

**PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS
APPROVAL FORM**

Discipline: Sociology


Jared Barton (Oct 12, 2026 09:12:45 PDT)

RTP Committee Co-Chair Signature and Date

Michelle Dean

RTP Committee Co-Chair Signature and Date


Jessica Lavariega Monforti (Oct 14, 2026 10:03:20 PDT)

Provost Signature and Date

10/14/2026

Sociology Department Personnel Standards

2026

Introduction

The Sociology Department is founded on a commitment to excellence in teaching and student learning, significant contributions through scholarship, and meaningful service to the Department, university, profession, and community. The Department Personnel Standards (PPS) for the Sociology Department at California State University, Channel Islands (CSUCI), present collectively held expectations for tenure-line faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Sociology PPS lists appropriate indicators of professional growth, development, and accomplishment to guide review processes associated with retention, tenure, and promotion. The Sociology Department takes collective responsibility to provide the review, feedback, and mentoring necessary for all members to succeed by achieving tenure and promotion.

The Sociology PPS shall¹ be reviewed every five years from the approval date of the current PPS. If changes to the PPS are proposed, the Department shall submit the PPS to the Committee on Equity and Anti-Racism (CEAR) for review and feedback prior to submitting it for approval to the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC).

If the faculty member's PPS changes during the interval between their initial appointment to a tenure-track position at CSUCI and the time of application for retention, tenure, and/or promotion, the faculty member may choose to be reviewed under the new PPS or under the PPS in effect at the time of their initial appointment.

Candidates applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion should consult the [University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP-22-11](#) in addition to the Sociology PPS. Reviewers at the level of the Department Personnel Committee (PPC), Chair,² Dean, URTPC, Provost, and President should incorporate both the Sociology PPS and SP-22-11 into their deliberations.

Tenure-line faculty hires might come with one or two years of service credit to be counted toward eligibility for tenure and/or promotion based on employment history (including service at the rank of lecturer), as negotiated by faculty as a condition of their initial appointment at CSUCI. Service credit affects the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) review cycle schedule (see Table 1).

¹ Throughout this document, the word “shall” indicates the action is mandatory. The words “may” and “should” indicate the action is optional.

² All mentions of Chair review in this document are if applicable.

At all levels of the RTP review cycle, the faculty member under review may submit a rebuttal statement in writing and/or request a meeting to discuss the evaluation and/or recommendation within 10 business days following the receipt of the evaluation and recommendation.

Table 1: Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Review Schedule

No Service Credit	1 Year Service Credit	2 Years Service Credit
1st Year PDP (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	1st Year (Year 2 at Rank) PDP (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	1st Year (Year 3 at Rank) PDP (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)
2nd Year Portfolio -Annual (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	2nd Year (Year 3 at Rank) Portfolio -Annual (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	2nd Year (Year 4 at Rank) Portfolio -Cumulative (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, Dean, URTPC, and Provost)
3rd Year Portfolio -Cumulative (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, Dean, URTPC, and Provost)	3rd Year (Year 4 at Rank) Portfolio -Cumulative (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, Dean, URTPC, and Provost)	3rd Year (Year 5 at Rank) Portfolio -Annual (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)
4th Year Portfolio -Annual (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	4th Year (Year 5 at Rank) Portfolio -Annual (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	4th Year (Year 6 at Rank) Portfolio -Cumulative (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, Dean, URTPC, Provost, and President)

5th Year Portfolio -Annual (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, and Dean)	5th Year (Year 6 at Rank) Portfolio -Cumulative (Reviewed by PPC, Chair, Dean, URTPC, Provost, and President)	
6th Year Portfolio -Cumulative (Review by PPC, Chair, Dean, URTPC, Provost, and President)		

Department Personnel Committee (PPC)

The Sociology Department Personnel Committee (PPC) evaluates the candidates under review and recommends them for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The PPC shall be constituted as follows, in accord with [Article 15](#) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Probationary and tenured faculty shall elect a three-member PPC of tenured faculty members. All tenured faculty members shall put their name on the ballot unless they are on leave. All PPC members shall have a higher rank than faculty being considered for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Faculty shall not serve simultaneously on more than one level of review, so faculty elected to the URTPC are ineligible to serve on the PPC. Tenured faculty under review for promotion to Full Professor are ineligible to serve on the PPC for probationary faculty being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. When there are insufficient eligible faculty from the Department, the PPC shall include faculty from a related academic discipline.

