

California State University Channel Islands

Department Program Personnel Standards

Proposed by the tenured and probationary faculty of the

School of Education

Educational Leadership and School Counseling & Psychology Department

Approved by:



RTP Committee Co-Chair Date

08/05/2025



Provost Date

08/05/2025

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS	3
INTRODUCTION	3
STATEMENT ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, AND ACCESS/ACCESSIBILITY	3
REQUIREMENTS FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND/OR PROMOTION	4
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP) AND PORTFOLIO	6
<i>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (Section H in SP 22-11)</i>	6
<i>THE PORTFOLIO (Section K in SP 22-11)</i>	7
STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (PPC)	10
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	11
TEACHING	12
STANDARD A: FACULTY WILL DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE PLANNING, CREATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COURSE METHODS, MATERIALS, AND TEACHING PRACTICES.	12
STANDARD B: FACULTY SHALL ENGAGE IN ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND TEACHING PRACTICES.	14
STANDARD C: FACULTY SHALL ENGAGE IN EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING, REFLECTION, AND RESPONSIVE CHANGE	16
REQUIREMENTS FOR RETENTION IN TEACHING	18
REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR IN TEACHING	18
SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES	19
STANDARD: FACULTY ARE EXPECTED TO ESTABLISH A RECORD OF SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ENDEAVORS THAT GENERATES, INTEGRATES, AND DISSEMINATES KNOWLEDGE.	19
EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT IN THE CATEGORY OF SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES CAN INCLUDE BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:	19
I. TIER ONE:	19
II. TIER TWO:	20
REQUIREMENTS FOR RETENTION IN SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES	21
REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR IN SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES	22
PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL, PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE	22
STANDARD: FACULTY SHALL TAKE A CONTINUOUS AND ACTIVE ROLE IN ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF THE UNIVERSITY, THE PROFESSION, AND THE COMMUNITY THROUGH GOOD CITIZENSHIP AND APPLICATION OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE.	22
REQUIREMENTS FOR RETENTION IN SERVICE	26
REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR IN SERVICE	27
WHAT IS CREDIT?	28
WHO LEADS CREDIT?	28
WHAT ROLES ARE INCLUDED?	29
CREDIT TERMS	29
Contributor Role	29
Role Definition	29
WHO USES CREDIT?	29
WHAT BENEFITS WILL CREDIT BRING?	30
HOW IS IT IMPLEMENTED?	30
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS	30
ABOUT CASRAI	30
GET INVOLVED	31

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS

School of Education

Educational Leadership and School Counseling & Psychology Department

Program Personnel Standards

This document will be reviewed every five years or earlier at the request of the University President, the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs, or the University RTP Committee.

INTRODUCTION

The Educational Leadership and School Counseling & Psychology Department – referred to as the **Department** hereafter – utilized the (a) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy SP-22-11, (b) the General Personnel Standards (GPS) document, and (c) the School of Education 2019 Personnel Program Standards (PPS) in designing these PPS specific to the new Department. The Department’s PPS provides guidelines for the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process for tenure-line faculty members under review. While “faculty” generally refers to both non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) and tenure-line faculty, for the purposes of this PPS, it refers only to probationary and tenured faculty. This PPS applies to tenure-track faculty whose home department is the Department. (note: Faculty affiliated with the Department –e.g., core or affiliated faculty in the doctoral program–, although holding a role as specified in the Department’s bylaws, follow their home department’s PPS.) Candidates applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion should also consult the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP-22-11 (referred to in this document as the “RTP Policy”) and obtain advice from Faculty Affairs, Success, and Equity (FASE), a faculty mentor, and/or their Program Chair when compiling their portfolio. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence and explanation for all achievements. Faculty hired under a previous Senate RTP policy (SP-17-01) and School of Education PPS may elect to stay under the guidelines of those documents in consultation with FASE.

Statement on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Access/Accessibility

These PPS affirm the Department’s commitment to equity and diversity as reflected by the Centers for Social Action and Global Engagement of the University, as well as Academic Senate Resolution SR-16-01. Faculty members are responsible for helping to foster a collaborative and inclusive community that strives for equity and equal opportunity on our campus and beyond. Given this commitment, these PPS encourage and value contributions to diversity, equity, inclusion, and access/accessibility (DEIA) through teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and professional, departmental, university, and community service, including community-based research.

Statement on Anti-Racist Educators

As educators, we recognize the importance of addressing racial inequities and creating

opportunities for all students to succeed. Anti-racist educators are those who actively seek to understand and challenge the ways that systemic racism impacts education and who work to dismantle systemic inequities. The Department expects faculty to integrate anti-racist principles into teaching, research, service, and professional development and articulate these efforts in their RTP narratives where relevant. Examples may include inclusive pedagogical practices, research that addresses racial equity, or service roles that advance anti-racist goals. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on how their work contributes to dismantling systemic inequities in education.

