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Criteria for Evaluations and Recommendations for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

There are four criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP):

(1) Professional Preparation and Development
(2) Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Contributions
(3) Contributions to the Field of Study (Research and Publications; Creative Activity)
(4) Service to University and the Community

(Note: Accelerated Promotion: Faculty wanting to be considered for accelerated promotion or early tenure must notify the Department Chair and the College Dean, in writing and prior to the start of the department-level reviews.)

(1) Professional Preparation and Development

Terminal Degree

The Ph.D. normally is considered the terminal degree for faculty in the Department of Family & Consumer Sciences. Exceptions may include the Masters of Fine Arts (MFA) degree and Masters in Architecture in the area of Interior Design; Doctor of Jurisprudence (J.D.) degree in the area of Consumer Affairs; Doctor of Public Health (Dr.PH.), Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) and the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) degree in the area of Nutrition, Dietetics & Food Science. Specific determinations of a terminal advanced degree in unusual circumstances may be embodied in a Memo of Understanding between the faculty member, the Department and the College

(2) Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Contributions

Teaching Effectiveness
Teaching effectiveness is a primary criterion for retention and tenure as well as promotion to any rank.

Procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness:
A. Peer evaluation
B. Student evaluation
C. Student consultation (forum)

A. Peer evaluation of class performance is made according to the following procedures:
1. During the fall semester, prior to deliberation, the Department Personnel Committee will schedule a class visitation for evaluations related to retention, tenure, and promotion. Tenured faculty members may indicate in writing and send to all levels of reviews (Department Chair, Chairs of Department and College Personnel Committee, and Dean) their wish not to be considered for promotion after receiving their notice of eligibility for promotion, and they will not receive a visitation except when they are scheduled for 5-year post tenure review. All others will receive a class visitation.

2. The Department Chair (or designee) and one member of the Personnel Committee (or designee) shall visit a class of each candidate eligible for retention, tenure, or promotion. The total number of different evaluators visiting each eligible candidate shall be no less than two per academic year. Class visits will be scheduled by mutual agreement between the evaluator and the faculty member being evaluated. A normal visitation will be approximately one hour. PP&R developed guidelines for Peer Reviews of Teaching: A Best Practices Guide (Appendix A) Online, distance learning, service learning, and laboratory courses will be evaluated through a process mutually agreed to by the faculty member and the Department Personnel Committee, and should include both peer and student evaluations. If a faculty member is being reviewed for retention and/or promotion, the evaluation must be done by a faculty member of a higher rank.

3. Each visiting faculty member conducting a Peer Evaluation will complete an Evaluation Form (Appendix B) and submit the form to the Department office, once the Evaluator and the Candidate have consulted and came to an agreement (post-evaluation interview) An Evaluator may elect to change items in the Evaluation if they are inaccurate or misleading, as pointed out by the Candidate. A copy of this form will be submitted to the candidate within 14 calendar days of the visit. An additional copy will be placed in his/her Personnel Action File located in the Dean’s Office. The candidate may request a meeting to discuss the report, to be held within ten (10) calendar days after the written report is placed in the candidate’s campus mailbox. The candidate may also submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing within the ten (10) calendar days. At the conclusion of the ten (10) calendar days, the report, and any response or rebuttal statement, will be placed in the Personnel Action File, with copies sent to the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair. A copy of the report shall be retained in the candidate’s Personnel Action File for a minimum period of five years.

B. Student Evaluation

1. The Department utilizes a department-approved Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness form (Appendix B) for measuring teaching
competence. A minimum of two classes annually for each faculty member, as determined by the faculty member, shall have such written student evaluations. Probationary faculty in their first year of service at CSUN will have two courses evaluated in both the fall and spring semesters.

2. After semester grades are assigned, the Department Chair shall provide each faculty member with the results of his/her quantitative and qualitative (comments reports) evaluations and shall place copies of the results in the Personnel Action File, located in the Dean’s Office, where they shall be retained for a minimum period of five years.