A signed evaluation and recommendation shall specifically state how the faculty member has met or has not met expectations outlined in the PPS. Unless they are serving as a member of the PPC, the Department Chair shall submit a signed independent evaluation and recommendation. Department Chairs not holding higher rank than faculty members undergoing review shall recuse themselves from the RTP review process for that faculty member. If a Department Chair is undergoing RTP review, they are ineligible to participate in the RTP review process.

Professional Development Plan (PDP)

The Professional Development Plan (PDP) serves as a faculty member's agenda for achieving the professional growth required for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. It should describe the activities that the faculty member plans to undertake and the goals they plan to achieve in order to merit the granting of retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

PDP statements for teaching, scholarly activities, and service shall not exceed 500 words each. These statements should describe the faculty member's professional goals, areas of interest, resource requirements, anticipated professional development activities, and expected accomplishments in each of the three areas in order to meet the Department Personnel Standards.

For faculty whose appointment begins in Fall semester, the PDP shall be submitted before the start of the second semester of the faculty member's initial year of appointment. This applies to faculty hired at the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor, but not to faculty hired at the rank of Full Professor. The PDP must be submitted along with at least one peer observation of teaching. It is the collective responsibility of the Department to ensure that this peer observation takes place. If the candidate asks a faculty member for a peer observation of teaching and they are not responsive, the candidate should notify the Department Chair or Dean. Faculty whose appointment begins in Spring semester shall submit their PDP and peer observation before the start of their second Spring semester.

The PDP shall be reviewed and approved by the end of the faculty member's first full academic year of appointment. The PDP shall be reviewed by the PPC, the Department Chair (if not on the PPC), and the Dean. In the event that the PPC, Department Chair, or Dean does not approve the PDP, the faculty member shall revise and resubmit within two weeks.

The approved PDP will be included in the faculty member's portfolio when applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The PDP is a planning document, not a formal agreement. Revision of the PDP in subsequent years is not normally necessary. However, if a faculty member's focus shifts substantially from the PDP during the probationary period, an explanation regarding the shift in focus should be provided.

Faculty should aspire to deepening their contributions over the course of their career. Because contributions in each area draw on a wide variety of skills, understandings, experiences, and capacities, the deepest contributions must be the outcome of intentional and incremental development. The PDP represents a strategic opportunity to map out those trajectories of development and intended contributions. The process of developing a PDP also represents an

opportunity to receive feedback and support in navigating those trajectories.

A PDP should set realistic goals and identify specific incremental steps to take toward those goals. In the area of teaching, that might include a sequence of course preparations, areas of skills and expertise to be developed, and identification of opportunities for developing those skills. In the area of scholarship, that might include a sequence of presentations and publications culminating in a general contribution, specific research skills to be developed to further one's agenda, and potential milestone publications or recognitions. In the area of service, it might include identification of general areas for service about which faculty are passionate, the identification of specific service opportunities within them, and plans for developing the capacities for and ultimately the achievement of leadership positions in those areas.

Requirements for Retention, Tenure and/or Promotion

For retention, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor, each faculty member is expected to make suitable contributions in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Retention

For retention, the level of achievement attained in each of the three areas shall be indicated as "On track to exceed Department Personnel Standards," "On track to meet Department Personnel Standards," or "Not on track to meet Department Personnel Standards."

According to SP-22-11, eligibility for retention requires that faculty members receive at least one evaluation rating of "On track to meet Department Personnel Standards" or "On track to exceed Department Personnel Standards" from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for retention in year two, three, four or five.

For retention, the period under review is the period since the last submission of the portfolio. For the third probationary year (or second probationary year at CI for faculty hired with two years of prior service credit), the period under review is the entire probationary period, including years for which service credit is granted.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the level of achievement attained in each of the three areas shall be indicated as "Exceeds Department Personnel Standards," "Meets Department Personnel Standards," or "Does not meet Department Personnel Standards."

According to SP-22-11, eligibility for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires that faculty members under review obtain a rating of “Meets Department Personnel Standards” or “Exceeds Department Personnel Standards” in all areas of evaluation from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

For tenure, the period under review is the entire probationary period, including years for which service credit is granted.