Statement on Anti-Ableism

Anti-Ableism consists of strategies, theories, actions, and practices that challenge and counter ableism, inequalities, prejudices, and discrimination based on developmental, emotional, physical, or psychiatric (dis)ability. The Department:

- acknowledges disability diversity while treating all disability categories equally regardless of societal or historical biases or stigma toward some conditions (the wording is from disability advocates which we determine as socially valid, while acknowledging that individualized accommodations bring equity for full participation in education and the workplace)
- challenges ableism
- promotes disability inclusion
- is aware of language and seeks to use inclusive anti-ableist language
- treats people with disabilities as equals with the general public. The department agrees with this statement from disability advocates about equality of all humans as a baseline while recognizing individualized accommodations for equity (as determined by the individual and DASS for students and with HR for employees).
- actively works to make everything accessible

[modified from Everyday Activism Network]

Requirements for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion

According to the RTP Policy, eligibility for retention requires that faculty members receive at least one evaluation rating of “On track to meet Program Personnel Standards” or “On track to exceed Program Personnel Standards” from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for retention. However, receiving a single evaluation rating of “On track to meet Program Personnel Standards” or “On track to exceed Program Personnel Standards” does not in and of itself guarantee the granting of retention, if adequate progress has not been shown in other areas of evaluation. The standards applied by reviewers shall be in line with reasonable expectations for probationary faculty growth, development, achievement, and commitment to principles of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access/accessibility along their entire path toward tenure and/or promotion.

According to the RTP Policy, eligibility for tenure and/or promotion requires that faculty members under review obtain a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” or “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” in all areas of evaluation (Teaching or Professional Activities; Scholarly and/or Creative Activities; and Service) from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for tenure and/or promotion (refer to Section L of the RTP Policy). Furthermore, these requirements represent expectations for faculty to meet by the end of their probationary period or time at their current rank. With the exception of the area of Service (refer to the Service section)², standards for faculty remain the same whether applying for promotion to associate or full professor.

Under extraordinary circumstances, such as when a faculty member has been brought in to begin a new program or is part of a project with a non-traditional mode of dissemination - the faculty member may develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding their specific RTP expectations. This MOU would be developed with their dean and in consultation with the provost’s office and/or FASE.

Professional Development Plan (PDP) and Portfolio

Please refer to sections H and K, respectively, in SP 22-11 for information and clarification of the Professional Development Plan and Portfolio.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (Section H in SP 22-11)

1. The Professional Development Plan (PDP) is the faculty member's agenda for achieving the professional growth necessary to qualify for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The plan shall be submitted before the start of the second semester of the faculty member's initial appointment, except for faculty hired at the rank of tenured Full Professor.
2. The PDP shall be reviewed and approved by the end of the faculty member's first full academic year of appointment.
3. The PDP shall 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, eventually to Full Professor. While more focus and specificity shall be given to planning for the first two years, the plan shall address the entire period prior to applying for tenure and/or promotion.
4. The purpose of the PDP is to provide CSUCI faculty members the opportunity to specifically address how -given their background, experience, and interests--they will meet University and program requirements for retention, tenure, and/or promotion, and to receive feedback on the plan from the PPC, the program Chair (if not on the PPC), and the Dean (or appropriate administrator for Counselor faculty).
5. The PDP is a planning document; it is not a formal agreement or contract. PDP statements for Teaching/and or Professional Activities; Scholarly and/or Creative Activities; and Service shall not exceed 500 words each. These statements shall describe the faculty member's professional goals, areas of interest, resource requirements, anticipated professional development activities, and expected

accomplishments in each of the three aforementioned areas in order to meet the Program Personnel Standards (or General Personnel Standards in the absence of approved PPS) for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

6. The approved PDP shall be included in the faculty member's Portfolio, which is submitted when applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. For tenured faculty, the PDP shall be included in the Portfolio when the faculty member applies for promotion.
7. The PDP shall be reviewed by the PPC, the Program Chair (if not on the PPC), and the Dean (or appropriate administrator for Counselor faculty), each of whom shall provide written feedback according to the timetable determined by FASE (or the Division of Student Affairs for Counselor faculty), and prior to the end of the faculty member's first full year of tenure-track service. The Dean or appropriate administrator shall be responsible for final approval of the PDP.
 - a. In the event that the PPC, Program Chair, or Dean (or appropriate administrator) does not approve the PDP, the faculty member shall revise and resubmit within two weeks.
 - b. After re-submittal, if the PPC, Program Chair, or Dean (or appropriate administrator) makes further suggestions for modifications, the faculty member shall, within two weeks, submit a revised PDP.
 - c. 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 may be provided in the appropriate section of the Portfolio (e.g., cover letter or self-assessment narratives) when undergoing RTP review.
 - d. Faculty members may revise their PDP if it was written before the existence of PPS in the faculty member's academic program and if the faculty member elects during the probationary period to align their PDP with the new Program Personnel Standards rather than with the General Personnel Standards.