C. Student Consultation (forum)

Students shall be provided the opportunity to consult with the Department Personnel Committee regarding the teaching performance of probationary or tenured faculty members under consideration for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. The consultation will take place in a building that is different from the department’s building.

1. Student consultation will occur on a date approved by the Department Personnel Committee
2. A notice should be posted no later than 5 business days before the consultation session
3. During this student consultation period, a notice will be posted (see Appendix D) in Sequoia Hall.
4. Written statements from students regarding faculty shall be handled in accordance with Section 600 of the Administrative Manual.

Instructional Contributions

Faculty who undertake activities that make substantial contributions to their courses beyond what is normally evaluated as teaching effectiveness, or who engage in activities that contribute to instruction beyond the limits of their classes, shall be given appropriate positive recognition.

Examples of such instructional contributions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Development of effective instructional materials, teaching strategies, or other pedagogical improvements, especially when these are useful to other instructors and their students
- Dissemination (through workshops, seminars, or conferences) of information, materials, or skills designed to sustain or improve teaching effectiveness
- Development and/or execution of programs designed to assist the teaching efforts of other faculty, for example, training programs for new faculty or teaching assistants
• Development of unusually clear educational objectives and of the testing instruments to measure their achievement, when these are helpful to the Department or University

(3) Contributions to the Field of Study: Peer Reviewed Publications and Other Significant Scholarly and Creative Contributions

Expectations of Contributions to the Field of Study:

Assistant Professor
1. Significant scholarly or creative contributions to the field of study as defined in Section 600 beyond terminal degree are desirable.
2. Functions as an active member through participation in professional organizations, institutes, etc.
3. Pioneering work in profession is not required.

Associate Professor
1. Significant scholarly or creative contributions to the field of study as defined in Section 600, beyond the terminal degree are normally required.
2. Participation in a program and carrying out of significant responsibilities in professional organizations, institutes, etc.
3. Pioneering work in profession (e.g. organizing professional groups, promoting reforms, developing new fields) is desirable.

Professor
1. Significant scholarly or creative contributions to the field of study as defined in Section 600 beyond terminal degree is required. Exceptions to these requirements shall be defined and justified by the candidate and evaluated by the recommending agencies in the Department. No exception shall be granted unless the candidate has demonstrated outstanding contributions to the field of study in other ways. The Personnel Planning and Review Committee will evaluate all candidates requesting consideration under this provision.
2. Assumes leadership responsibilities; presents major papers in professional organizations, institutes, etc.
3. Pioneering work in profession, (as examples organizing professional groups, promoting reforms, developing new fields) is desirable.

Defining Significant Scholarly and Creative Contributions to the Field of Study for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

This section describes research, scholarship, and creative activity used by the Department of Family & Consumer Sciences for evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure. Our faculty engages in basic and applied research and creative activities appropriate to their specialties that support the department’s mission and disseminate their findings and results through relevant modes.
A. Peer Reviewed Publications:

1. Publications deemed appropriate to the FCS Department. The FCS Department defines "Publications" in the following manner:

   a. The publication of any paper in a refereed journal on a topic related to family and consumer sciences, pedagogy, and/or application of scholarly knowledge in professional services.

   b. The publication of books, book chapters, monographs or manuals based on research, including textbooks that are based on technical and research information.

   c. Papers in proceedings that have been peer-reviewed by proceedings committee for merit.

   d. Juried and/or invited exhibits related to Interior Design, Housing, Apparel and other aspects of art associated with Family and Consumer Sciences.

   e. Any original, creative, or educational material that has been juried or reviewed by recognized scholar and contributor to the field of study and made available for distribution. The burden of proof for evaluation and distribution rests with the candidate.

   f. Externally funded grants obtained through submitting a written proposal, which has been evaluated through a formal, juried review process.

