shall be conducted according to the guidelines specified in these DPS, and in UPS 210.080.

The observation should normally occur during the Fall Semester (except where this is impractical due to faculty leave). Each observation shall result in a formal evaluation that the faculty member shall include in their portfolio. The observer should also discuss the observation with the faculty member as soon as practical, so that the faculty member can gain feedback on their performance.

The faculty member shall receive a rating (for each individual classroom observation) of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing* or *Beginning* (see Appendix B). If any observation results in the faculty member receiving a rating of *Beginning*, a further observation, by a different observer, is required during the Spring Semester. An additional observation is also required in the Spring Semester for probationary faculty in their 4th or 5th year, if the result of the Fall review is *Developing*.

An example classroom observation form is included in Appendix B.

Faculty that intend to seek promotion to the rank of Professor in the next 2 years should appraise the Department Chair that they require classroom observations. The Department Chair should also remain aware of faculty that may require observations in support of upcoming RTP action.

Choice of Observer

Subject to the requirements of UPS 210.080, the observer may be any tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the Physics Department, including members of the DPC or the Department Chair. The observer may also be a tenured faculty member of a different department, if that person is a member of the Physics DPC. The observer shall be chosen by the DPC.

Criteria to Achieve Each Rating

Per Table 2.1.1, the faculty member must achieve observation reviews that are “consistently” at some rating, to achieve that rating in the Classroom Observations category. “Consistently” shall be understood as the highest rating obtained by any the following three approaches:

- The highest rating such that greater than 50% of observations over the past two years are at that rating or higher,
- The highest rating such at least 50% of observations are at that rating over the past 4 visitations,
- (For probationary faculty only) The rating of the most recent observation, if the faculty member has demonstrated consistent improvement towards this level over previous observations, conducted over the entire probationary period. Consistent improvement may be demonstrated by:
 - improvements in observation ratings over the probationary period, and;
 - discussion, in the Teaching Narrative, of the faculty member’s efforts to incorporate suggestions for improvements from previous observations, coupled with evidence of such effort in the observation reports/SOQ comments.

- The DPC/Department Chair shall have, in their respective evaluations, discretion over whether a faculty member has demonstrated “consistent improvement”, provided their interpretation remains in line with the guidelines presented here. The evaluator(s) shall discuss in their report how the faculty member has demonstrated consistent improvement, if this section is relevant.

Conflicting Reviews

Where two (or more) classroom observations give results that appear to conflict (i.e. assign significantly different ratings in a similar context, and where that difference does not appear to be adequately explained by improvement over time or expected variation between different observers), the DPC should authorize additional observations, by independent observers, to resolve such discrepancies.

The DPC or Department Chair may further choose to exclude, from their respective evaluations, any observations they deem incongruent with the total set of observation reports. However, any such action must be noted and thoroughly justified in the evaluation report.

Additional Observations

The Physics Department may conduct additional observations during either semester, at the request of any of: the faculty member; the DPC, or; the Department Chair. Additional observations shall be included in the portfolio provided the DPC nominates the observer, and any of the following apply:

- The faculty member under observation elects to include the observation.
- The observation was required by these DPS, due to the outcome of a previous observation (see earlier this section).
- The observation was authorized by the DPC specifically for the purpose of resolving a conflict between previous observations (see “Conflicting Reviews”).

If none of these conditions are obtained, or if the observer was not approved by the DPC, then the additional observation shall be regarded as advisory and not included in the portfolio.

2.1.3 Teaching Materials

As a part of their portfolio, faculty shall provide representative samples of materials they have prepared for their classes. This must include syllabi for each class the faculty member has instructed during the probationary period. Where applicable, faculty may also include broader samples including: slides or other visual aids; student assignments/projects/exams; graded student work; evaluation rubrics; standardized assessment tools (e.g. concept inventories) or Learning Management System (LMS) pages that the faculty has used or developed for their classes. This list is illustrative and not exhaustive, faculty may include any material in this section they feel is helpful in illustrating their teaching performance.