Promotion to Full Professor

For promotion to Full Professor, the level of achievement attained in each of the three areas shall be indicated as “Exceeds Department Personnel Standards,” “Meets Department Personnel Standards,” or “Does not meet Department Personnel Standards.”

According to SP-22-11, eligibility for promotion to Full Professor requires that faculty members under review obtain a rating of “Meets Department Personnel Standards” or “Exceeds Department Personnel Standards” in all areas of evaluation from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for promotion to Full Professor.

For promotion of tenured Associate Professors to the rank of Full Professor, the period under review is time elapsed since the closure date of the portfolio submitted for promotion to Associate Professor.

The Portfolio

The portfolio shall be compiled and submitted by the faculty member under review using an online platform. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that the portfolio is current and complete before it is submitted. The portfolio shall be comprised of the approved PPS, the approved PDP, the faculty member’s CV, a list of the faculty member’s assigned Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) for each semester, and a list of all classes taught. The list of all courses taught each semester at rank shall include relevant details such as modality, class size, and if it was a new preparation. Should the faculty member choose, they may submit an optional cover letter not to exceed 750 words.

The portfolio shall also include at least one peer observation of teaching for each probationary year, and at least one peer observation of teaching during time at the rank of Associate Professor for promotion to Full Professor (the candidate is welcome to request and include more peer observations of teaching if useful, but it is not expected). The peer observations of teaching shall be provided by a tenured faculty member at CSUCI who holds a rank higher than that of the faculty member being observed. Teaching observations conducted by one’s

peers should assess pedagogical effectiveness of teaching methods and course materials, including the syllabus and delivery of content. Peer observations are most valuable when they identify areas of strength and areas to be considered for improvement. It is recommended that some observations be conducted by Sociology faculty, but external observers can also provide invaluable perspectives and should be chosen strategically for their relevant expertise.

Lastly, a narrative self-assessment of activities and accomplishments in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service is required. The narrative self-assessments should not exceed 1000 words each. Narratives are meant to provide a big-picture view of each area of performance, helping readers to not only understand how specific accomplishments described connect to one's guiding philosophy and long-term goals, but to also see evidence of continuous learning and growth through description and reflection of their activities. While narratives are primarily retrospective (unlike the PDP, which is primarily prospective), narratives should also include a discussion of plans for ongoing and future professional development in each of the areas.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence and explanation for all achievements. The appendix of the portfolio shall include syllabi for all courses taught and supporting materials that document accomplishments, including copies of scholarly work, external letters of support, evidence of teaching effectiveness, evidence of assessment of student learning outcomes, evidence of faculty development activities, evidence of anti-racist pedagogical efforts, evidence of culturally relevant pedagogy, and evidence of cultural taxation, invisible labor or hidden service.

Faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service shall not be "double counted," despite the recognition that many activities and accomplishments may straddle multiple categories. For example, faculty may, at their discretion, involve students in different student research activities; however, each student research activity may be classified under only one faculty responsibility area (Teaching, Research, or Service) and may not be double-counted. Since there are different opportunities that come up for student research, all activities may not be considered the same. For instance, while similar forms of student research (such as capstone projects) may be used across different contexts, the classification may be determined by the primary end goal of the activity. Student research with a pedagogical or mentoring focus may be designated under teaching; student research primarily aimed at producing scholarly outputs may be designated under research; while student research centered on applied, community-engaged outcomes may be designated under service. When such overlap occurs, it is up to the candidate under review to justify which contributions correspond to each category. Each discrete activity of student research or community-based research mentioned by faculty in their portfolio shall be considered under only one category of professional contribution.

In addition to the materials submitted by the faculty member under review to the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), the Personnel Action File (PAF) includes Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs), peer observations of teaching, and prior review cycle letters from each level of review.

A portfolio is required for Year 2, Year 3, Year 4, Year 5 and Year 6. After achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a portfolio is only required when going up for promotion to Full Professor. We suggest that candidates talk with senior faculty about methods for keeping track of their work during the probationary phase, in the transition from Associate to Full, and for five-year reviews post-tenure.

The following sections provide additional information about narratives and supporting materials for each of the three areas of review: teaching, scholarly activities, and service.

Teaching

The General Department Personnel Standards define teaching as a cyclical process composed of (1) the planning, creation, and implementation of appropriate and effective course methods, materials, and teaching practices; (2) the assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and teaching practices; and (3) efforts to improve teaching and learning, personal reflection, and responsible change. This cycle reflects the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher dedicated to continuous improvement.