   g. In the event that a non-refereed publication or non-juried exhibit is submitted as an equivalent to publication, the following review process will be used:

      i. A three-person external peer review team will be jointly selected by the candidate and the Department Personnel Committee.

      ii. Names of potential peer reviewers can be submitted by the candidate or Department Personnel Committee or in consultation with the Option Coordinator and Department Chair.

      iii. One reviewer will be chosen by the candidate, one by the Department Personnel Committee, and one jointly selected.

      iv. The external review process must be consistent with deadlines within Section 600 of the Administrative Manual.

   h. An accreditation self-study report reviewed and approved by appropriate campus officials. The faculty member wishing to receive equivalent credit for an accreditation self-study as a publication must be the primary author of the self-study.
i. A manuscript for a journal article, conference proceeding, book chapter, monograph, or manual submitted, but not yet published, may be included if it is accompanied by a letter from the editor(s) stating that it has been accepted for publication through a peer review process. Books must be published in order to be accepted as publications. Revisions of published books are not considered publications.

j. Any scholarly work recognized as a publication for a previous promotion cannot be considered for subsequent promotion.

k. The Department sets as a minimum requirement the following number of publications or other significant contributions for the candidate to be promoted from one rank to the next: a) at least 3 to be promoted from Assistant to Associate; b) at least 2 to be promoted from Associate to Full professor. Was approved by FCS faculty 10/23/13.

2. Authorship
Candidates need to clearly identify peer-reviewed publications and other significant contributions by providing evidence of the peer-reviewed process.

- Authorship guidelines:
  o Anyone who has made a substantial, direct, intellectual contribution to work should be acknowledged. This should include contributions from colleagues and students. An example of authorship policy includes descending order of contribution, placing first the person who took the lead in writing the manuscript or grant, or doing the research. It is suggested that authorship should be decided before starting the project.
  o In the PIF, each faculty member shall include a Co-Authorship Disclosure Form (Appendix E), so that the reviewers can interpret contributor-roles correctly.

B. Other Significant Research and Creative Activity
Individual faculty members may demonstrate their academic productivity through any of the eight models of scholarship described below. All models require peer review.

1. The Laboratory Model. Refers to experimental and laboratory testing.

2. The Empirical Model. Adapts the empirical methods and theories of natural and social sciences to the study of the human behavior and environment.

3. The History Model. Relates the cultural, political, and social context to the past.
4. The Design Model. Relates to the traditional practice of the design disciplines and visual arts where creative work is peer reviewed.

5. The Applied Research Model. Refers to practical problems investigated, implemented, and/or evaluated.

6. The Theoretical Model. Involves the development and application of theory in all areas of Family & Consumer Sciences.

7. The Studio Model. Refers to the studio experience as a form of inquiry particularly through the making of building designs, interior and apparel designs, and food products.

8. The Pedagogical Model. Focuses on the art and science of teaching theory and methodology in all areas of Family and Consumer Sciences including Community Service Learning, for example.

(4) Service to the University and Community

Contributions to the University and community refer to those contributions normally expected from all members of the faculty. Such contributions include active membership on committees at the Department, College, or University level; student advisement, and such other responsibilities, including community service, undertaken to advance the goals of the University. The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences identifies the following as contributions to the University and Community recommended for each rank:

**Assistant Professor**
1. Effective participation in faculty and student affairs committees or initiatives at various levels (University, College, Department)
2. Student advisement, mentoring, and retention activities are highly desirable
3. Community service

**Associate Professor**
1. Significant contributions and effective participation in faculty and student affairs at various levels (University, College, Department)
2. Identification as being effective in student advisement, mentoring, and retention activities
3. Community service

**Professor**
1. Demonstrates leadership qualities and makes significant contributions through effective participation in faculty and student affairs at various levels (University, College, Department)
2. Identification as being effective in student advisement, mentoring, and retention activities
3. Community service

Appendix A

Peer Reviews of Teaching
A Best Practices Guide
California State University, Northridge

This document is intended as a guide to assist university departments and personnel committees to prepare for and conduct peer teaching reviews and evaluations. A subcommittee of PP&R, conducted on campus and off campus research into “best practices” for conducting peer reviews of teaching. This document summarizes those practices that may be most valuable and applicable to our campus.