A comprehensive listing of all teaching materials the faculty member has generated over the review period is unlikely to be helpful to evaluators. Faculty should instead focus on including materials that are broadly representative, or are needed as evidence of any specific

claims/arguments the faculty member presents in their Teaching Narrative Summary. The faculty member may also include, with their materials, sub-narratives that explain any complex points. Such sub-narratives, if used, shall be as concise as possible.

Evidence of effective teaching materials may also be drawn from demonstration of student satisfaction, through written comments on SOQs, or faculty may discuss their teaching approaches in their Teaching Narrative Summary (i.e., for classes that may not require the development of extensive presentation materials).

Criteria for achieving each rating in this category are given by the Teaching Materials Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.1.2). Included in the matrix are typical examples that might constitute evidence in each category, as well as typical locations where such evidence is often found in the portfolio. In all cases, these are illustrative examples and not intended to be exhaustive.

Within the guidelines given in this Section and Table 2.1.2, evaluators have discretion in their ratings for this section. Notwithstanding, evaluators shall clearly justify their ratings in this section. In particular, where the evaluator does not award a rating of *Exemplary* in any given category of Table 2.1.2, the evaluator(s) shall describe specific actions that the faculty member may undertake to improve their rating at subsequent reviews.

2.1.4 Teaching Development

The Physics Department expects faculty will continually strive to enhance the teaching quality of the Department. Development may be demonstrated by attendance at professional teacher training seminars or workshops that improve the faculty member's own teaching prowess. Development may also be demonstrated by efforts to expand or enhance the Physics Department's teaching offerings, such through the creation of new courses, development of teaching materials used outside of the faculty member's own classes, etc. Faculty shall describe in their Teaching Narrative what efforts have been made to ensure the ongoing excellence of the Physics Department's Teaching program.

Some illustrative examples of actions that enhance the Department's teaching excellence are given in Table 2.1.1. This list is intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Evaluators may note any other accomplishments that they feel are relevant to this area and assign those as completed criteria.

Teaching assignments are made by the Department Chair, to satisfy the teaching needs of the Physics Department. If a faculty member is not able to be assigned courses to satisfy "Teaching courses at the lower-division, upper-division and graduate division" during their probationary period, due to department scheduling needs, that faculty should note this in their Teaching Narrative. A supporting letter from the chair should also be included in the portfolio as evidence this was the case. In such instances, evaluators may consider this criteria as completed by default.

2.1.5 Overall Teaching Evaluation

The faculty member shall receive an overall evaluation for their teaching performance of either *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing*, or *Beginning*. This overall rating is used in Section 3 to determine the RTP outcome.

The overall rating is determined as indicated in Table 2.1.1.

Teaching Materials Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.1.2)

	Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Course information communicated to students	All relevant information clearly communicated	Critical communication clearly communicated, some omissions in supplemental information	A small number of omissions of critical information	Significant omissions in critical information
	Important course information may include (but is not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course dates and locations • Communication protocols with the instructor • Class requirements and criteria to achieve all possible outcomes • Any information required by the department, college or university Possible sources of evidence include: syllabi; SOQ comments; LMS pages			
Clearly defined learning goals	Clear learning goals	Minor improvements possible	Significant improvements possible	Learning goals not clearly stated
	Examples of appropriate learning goals may include (but are not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical information placed in context, highlighting the importance of the topic as a whole • Assumed knowledge is clearly communicated and appropriate • Skills/knowledge that the course will develop are clearly communicated Possible sources of evidence include: syllabi; SOQ comments; examples of work/projects/assignments; sample visual aids			
Establishment of appropriate academic standards and expectations	Academic standards appropriate	Minor improvements possible	Significant improvements possible	Academic standards insufficient
	Examples of appropriate academic standards may include (but are not limited to) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic goals, expectations, competencies (etc.) are appropriate to the course • Information presented/discussed is accurate and appropriate to the course • Assessment items are fair, related to course goals, and administered with appropriate frequency • Grading/proctoring procedures are robust, fair, and conducive to learning Possible sources of evidence include: syllabi; SOQ comments; narratives; example work/projects/assignments; sample visual aids/worksheets; standardized learning tools			
Class materials are conducive to learning	Well-presented materials	Minor Improvements possible	Significant improvements possible	Materials not conducive to learning
	Examples of engaging materials may include (but are not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized and effective slides or other visual aids/demonstrations (where appropriate) • Use of an appropriate variety of teaching/learning strategies • Effective in-class activities/worksheets • Incorporation of faculty research or current/topical events into classroom curriculum Possible sources of evidence: SOQ comments; narrative summary; sample visual aids/assignments; examples work/projects/assignments; LMS pages			
Overall	EXEMPLARY in any 2 categories and at least ACCOMPLISHED in all others	At least ACCOMPLISHED in any 3 categories and at least DEVELOPING in the 4th	At least DEVELOPING in any 3 categories	BEGINNING in 2 or more categories