Course Design and Implementation. The candidate's narrative and appendices shall demonstrate how they use specific methods and materials that are appropriate and effective. Candidates shall demonstrate how they have effectively balanced rigor, access, and equity in their teaching.

Faculty use of high-impact teaching and learning practices that promote student success, especially for historically underrepresented groups, are encouraged. These include, but are not limited to, culturally-relevant pedagogy, anti-racist pedagogical practices, and service-learning opportunities. Faculty may draw on their teaching materials from the academic year or teaching for Extended University outside of their contractual obligations.

Supporting materials to document that expectations have been fulfilled can include syllabi, examples of instructional methods that actively engage students through high-impact practices, examples of assignment prompts, examples of exam questions, and examples of student work.

Assessment, Reflection, and Pedagogical Development. Candidates' narrative and appendices

shall show active engagement in assessment of student learning outcomes and efforts to improve teaching and learning through personal reflection and responsible change.

The Sociology Department encourages the development of faculty toward mastery of teaching practices. That is a long process of growth and development which includes not only sustained practice and reflection, but keeping abreast of developing norms and best practices in the discipline and beyond. To do so, faculty are expected to seek out and take advantage of opportunities to develop new skills and learn about new practices as part of a strategic developmental trajectory. Candidates are encouraged to engage in experiential learning in the classroom. As such, narratives may reflect on the ways faculty have tried, failed and succeeded in their pedagogical approaches informally.

Supporting materials can include evidence of assessment, modification of instructional methods, revision of assignments, redesign of course structure, evidence of professional development opportunities, analysis of equity gaps, and evidence of scholarship on teaching and learning. At a minimum, evidence of teaching effectiveness should include peer observations of teaching and SRTs. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on peer observations of teaching and SRTs in their narratives.

While peer observations and student evaluations are required elements of assessment, candidates are encouraged to reflect beyond solicited feedback from others. To have value, assessments of any sort must be received and addressed, which represents the process of reflection. Candidates should indicate in their teaching narrative that they have examined their assessments and sought to interpret them to the best of their ability. Reflection should not be solely backward looking, but forward looking. The primary value of reflection is to identify strengths that can be built upon, and weaknesses that can be remediated. The candidate should clearly indicate how reflection has resulted in plans to shape future teaching practices in ways that will lead to deeper student learning.

SRT evaluations require focused interpretation – identifying areas where students are satisfied and not satisfied, and determining what that might mean for teaching quality. Quantitative evaluations are to be interpreted as a rough indicator of student satisfaction with the course and with the instructor, and not directly as a measure of the quality or effectiveness of teaching. Assessments of teaching effectiveness should also be guided by the open-ended comments on the evaluations, which can make sense of specific issues that are contributing to learning or detracting from it. Student feedback on the relevancy of course content should also be taken into consideration to support growth in course design and implementation. In all cases, the focus should be on patterns of comments rather than individual comments.

All forms of student assessment should be examined for potential biases, given that research

has indicated pervasive bias across social categories of identity, such as gender, race, age, and sexuality. In accord with the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements regarding SRTs when faculty believe that additional information is needed or in the case of perceived student bias.

Beyond course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, and pedagogical development, the teaching narrative and supporting materials can also include evidence of mentoring students outside of the formal advisory role, engaging students in research, assisting them with graduate school applications, and writing letters of recommendation.

The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in teaching, and will be evaluated based on the following table.

Table 2a: Teaching Expectations for Retention

	<i>Not on Track to Meet Standards</i>	<i>On Track to Meet Standards</i>	<i>On Track to Exceed Standards</i>
Retention	Insufficient evidence of implementing the examples listed above in course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities, and pedagogical evolution, as appropriate.	Demonstrates and provides sufficient evidence of implementing the examples listed above in course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities, and pedagogical evolution, as appropriate.	Demonstrates and provides sufficient evidence of innovative, impactful, high quality course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities and pedagogical evolution, and/or demonstrates emerging leadership in these areas.