While there are multiple methods of evaluating teaching that involve various sources of data, this guide focuses primarily on conducting reviews of classroom teaching, online teaching and teaching that involves service learning. Although Personnel Procedures may require peer teaching evaluations to take place on a set regular basis, departments and individual faculty can conduct more than the required reviews.

Purpose of Peer Reviews
The literature identifies two types of peer evaluations with different purposes: formative (to improve teaching) and summative (for personnel decisions). At CSU, Northridge peer classroom reviews are often utilized for personnel decisions as well as to provide the instructor with constructive feedback. Each department should decide on the focus and purpose of their classroom peer review process. Departments must conduct minimum summative peer class visits, but may also, with the concurrence of the faculty member, conduct formative peer reviews.

Notice of the Review
According to Section 612.5.2.c. (2) (ii) of the Administrative Manual, the scheduling of a peer class visit should be by mutual agreement between the faculty member being reviewed and the reviewer. In addition, Article 15.14 of the Faculty Contract, requires that the individual being reviewed should be provided a notice that a classroom visit is to take place at least five days prior to the visit. In order to provide an effective review, the visit should take place on a class session that reflects regular class topics (not on the first day of class or a day when an exam is being administered or returned).

Orientation and Training of Faculty Who are Asked to Conduct Peer Reviews
Because peer reviews of teaching are important elements of an individual’s retention, tenure and promotion process, we recommend that Department Chairs spend some time orienting and training tenured faculty, who may be asked to conduct peer reviews, about the purpose and process for conducting peer reviews for their Department.
What is the best way to begin a peer review process?
The faculty member who is assigned to conduct a classroom peer review should contact the person who will be reviewed and if possible meet to discuss the purpose, process, date and location of the review visit. If the reviewer is unclear about the purpose of the class visit, he or she should consult with the Department Chair. The review process is enhanced if there is a discussion prior to the visit about the course goals and objectives with the instructor being reviewed. This is also the time that the person being reviewed can ask for specific feedback about his or her teaching. If a classroom observation form or rubric is utilized, this should be shared with the faculty member prior to the review. This meeting can also be the best time to ask for a copy of the course syllabus and review it together.

What to look for when reviewing a class syllabus?
A typical syllabus should include the sequence of assigned readings and activities by topic and date and information about course policies, procedures and objectives. The syllabus should also include language about University policies related to the Americans with Disabilities Act, plagiarism and others as listed in the course catalog. The syllabus should describe what students will be expected to know or be able to do after completing the course, including the skills and competencies that will be developed. The course student learning objectives should be clearly listed in the syllabus. The syllabus should give students a sense of what the course will cover, what work is expected of them, and how their performance will be evaluated, including grading criteria.

What to look for during the class visit?
Faculty who are asked to visit and review the teaching of a colleague should, if possible, observe the class for the entire session or with three-hour classes, at least until the break. The following should serve as a guide for what to look for and note in the review process:

- Does the class start on time?
- How many students attend the class?
- Does the instructor introduce the topics for the day, is material presented in a logical manner, does the professor use examples to illustrate concepts, does the professor summarize the main points at the end of the presentation?
- Does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter?
- Does the instructor speak clearly and hold the students' attention throughout the session?
- Is the instructor enthusiastic about the subject matter?
- Does the instructor answer questions clearly and accurately?
- Does the professor provide a clear explanation of assignments, due dates, etc.?
- If there is a group assignment during the review, are clear directives given to the small groups; do students understand what they are supposed to do in the small groups?
- Is the lecture/class discussion consistent with the course outline, class content, etc.?
Is the instructor aware of the extent to which students are engaged in the lecture/discussion? Does the instructor attempt to elicit input from those who are less engaged? Is the instructor receptive to student questions? Does the professor use appropriate pacing for student note-taking?