2.2 Scholarly and Creative Activities

The Department of Physics expects its faculty to engage in Scholarly and Creative Activities (SCA), which it defines as active and productive original research programs in fundamental or applied studies in physics, physics education, or related areas, that increase scientific understanding in those fields. The Department encourages its faculty to incorporate students in their research projects as student-faculty research is a hallmark of CSUF Physics. Faculty shall demonstrate continuing, regular activities that result (or are judged likely to result) in high quality peer-reviewed (when appropriate) scholarly publications. The Department expects its faculty to seek support for their research from internal and external funding agencies by regularly submitting research proposals. The department expects its faculty to be dynamic scholars who grow public and student engagement in research and develop new research methods, techniques, and infrastructure. The Department recognizes that changes in the direction of a faculty member's program of research or scholarly activity will remain broadly consistent with the department standards.

SCA Evaluation Criteria

Faculty SCA performance shall be assessed using the following four categories:

- Publications
- Grant Activity
- Student Engagement
- Additional Evidence

Faculty shall receive a rating of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing*, or *Beginning* for each category, as well as an overall rating for SCA.

The requirements to achieve any rating in any category (and overall) for SCA Performance are given in the Teaching Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.2.1). Conditions to achieve any given rating in any given category are the same regardless of what action the faculty member seeks (except where otherwise noted).

Additional details regarding each category can be found in the text of this section.

Required portfolio materials for SCA Performance Evaluation:

Per UPS 210.000, the portfolio for a Full Review shall minimally include the following materials related to SCA performance:

- Narrative Summary of SCA Performance
- CV
- A copy of each scholarly or creative work published during the review period
- Documentation of the peer-review or jury process
- Copies of letters of acceptance for those completed works that are "in press" or otherwise in the process of publication

- Copies of intramural and extramural grant proposals and, where applicable, grant award letters
- Abstracts of papers presented at professional meetings
- Papers currently being reviewed for publication, copies of manuscripts in preparation, etc.

Where used, “review period” refers to either the entire probationary period (for faculty seeking retention or tenure), or the period of accomplishments to be considered for promotion to Professor (minimally the previous four academic years).

2.2.0 SCA Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.2.1)

	Rankings			
Category	Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Publications	At least 5 publications	At least 3 publications	At least 1 publication	Zero publications
Grant Activity	Awarded at least 2 internal grants, OR, awarded at least 1 external grant	Awarded at least 1 internal grant	Submission of at least 1 external grant	No evidence of grant activity
Student Engagement	<i>Accomplished</i> , AND; Publication with student co-authorship, OR; student conference presentation	At least 2 students enrolled in 499/599 Independent Study classes; OR, at least 1 graduate student finalized to degree with presentation	At least 1 student enrolled in 499/599 Independent Study classes	No student research activity
Additional Evidence	At least 3 criteria satisfied, OR; 2 criteria satisfied, including 1 type b)	Any 2 criteria satisfied, OR; 1 type b) criteria satisfied.	Any 1 criteria satisfied, OR; progress towards any 2 criteria	No additional evidence
	Criteria that may demonstrate additional evidence include: Type a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 additional publication (may be repeated up to 2 times) • Demonstration of a new working experimental research laboratory • Contributed presentations (talk or poster) at a professional conference (may be repeated up to 2 times, at different conferences) • Publication of a conference proceedings (may not also count as a publication) Type b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship of a review article or book chapter • Presentation of an invited oral at a professional conference • Generation of a patent This list is illustrative not exhaustive.			
OVERALL	<i>Exemplary</i> in 2 categories, including Publications, and at least <i>Accomplished</i> in all remaining	At least <i>Accomplished</i> in 3 categories, including Publications, and at least <i>Developing</i> in the 4th	At least <i>Developing</i> in any 3 categories	<i>Beginning</i> in 2 or more categories