Table 2b: Teaching Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor

	<i>Does Not Meet Standards</i>	<i>Meets Standards</i>	<i>Exceeds Standards</i>
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	Insufficient evidence of implementing the examples listed above in course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities, and pedagogical evolution, as appropriate.	Demonstrates and provides sufficient evidence of implementing the examples listed above in course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities, and pedagogical evolution, as appropriate.	Demonstrates and provides sufficient evidence of innovative, impactful, high quality course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities and pedagogical evolution, and/or demonstrates leadership in these areas.
Promotion to Full Professor	Insufficient evidence of implementing the examples listed above in course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities, and pedagogical evolution, as appropriate.	Demonstrates and provides sufficient evidence of implementing the examples listed above in course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities, and pedagogical evolution, as appropriate.	Demonstrates and provides sufficient evidence of innovative, impactful, high quality course design, implementation, assessment, reflection, professional development opportunities and pedagogical evolution, and/or demonstrates leadership in these areas.

Scholarly Activities

Faculty are expected to establish a record of scholarly endeavors that generates and disseminates knowledge. Publications are the central component in any body of scholarship, as they demonstrate a collective contribution to some field of study within the discipline and beyond. For a publication to count towards meeting or exceeding standards for retention, promotion, or tenure, it must be published or accepted during the period under review for a peer reviewed journal article, or in print or in production for a book manuscript.

For either journal articles or book manuscripts, contributions may be comprised in the findings of systematic empirical research or in the insights associated with rigorous theoretical/conceptual elaboration, or systemic review of a body of literature. Publications will be evaluated as a collection, focusing on the academic and intellectual contribution of the body of scholarship as a whole. Scholarly activities conducted and/or published in languages other than English shall be given the same consideration as those conducted and/or published in English.

Individual academic publications vary substantially in the extent of their contributions. The Sociology Department encourages colleagues to aspire to make significant contributions, as that has a range of indirect benefits for our Department, our university, and our students – as well as the individual's own academic trajectory. To provide that encouragement, the Sociology Department recognizes essential differences in types of publications, assigning greater value to those which make greater contributions.

We recognize that scholars are intentional about pursuing publications in specific journals. This intentionality may include the selectivity or influence of a journal or may include other factors like intended audience (disciplinary vs. interdisciplinary), affiliation with a professional association, or special issues of journals that coalesce around a particular subject matter, to name a few. To recognize this scholarship philosophy, we encourage the candidate to include in their narrative a discussion about their intentions behind publishing in particular journals that may not be highly selective, may be interdisciplinary, or reflect solely academic subfield influence. Additionally, journal article contribution can be gauged by selectivity and influence – generally measured in terms of acceptance rates, impact factor (or other parallel indicators), and reputation of the publishing house and editorial staff. The Sociology Department makes a distinction between different types of journals – those with lower acceptance rates and higher impact, and vice versa. Journals of the former character count more toward exceeding expectations for scholarly activities. Publishing in predatory journals will not count at all. A predatory journal is one that typically has some combination of these characteristics: no peer-review process or an inadequate peer review, one that publishes all articles for which the author pays article processing fees, has unverified impact factors, aggressively targets authors for publication, advertises a timeline for publication that is unrealistic, etc. The candidate under review should provide information about the nature of the journal and the rationale for publishing there. The expectation is that the body of scholarship

for junior faculty will generally be published in mid-tier journals, while publishing in higher tier journals will exceed expectations.

The publication of a book chapter in an edited volume can also represent a valuable academic contribution. To count as an equivalent to a peer-reviewed journal article, candidates must submit evidence of peer review. In addition, invited publications, and publications in journals that have modified peer review, or editorial review – such as publications in the proceedings of professional meetings, book reviews and other review publications, publication of policy briefs or reports to (or sponsored by) research institutions, and community-based research – can also be important venues to present research. The rigor of these types of publications varies depending on the publisher, editor, and degree of internal or external peer review.

Book manuscripts generally represent a significant contribution, as they are a more extended and developed presentation on a subject. As with journals, there is a wide range of contributions generally associated with the publisher and the review process that they employ. A research monograph published with a university or other academic press after peer review represents the standard expectation for tenure and promotion. Textbooks focusing on the dissemination of existing research rather than the publication of original research also contribute to the field and count for meeting standards. Research monographs and textbooks both go towards meeting expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Full Professor. Book manuscripts that are self-published will not count towards meeting the standards for tenure or promotion to Associate or promotion Full Professor.

The academic contributions associated with issues of authorship can vary similarly to those associated with publication venue. In Sociology, the general expectation for faculty is to contribute primarily to joint-authored publications to meet expectations. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to contextualize the relative weight of authorship roles. Contributions representing more significant authorship, such as sole-authored publications, will exceed expectations.