**How is feedback provided?**
At California State University, Northridge, we have traditionally relied on written comments (via letters) as a form of feedback to the faculty member. These letters range from brief reviews with template language to extensive letters that include the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s presentations and provide comments for improvement. We recommend thoughtful and extensive written feedback that is individualized to the specific instructor, course and discipline under review. All written or verbal feedback should be accompanied with specific examples or observation notes and delivered in a timely manner to meet the RTP deadlines. A follow-up feedback meeting is also recommended to provide both highlights and strengths of the teaching as well as address areas for improvement.

**Departments Can Develop Class Visit Observation Instrument/Guidelines**
Departments can develop their own evaluation/observation forms, rubrics and review criteria that are appropriate to their discipline and type of class being observed. We recommend criteria and rubrics that allow for written comments and observations not just a check list of criteria. Many Departments at California State University, Northridge have developed their own review criteria and/or observation forms. Some examples, available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website under “policies” or the Department’s website include Personnel Procedures for the Departments of Business Law, Civil Engineering & Applied Mechanics, Economics, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies and Marketing.

**How to conduct peer reviews of online or hybrid courses?**
For hybrid classes the peer review can be a blended peer review. For example, the peer reviewer can attend a class when it meets face-to-face and when the class meets online. This will provide the peer reviewer with information about how the face-to-face portion connects with the online portion of the class. The blended peer review also enables the peer reviewer to see the instructor’s pedagogy, delivery, engagement of and interaction with students as it is done in a physical classroom visitation.

Online classes can be peer-reviewed by having the peer-reviewer log-in as a guest when the class is synchronized (meeting online at the same time). Another way is to have the peer-reviewer “lurking” – sitting in as a “technician,” while the class is in session. “Lurking” provides the peer-reviewer with information about the instructor’s online teaching and interaction with students without the students’ knowledge.

**Suggested Steps for Peer Reviewing a Fully Online Course**
1. Request to observe the online course. This involves asking for the following from the online instructor:

**Special thanks to Carolyn Jeffries Maeder, Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, for her contributions to this section.**

a. Enrollment into the online course.

You should decide whether you would like to be enrolled as a formal guest or as a lurker. A formal guest would be introduced to the students and have a presence in whole class and group discussions and on participant lists. Someone who is lurking is not typically introduced to the students and is not an active member of online discussions or interactions. The lurker is transparent, the same way a technical support person would be. There are benefits and challenges to both designations.

b. Information on how to log-in.

c. Information on where the syllabus or syllabus information is located and how to access it.

The syllabus could be posted as one piece for reading online, copying and pasting into a word document, and/or downloading. Or, it could be posted in a folder as several separate pieces: course description, course schedule, readings and resources, contact information, and objectives. You could request that the instructor e-mail you a copy of the syllabus or place a paper copy in your mailbox; however, this would be extra work for the online instructor if the syllabus was developed and posted in pieces.

2. Arrange for an observation time frame.

In an online course this could vary (e.g., an hour, a day, a week, a specific time) depending on how the course is set up in regard to synchronous and asynchronous aspects such as due dates.

3. Log-in to the course and review the syllabus or syllabus information according to the evaluation criteria.

4. Visit a few sections of the online course and review them according to the evaluation criteria.
Sections could include lectures, topic information, resources, whole class discussion forums, group forums, blogs, assignments, weblinks, course information, activities/exercises, reviews, and quizzes. As with on-ground observations (a typical face-to-face, residential CSUN course), as a peer reviewer you may not have access to some important sections/components of the course such as quizzes, each student's grade book, and personal communication of students with other students or students with the instructor.