2.2.1 Publications

Faculty are expected to demonstrate the output of their original scholarly work through the generation of publications that are peer-reviewed.

“Publication”, where it appears in these DPS, refers to a manuscript presented in a scientific journal that is typical for quality research in the discipline. For a manuscript to count as a publication, for the purposes of these DPS, the manuscript must:

- have been accepted for publication, without further revision, by a recognized and reputable scientific journal
- present the finalized results of an original study in physics, physics education, or a related field
- demonstrate results to which the faculty member, or members of their research team at CSUF, have made a significant contribution to either the production or analysis of the primary data
 - These contributions must occur during the period of the faculty member’s employment at CSUF.
 - “Significant contribution” means that if the faculty member’s contribution to the manuscript were removed from the manuscript, the major findings of the manuscript would change.
 - Provided the faculty member has made such a significant contribution, neither their position in the author list, nor the number of co-authors on the manuscript, has any significance for the purposes of these DPS.
- have undergone peer-review before being accepted
 - “Peer-review” means that the journal’s publication guidelines specify that manuscripts are blind reviewed by one or more expert level scientists in the relevant discipline. Said reviewer(s) make a recommendation to, but are not a member of, the journal’s editorial board (or other equivalent entity), which decides whether to publish the manuscript.

The Department recognizes that, in several areas of physics and its related fields, quality research is typically presented in outlets other than scientific journals (e.g., juried conference proceedings). For results in such fields, manuscripts that otherwise satisfy all above requirements shall be considered as equivalent to publications in a scientific journal.

Notwithstanding, to be rated as *Accomplished* in the publications category, at least one publication must be in a recognized and reputable scientific journal. To be rated as *Exemplary* in the publications category, at least two publications must be in scientific journals.

Faculty should describe, in their Narrative Summary, how their manuscript(s) comports with these requirements. This is particularly encouraged for non-traditional publishing outlets.

2.2.2 Grant Activity

Faculty members are expected to seek funding, and/or time allocation at computing/instrument centers to support their innovative research.

Where used in these DPS, “external grants” refers to funding to support faculty/student research provided by federal funding agencies or foundations. External grants (as defined for the purposes of these DPS) normally continue over a period of at least 2 years, fund multiple elements of a broad research program (i.e. equipment, salaries, travel, publication costs, etc.) and require at least one progress report (or equivalent document) during the term of the grant, as well as a final report.

“Internal grants” refers to funding to support faculty/student research provided by CSUF or the CSU. Grants from external agencies that primarily support specific elements of a broader research program (such as providing computer time, instrument time, telescope observing time, beam-line or other specialized facility time, travel, or meeting organization, etc.), over a limited time frame (normally less than one year) will be considered at the same level as internal grants.

Documentation of grant activity should include funded grants and contracts, review panel comments of unfunded proposals, if available, and submitted extramural grant proposals. Co-PIs should indicate the relative contributions they made to the proposal.

Probationary faculty at their second-year review shall be considered *developing* if they provide evidence of progress towards submission of an external grant. Evidence of progress could include, for example, draft grant proposals or correspondence with granting agencies.

The grant activity requirements to achieve each rating are detailed in Table 2.2.1.

2.2.3 Student Engagement

The Physics Department expects faculty to actively supervise and involve students in research and creative activities. Evidence of student involvement in research activities may include:

- Student authorship as lead-author or co-author of a publication
- Conference reports, presentations, or seminars given by a student
- Direction of students in independent study (course codes PHYS 499/599) and master’s projects/thesis (course code PHYS 597/598) related to the faculty’s research, with a study plan and a final report

The student engagement requirements to achieve each rating are detailed in Table 2.2.1.