In addition to a body of published research, candidates are expected to provide evidence of professional activities that indicate ongoing engagement with research in the discipline and beyond. Such evidence might include presentations at regional, national or international professional meetings; grants awarded (and, to a lesser extent, significant unfunded grant applications); digital scholarship; papers under review; and projects in process. Evidence of projects in process include article submission, revise and resubmit editorial decisions, and conditional acceptance.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) can be included in scholarship activities rather than teaching activities. To include SoTL in scholarship, the candidate should show that it is part of the candidate's core research agenda, and that it meets the expected criteria and rigor in research.

Evaluation of Sociology faculty members for retention, tenure and promotion shall be based on the demonstration of a body of scholarship that contributes to their academic subfield and to the discipline. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in scholarly activities, and will be evaluated based on the following table.

Table 3a: Scholarship Expectations for Retention

	<i>Not on Track to Meet Standards</i>	<i>On Track to Meets Standards</i>	<i>On Track to Exceed Standards</i>
Retention	Insufficient evidence of a research agenda that will lead to one book manuscript or three peer-reviewed articles	Evidence of ongoing research agenda that will likely lead to one book manuscript or three peer-reviewed articles (or equivalent)	Evidence of ongoing research agenda that will likely lead three articles where one or more has sole authorship; three articles where one or more is in a top-tier journal; more than three peer-reviewed articles; a sole-authored book manuscript; or a book manuscript plus an additional publication

Table 3b: Scholarship Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor

	<i>Does Not Meet Standards</i>	<i>Meets Standards</i>	<i>Exceeds Standards</i>
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	Fewer than one book manuscript or three peer-reviewed articles	One book manuscript or three peer-reviewed articles (or equivalent)	Three articles where one or more has sole authorship; three articles where one or more is in a top-tier journal; more than three peer-reviewed articles; a sole-authored book manuscript; or a book manuscript plus an additional publication

Promotion to Full Professor	Fewer than one book manuscript or three peer-reviewed articles	One book manuscript or three peer-reviewed articles (or equivalent)	Three articles where one or more has sole authorship; three articles where one or more is in a top-tier journal; more than three peer-reviewed articles; a sole-authored book manuscript; or a book manuscript plus an additional publication
------------------------------------	--	---	---

Service

Faculty shall take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the University, Department, Discipline, and Community through the application of professional expertise. Candidates are expected to maintain appropriate and consistent service activity throughout each period of review. It is up to the faculty member to describe the responsibilities and significance of the service they perform. Narratives should provide a sense of the specific work associated with service roles.

Faculty members under review shall clearly show that they have assumed a service load appropriate to the three Weighted Teaching Units (3 WTUs) that all tenure-track faculty are assigned. This baseline service expectation represents 20% of overall workload per semester. While all faculty are held to the 20% service workload a semester, greater depth of service and roles of greater responsibility are expected as faculty are promoted through the ranks.

Any service that is compensated by reassigned time shall be considered by reviewers when evaluating overall accomplishment and growth in the area of service. Faculty who receive reassigned time for service beyond the standard 3 WTUs are expected to perform an amount of service consistent with the standard 20% of overall workload plus an additional amount of service commensurate with each additional WTU of reassigned time. If a faculty member receives reassigned time for a service role, they must reveal that it is compensated, and explain what other service they engage in that fulfills their initial 3 WTUs for service.

The opportunities to serve are always more plentiful than the availability of time, so faculty must make strategic decisions about how to fulfill their service obligations and opportunities. The Sociology Department holds and supports the collective belief that the most useful and important service should be a source of passion and satisfaction. To accomplish that, tenure-line faculty are encouraged to intentionally develop a service trajectory, in the same way that they develop a research trajectory, by identifying strategic steps to reach particular goals and outcomes. No faculty member is expected to avail themselves of opportunities to serve in all capacities listed below, but are expected to provide ample service in each area to collectively represent sufficient and significant service.

The four areas of service activities, described in detail below, are as follows: Department service; University service; Professional service to the discipline; and Professional service to the larger community. The Sociology Department encourages each tenure-line faculty member to serve in the capacities listed below, but requires particular attention to service to the Department and the University. The type of service dedicated to the Department and University shall gradually increase with time spent at rank to eventually take on more significant leadership roles. Faculty should describe the work they contribute in their various service roles to articulate both the quality and quantity of service. In describing service workload, faculty members under review are encouraged to address issues of cultural taxation and invisible labor.