5. Follow the same format for providing feedback as with on the classroom courses, either a letter or a letter and follow-up meeting to provide feedback.

Other Relevant Tips for Reviewing On-line Courses
When reviewing and evaluating an online course and its instructor be aware of the following issues:

1. If there seem to be formatting, layout, or technological problems/challenges - remember that the instructor has little control over much of the availability and functioning of the technology. It is unfair to include such technology related items or problems in instructor evaluations. However, it is fair to assess what the instructor has done to compensate for those problems and make information easier to find (e.g., posting an assignment due date in many places at multiple times, giving lots of reminders about locations or different types of information).

If there seems to be a paucity of visible communication and interaction, it may be that the communication is rich and robust but it is occurring via independent technologies and/or private means. If there seems to be a lack of visible interaction, you may want to ask the instructor how and where it may be occurring.

1. If the online discussions and interactions seem shallow, off topic, or profuse, they may be. Educators who are new to online instruction may not yet be knowledgeable about ways to allow students to communicate on topic and off topic as well as freely explore new technologies.

Look for indications that the instructor is designing, setting up, staging and giving feedback to encourage rich discussion and interaction (e.g., positing protocols and specific directions/activities for discussion topics, giving feedback that brings a discussion back on topic, reminding students that there are special forums for sharing off topic information). Look for specific ways that the instructor is allowing for off topic interaction. Ways to allow for off topic communication (e.g., sharing locations of additional information/resources, sharing new ideas, asking questions about procedures, coursework, or the field) can range from setting up special discussion forums with labels designating them as off topic to simply suggesting that the students communicate off topic issues within the message center or by e-mail.
1. Look for indications that the instructor is introducing a new technology and inviting free exploration.

**Reviewing and Assessing Service Learning Teaching/Courses**

Service-learning is a teaching methodology which links classroom learning and community service to enrich the learning experience and emphasize civic responsibility (University of Missouri, Center for Teaching & Learning, www.umsl.edu). Some suggested criteria for evaluating the teaching of service learning courses or components of courses are:

**Suggested Steps and Tips for Reviewing Service Learning Teaching/Courses**

1. Prior to the visit, follow the same suggested steps for setting up any classroom visit.
   Request to visit the course during the time that the course meets on campus and students are provided a background for service learning and given instructions for their placement. If the course is taught off-campus, request site location and a map (if necessary), specific time to arrive, and parking details.

**What to look for during the class visit?**

. Does the instructor clearly explain the service learning processes and requirements to the students?
. Are the service learning aspects of the class integrated with the course subject matter?
. Does the instructor maintain current and ongoing contact with community sites where students are engaged in service learning?
. Are service learning opportunities developed and designed in partnership with the community being served?
. Does the instructor work with the student and community partner to resolve scheduling and logistical problems?
. Does the instructor provide opportunities for students to reflect about their service learning experiences and does he or she provide feedback about the reflections?
. Does the instructor motivate students to continue to perform community service?
. Does the instructor make students aware (through placements or reflection) about the needs of diverse community populations?

If online, hybrid or service learning courses will be reviewed using different criteria from that used for in-classroom visits, the Department should develop these procedures and submit them for review through the University review and approval process.
Appendix B
Department of Family & Consumer Sciences
Faculty Evaluation Form For Classroom Visitations

Instructor being evaluated:
Date: ____________________________
Class: ____________________________ Time: ____________________________ a.m. / p.m.
Mode of Teaching: ☐ Lecture ☐ Interactive ☐ Activity/Lab ☐ Lecture/Questions ☐ Seminar
Evaluator's Name ____________________________ Evaluator's Signature: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Unable to evaluate</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter level appropriate to course level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude and enthusiasm of instructor Interested in topic Projects his/her interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides for student participation within potential of class size and format of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths:


Areas for Possible Improvement:


Additional Comments:


Appendix C

Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness Form

California State University, Northridge
Department of Family & Consumer Sciences
Faculty Evaluation Questions

Instructions - Read Carefully

Use a #2 Pencil only on the Scranton form. Do not write on the evaluation question sheet. Do not write your name on the Scranton form. If a question is not applicable — leave it blank. There are 22 numbered questions.