Faculty members may engage in additional student mentoring outside of the faculty member’s research group. These contributions can be considered evidence of supporting student engagement.

2.2.4 Additional Evidence

Faculty scholarly and creative activities are expected to lead to wide-ranging contributions to their discipline. Forms of additional evidence of scholarly and creative activities are listed in Table 2.2.2. The publication requirements to achieve each rating are (per Table 2.2.1):

The examples listed in Table 2.2.2 are illustrative and not exhaustive. Evaluators may include other accomplishments that are included in the portfolio, and they deem appropriate.

2.2.5 Overall SCA Evaluation

The faculty member shall receive an overall evaluation for their SCA performance of either *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing*, or *Beginning*. This overall rating is used in Section 3 to determine the RTP outcome.

The overall rating is determined as indicated in Table 2.2.1.

2.3 University, Professional and Community Service

The Physics Department expects that each faculty member will be engaged in service to and actively contribute to the welfare and growth of the department, college, university, community, and/or profession. Service contributions shall be evaluated based on activities described in the service narrative that reflect a commitment to the advancement of learning.

All faculty are expected to participate in collegial governance activities, particularly as members of department and/or college committees, as a part of their service activities. However, for untenured faculty members, development of teaching performance and scholarly and creative activities is of primary importance as reflected in the Criteria for Personnel Actions in Section 3.

Service Evaluation Criteria

Faculty service activities shall be assessed in the following four areas:

- Department service
- College and University service
- Professional service
- Community service

Faculty shall receive a rating of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing*, or *Beginning* for each area, as well as an overall rating for Service. The requirements to achieve any rating in any area (or overall) are given in the Service Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.3.1). Note that the conditions to achieve any given rating in any given area are the same regardless of what action the faculty member seeks. Additional details regarding each category can be found in the text of this section.

2.3.0 Service Evaluation Matrix (Table 2.3.1)

	Rankings			
Category	Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Department Service	At least 2 criteria satisfied, including at least 1 Type b), OR; any Type c) criteria satisfied	2 Type a) criteria satisfied, OR 1 Type b) criteria satisfied	1 Type a) criteria satisfied	No activity
	Criteria that may demonstrate Department service include (all criteria may be repeated up to 2 times, but must be different activities): Type a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on a committee • Colloquia organizer • Physics Club Liaison Type b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair of a committee (cannot also count for type a) • Member of a faculty search committee (cannot also count for type a) Type c) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate or Graduate Advisor • SI Coordinator • Department Chair* 			
College and University Service	At least 2 criteria satisfied, including at least 1 Type b), OR; any Type c) criteria satisfied	2 Type a) criteria satisfied, OR 1 Type b) criteria satisfied	1 type a) criteria satisfied	No activity
	Criteria that may demonstrate College and University service include (all criteria may be repeated up to 2 times, but must be different activities): Type a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on a committee • Participation in inter-departmental or inter-college activities Type b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair of a committee (cannot also count for type a) • Coordination of inter-department or inter-college activities (cannot also count as type a) Type c) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on Academic Senate • Directorship of a CSUF Center • Department Chair* 			
Professional Service	At least 2 criteria satisfied	At least 1 criteria satisfied	Progress towards 1 criteria	No activity
	Criteria that may demonstrate professional service may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal Referee • Grant agency proposal reviewer • Conference organization • Conference session chair • Colloquium presentations • Software development (used outside of the faculty member's own group) • Awards or honors from professional societies or organizations 			

	At least 2 criteria satisfied	At least 1 criteria satisfied	Progress towards 1 criteria	No activity
Community Service	Criteria that may demonstrate community service may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public presentation • Outreach activities • Participation in community events • Work with K12 teachers or classes 			
OVERALL	EXEMPLARY in any 2 categories, including at least 1 of Department or College and University	At least ACCOMPLISHED in any 2 categories, including at least 1 of Department or College and University	At least DEVELOPING in any 2 categories	BEGINNING in 3 or more categories

*Serving as Chair of the Department may count for both Department and College/University service.