Department. Tenure-line faculty are expected to contribute to Department-related tasks and participate in Department-related activities, including but not limited to: participation in governance activities; participation in ad-hoc committees or task forces as needed; participation, formally and informally, in search and hiring processes; Department curriculum-building and implementation; Department assessment activities; peer observations of teaching; Department representative to the Academic Senate; Department representative to the Local Curriculum Committee; advisory roles for student organizations; and mentorship of junior faculty. In support of our students, tenure-line faculty are encouraged to attend Sociology Department events whenever possible, such as capstone presentations, majors fairs, orientations, preview days for prospective students, and graduation ceremonies.

University. Tenure-line faculty should participate in shared governance through regular participation in university service roles, including but not limited to: serving on Academic Senate committees and other university-wide committees; recruitment of new students, faculty, staff, and administrators; and participation in affiliated groups. In identifying service roles at the university level, faculty should distinguish among different types of university service roles – standing committees and ad hoc committees, elected versus appointed positions, and those with heavy versus lighter service loads. Tenure-line faculty are encouraged to support and attend university events whenever possible, such as convocations, commencement, campus hiring events, and cultural events for our diverse student body.

Professional Service to the Discipline. Tenure-line faculty are expected to serve our profession, defined inclusively as the collective institutional field of higher education. The focus of that service is naturally at the disciplinary level (primarily Sociology but including any other disciplines with which faculty engage through interdisciplinary work). Examples of service include but are not limited to the performance of peer reviews in the publication process; editorial board responsibilities; reviews of Departments or colleagues at other institutions; and participation in governance, leadership positions, committee work, or conference organizing for professional organizations. Additional professional service may also include organizations that are not discipline-based (e.g., Campus Compact, American Council on Higher Education, Alliance of Hispanic Serving Institution Educators).

Professional Service to the Community. Tenure-line faculty are encouraged to serve the community, both locally and beyond, both directly and (more commonly) through service to community-based organizations. Service can be performed by volunteering professional skills; sitting on the boards of community organizations; engaging in public sociology (e.g., by presenting research to community members, publishing of opinion editorial pieces, disseminating digital scholarship, or giving interviews to news media); or by representing the Sociology Department in the community at large in other ways. To satisfy professional requirements for community service, the service should draw on one's professional skills or capacities.

Candidates under review shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed service expectations, and will be evaluated based on the following table.

Table 4a: Service Expectations for Retention

	<i>Not on Track to Meet Standards</i>	<i>On Track to Meet Standards</i>	<i>On Track to Exceed Standards</i>
Retention	No evidence for a consistent record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with their assigned 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)	Demonstrates and provides evidence for a consistent record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with their assigned 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)	Demonstrates and provides evidence that they have assumed a service load of a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that they have gone beyond both their assigned 3 WTUs for service and any additional assigned time for service commitments (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)

Table 4b: Service Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor

	<i>Does Not Meet Standards</i>	<i>Meets Standards</i>	<i>Exceeds Standards</i>
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	No evidence for a consistent record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with their assigned 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)	Demonstrates and provides evidence for a consistent record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with their assigned 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)	Demonstrates and provides evidence for sustained participation in service on a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that goes beyond their 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)

Promotion to Full Professor	No evidence for a consistent record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with their assigned 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)	Demonstrates and provides evidence for a consistent record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with their assigned 3 WTUs (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)	Demonstrates and provides evidence for sustained participation in service on a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that goes beyond their 3 WTUs for service and any additional assigned time for service commitments (see above for expectations appropriate to rank)
--	---	--	---

Statement on Equity and Inclusion

The Sociology PPS affirms California State University, Channel Islands' commitment to diversity, equity, anti-racism, inclusion, and accessibility. Given this commitment, the Sociology PPS encourages and values faculty contributions to equity and inclusion across all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Sociology Department is responsible for fostering an inclusive community that strives for equity on our campus and beyond. Candidates are encouraged to illustrate how their experiences of cultural taxation, invisible labor, or differential access to resources and opportunities have impacted any area of their portfolio. The PPC shall recognize and mitigate the possible impact of bias on the PPS's evaluation of candidates.