Bubble in the class number of the class you’re evaluating on the very top portion of the Scantron (the un-numbered section).

1. My student class level
   a. Freshman/Sophomore
   b. Junior/Senior
   c. Graduating Senior
   d. Credential Student
   e. Graduate Student

2. My overall GPA range is:
   a. 1.6 or less
   b. 1.6-1.9
   c. 2.0-2.5
   d. 2.6-3.3
   e. 3.4 or greater

3. This course is required for my academic program (major)
   a. True
   b. False

4. This course is in my concentration or option
   a. True
   b. False

5. My major and area of study is (leave blank if major is not listed)
   a. FCS/Apparel
   b. FCS/Consumer Affairs
   c. FCS/ Family Studies or FCS/Education
   d. FCS/Interior Design
   e. FCS/Nutrition, Dietetics, & Food Science
The following statements reflect various ways instructors can be described. Bubble the letter on the Scantron that indicates the extent to which the statement is descriptive of the instructor in this course.

Rate your level of agreement for each comment
a = Not at all descriptive; e = Very descriptive

6. Is well prepared
   a. b. c. d. e.

7. Has interest and concern in the quality of his/her teaching
   a. b. c. d. e.

8. Has a genuine interest in students
   a. b. c. d. e.

9. Seems to enjoy teaching
   a. b. c. d. e.

10. Relates to students as individuals
    a. b. c. d. e.

11. Explains clearly
    a. b. c. d. e.

12. Presents origins of ideas and concepts
    a. b. c. d. e.

13. Discusses points of view other than his/her own
    a. b. c. d. e.

14. Has an interesting style of presentation
    a. b. c. d. e.

15. Emphasizes conceptual understanding
    a. b. c. d. e.

16. Is careful and precise in answering questions
    a. b. c. d. e.

17. Knows if the class is understanding him/her or not
    a. b. c. d. e.

18. Invites criticism of his/her own ideas
    a. b. c. d. e.

19. Is a dynamic and energetic person
20. Is valued for advice not directly related to the course
   a.  b.  c.  d.  e.

21. Course is among the best I have had at this university
   a.  b.  c.  d.  e.

22. Professor is among those from whom I have learned the most
   a.  b.  c.  d.  e.
Appendix D

Notice for Student Consultation

NOTICE

THE DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY & CONSUMER SCIENCES AT CSUN INVITES STUDENTS TO SUBMIT WRITTEN AND/OR GIVE ORAL STATEMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE ON THE REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND/OR PROMOTION OF

\- (names of faculty under consideration)

ANY STUDENT WHO WISHES TO DISCUSS THE PERFORMANCE OF THE FACULTY MEMBER(S) BEING CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE SHOULD MEET WITH THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE ON

(date) (time) (location)

Students are informed that at some point their comments might not be kept confidential. (CSUN Administrative Manual section 613)
Appendix E

Co-Authorship Disclosure Form

There were (please list number) co-authors responsible for the final preparation of
(please list name of work)

The following chart indicates the creative responsibility of each of the co-authors (please
list co-authors in the order in which they appear on the work). If this format does not
provide a suitable mechanism for explanation, use a separate sheet of your own design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature/name</th>
<th>Creative Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-author 1:</strong></td>
<td>Type name here (Describe responsibility here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-author 2:</strong></td>
<td>Type name here (Describe responsibility here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-author 3:</strong></td>
<td>Type name here (Describe responsibility here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-author 4:</strong></td>
<td>Type name here (Describe responsibility here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-author 5:</strong></td>
<td>Type name here (Describe responsibility here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>