2.3.1 Department Service

Service contributions to the department are divided into three types based on the expected effort required. Examples of each type of service to the Department are given in Table 2.3.1. This list is intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Reviewers may note any other accomplishments that they feel are relevant to service to the department, determine which type is appropriate based on effort required, and assign those as completed criteria.

2.3.2 College and University Service

Service contributions to the College and University are similarly divided into three types based on the expected effort required. Examples of each type of service to the College and University are given in Table 2.3.1. This list is intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Reviewers may note any other accomplishments that they feel are relevant to service to the department, determine which type is appropriate based on effort required, and assign those as completed criteria.

2.3.3 Professional Service

Examples of professional service contributions are given in Table 2.3.1. This list is intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Reviewers may note any other accomplishments that they feel are relevant to professional service and assign those as completed criteria.

2.3.4 Community Service

Examples of community service activities are given in Table 2.3.1. This list is intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Reviewers may note any other accomplishments that they feel are relevant to community service and assign those as completed criteria.

2.3.5 Overall Service Evaluation

The faculty member shall receive an overall evaluation of their service activities of either *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing*, or *Beginning*. The overall rating is determined as indicated in Table 2.3.1. This overall rating is used in Section 3 to determine the RTP outcome.

3 Criteria for Personnel Actions

This section describes the possible outcomes for any RTP action that a faculty member may seek, and the conditions required to achieve said outcomes. The recommended actions are given by the appropriate “Action Matrices” described in this section.

For each Action Matrix, the leftmost column indicates the faculty member’s overall ranking in the area of Teaching. The topmost row indicates the faculty member’s overall ranking in the area of Scholarly and Creative Activities. The color of the intersecting cell indicates the action for which the faculty member should normally be recommended, as described in the accompanying Key for each matrix. Considerations from Service accomplishments are given in the Key. Where used below, “Service” is shorthand for the area of University, Professional and Community Service.

A unique action matrix is given for each possible action that a faculty member may seek. The Physics Department recognizes that probationary faculty members require time to develop skills and build accomplishments in all three areas. Hence, the requirements for positive tenure or promotion decisions are higher than those required for retention.

3.1 Criteria for Retention

3.1.1 Second Year Retention

		Scholarly and Creative Activities			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Teaching	Exemplary				
	Accomplished				
	Developing				
	Beginning				

Key

	Recommendation for Retention
	Recommendation for Retention; Full Performance Review required at 3 rd year if Service is <i>Beginning</i>
	Recommendation for Retention with Full Performance Review at 3 rd year if Service is <i>Developing</i> or better; otherwise Termination

3.1.2 Fourth Year Retention

		Scholarly and Creative			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Teaching	Exemplary				
	Accomplished				
	Developing				
	Beginning				

Key

	Recommendation for Retention
	Recommendation for Retention with Full Performance Review required at 5 th year if Service is <i>Developing</i> or better; otherwise Terminal Year
	Recommendation for Terminal Year

3.1.3 Additional Full Reviews

Faculty may be required to submit a Full Review portfolio in the third or fifth year, in place of the standard Abbreviated Review, as indicated in the second and fourth year (respectively) Action Matrices. The possible outcomes of an additional Full Review are that:

1. The faculty member is retained for a fourth or sixth year, respectively (during which they will submit their normally scheduled Full Performance Review)
2. The faculty member receives a terminal year.

Full Review shall be evaluated by the same Action Matrix that the faculty member was evaluated by at their previous Full Review. The possible outcomes are as described in the relevant Action Matrix, with the exception that if the evaluation indicates that the faculty member should be retained but with a full review the following year (indicating that the faculty member has shown no improvement from the previous review), a terminal year should normally be recommended.

3.2 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

		Scholarly and Creative			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Teaching	Exemplary				
	Accomplished				
	Developing				
	Beginning				

Key

	Recommendation for Early Tenure and Promotion if Service is rated as <i>Accomplished</i> or better; otherwise treat as below
	Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion if Service is <i>Developing</i> or better; otherwise terminal year
	Recommendation for terminal year

3.3 Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

		Scholarly and Creative			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
Teaching	Exemplary				
	Accomplished				
	Developing				
	Beginning				

Key

	Recommendation for Early Promotion if Service is <i>Exemplary</i> ; otherwise treat as below
	Recommendation for Promotion if Service is <i>Accomplished</i> or better; otherwise no promotion recommendation
	No promotion recommendation

Promotion to the rank of Professor may be considered for faculty members whose accomplishments fall outside of the normal ranges indicated in this section but still meet the minimum requirements set forth in campus policy (UPS 210.000 & UPS 210.002). Both the DPC and Department Chair must indicate a concurring opinion on such a recommendation in their respective reports. Both reports must provide a thorough and compelling justification, highlighting the exceptional accomplishments under consideration, in support of this recommendation.

Appendix A

Sample Student Opinion Questionnaire

Department of Physics

Student Opinion Questionnaire

Student opinion questionnaires play an important role in the evaluation of instructors. Your opinions influence the evaluation of instructors that takes place periodically. Responses are anonymous, and instructors will not have access to the forms or the data until after final grades have been officially submitted. Written comments are encouraged. Course evaluations are confidential and should be discussed with others.

Studies have shown that student evaluations of teaching are often influenced by students' unconscious and unintentional biases about the race and gender of the instructor. For instance, women and instructors of color are systematically rated lower in their teaching evaluations than white men, even when there are no actual differences in the instruction or in what students have learned.

As you fill out the course evaluation, please keep this in mind and make an effort to resist racist stereotypes about the instructor(s). Focus your opinions on the effectiveness of the instructor in the course, what you have learned, and not unrelated matters.

In the table below, please rate the indicated aspects of the instruction in this course from A (highest rating) to E (lowest rating).

	A	B	C	D	E
Clarity of Instruction					
Explanation of basic concepts					
Effective use of examples, illustrations and/or demonstrations					
Makes effective use of class time					
Responsiveness to student questions					
Promoting an atmosphere conducive to student-faculty interaction					
Attitude towards students					
Fairness of course procedures					
Enthusiasm for the course					
Overall rating of instruction					

Please write below any comments you have, positive and/or negative, that point out specific good or bad features of the instruction in this class. Your constructive comments can be helpful to the instructor and to the department to improve the quality of instruction.

Appendix B

Sample Classroom Observation Form

Department of Physics

Classroom teaching observation form

Faculty member under observation:

Faculty member performing observation:

For the observer: For each of the items below, rate the instruction as:

Exemplary – if the faculty member demonstrates excellence in that category

Accomplished – if the faculty member succeeds but has some area for improvement

Developing – if the faculty member almost succeeded in this area but needs moderate improvement

Beginning – if the faculty member struggled in this area

Preparation: The faculty member was well-prepared for class. The faculty member provided a coherent structure for the class, which was understood by the students.

Comments:

Rating:

Clarity: The faculty member presented the material clearly and in a manner that was easy to follow. Teaching and learning strategies were appropriate to the subject matter and considered student needs.

Comments:

Rating:

Student involvement: Students were visibly engaged with the material. This can be evidenced by students actively taking notes, asking questions, and/or participating in discussions and activities.

Comments:

Rating:

Responsiveness: The faculty member would periodically “check in” with students (either verbally or nonverbally) and react accordingly. This may take the form of changing the pace of instruction, answering questions clearly, introducing more examples, ...

Comments:

Rating:

Classroom Management: The faculty member demonstrated effective classroom management skills. The classroom environment supported equitable learning for all students. The faculty member managed class time well.

Comments:

Rating:

Overall, what went well in this class?

Overall, what suggestions for improvement do you have?

Overall rating:

To the observer: Please give the faculty member an overall rating for the observation, according to the table below:

Overall Rating:

	Requirement
Exemplary	At least 3 Exemplary categories, with no more than 1 Developing and 0 Beginning ratings.
Accomplished	At least Accomplished in any 3 categories, with no more than 1 Beginning rating.
Developing	At least Developing in any 3 categories
Beginning	Any other