THE PORTFOLIO (Section K in SP 22-11)

1. The Portfolio consists of all materials submitted by a faculty unit employee for purposes of review for retention, tenure, and/or promotion, as well as various required forms. The combined Portfolio and Personnel Action File (PAF) form the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and shall be considered as a whole during retention, tenure, and/or promotion reviews. Evaluations, recommendations, and rebuttals, if any, are added at the various levels of review.
2. The Portfolio shall be compiled and submitted by the faculty member to be reviewed using the online platform indicated by FASE. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that the Portfolio is current and complete before it is submitted.
3. All faculty members undergoing RTP review shall submit their Portfolio in digital

format using the online platform indicated by FASE. Faculty with documented disabilities covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act shall work with their Chair and CSUCI Human Resources to arrange for disability-related accommodations to allow them to successfully navigate the online RTP platform indicated by FASE (or to submit their Portfolio in another format if needed).

Faculty must avoid the use of hyperlinks to external websites or online storage platforms (e.g., Google Drive, Dropbox, OneDrive), except in the cases of static links (e.g., DOI) or in cases where Interfolio does not support the file type or format. In such cases, external links must be clearly labeled and accompanied by a brief explanation. Hyperlinks to documents or materials stored within Interfolio (i.e., links to other sections of the portfolio or to uploaded files) are permitted and encouraged to facilitate internal navigation.

4. Materials may be added to the Portfolio until the submission deadline, at which time the Portfolio shall be declared complete.
5. After the submission deadline, materials may only be added to the Portfolio with the permission of the URTPC. Late additions to the Portfolio shall only be permitted for materials that become available after the Portfolio submission deadline and only if, in the judgment of the URTPC, the material in question is likely to substantively affect the evaluation rating of the faculty member. Furthermore, late additions to the Portfolio must be submitted by faculty members prior to the deadline determined by FASE. Materials added to the Portfolio after the portfolio submission deadline shall be returned to the PPC for review, evaluation, and comment before consideration at all subsequent levels of review.
6. Materials included in the portfolio may reflect all work undertaken during the entire time in rank at CSUCI, as well as work undertaken during prior appointments that contributed to the receipt of service credit, if applicable.
7. The Portfolio shall consist of a main body and an appendix. The main body of the Portfolio shall be comprised of the following items in the following order:

GENERAL

- a. An optional cover letter: Faculty may include a cover letter, not to exceed 750 words, to contextualize their overarching contributions during their time at rank. The cover letter should not repeat a faculty member's CV or narrative self-assessments (described below). If faculty are applying for early tenure and/or promotion, the cover letter may be used to explain the accelerated timeline. The cover letter may also address issues of cultural taxation, invisible labor, or other equity-related concerns that reviewers should be aware of when evaluating the Portfolio.
- b. The approved PPS.
- c. The approved PDP.
- d. The faculty member's current curriculum vitae covering their entire academic and professional employment history.
- e. For teaching faculty, a list of the faculty member's assigned Weighted Teaching

Units (WTUs) for each semester at the current rank. The list shall include the WTUs for teaching, along with WTUs for reassigned time or approved leave, which shall be listed with their corresponding purpose.

TEACHING

- a. A narrative self-assessment of activities and accomplishments in Teaching in reference to the applicable University standards as stated in this document and the program standards as stated in the PPS, not to exceed 1000 words.
- b. Per CSUCI Senate Resolution 20-10, faculty are encouraged to include an assessment of anti-racist pedagogical practices in their self-assessment narrative.
- c. For one-year review periods, narratives shall highlight activities and accomplishments since the prior submission of the portfolio, within the context of the faculty member's overall growth and development at the current rank.
- d. Narratives shall be cumulative, reflecting the faculty member's entire time at the current rank when required in the review cycle and as indicated in the Senate policy.
- e. A list of all classes (by semester) taught at the current rank with any relevant details such as modality, new preparations, and class size.
- f. For probationary teaching faculty-a minimum of one peer observation of teaching from each probationary year under review. For tenured faculty, a minimum of one peer observation is required during the period of review. All peer observations shall be provided by a tenured faculty member at CSU Channel Islands who holds a rank higher than that of the faculty member being observed.
- g. There is no need to include Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs), as these are included by FASE in the Personnel Action File. Any faculty rebuttals regarding SRTs (per the CBA) are also included by FASE in the PAF. See section R and Appendix C for more information regarding such rebuttals.

SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

- a. A narrative self-assessment of activities and accomplishments in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities in reference to the applicable University standards as stated in this document and the program standards as stated in the PPS, not to exceed 1000 words.
- b. For one-year review periods, narratives shall highlight activities and accomplishments since the prior submission of the portfolio, within the context of the faculty member's overall growth and development at the current rank.
- c. Narratives shall be cumulative, reflecting the faculty member's entire time at the current rank when required in the review cycle and as indicated in the Senate policy.

SERVICE

- a. A narrative self-assessment of activities and accomplishments in Service in

reference to the applicable University standards as stated in this document and the program standards as stated in the PPS, not to exceed 1000 words.

- b. For one-year review periods, narratives shall highlight activities and accomplishments since the prior submission of the portfolio, within the context of the faculty member's overall growth and development at the current rank.
- c. Narratives shall be cumulative, reflecting the faculty member's entire time at the current rank when required in the review cycle and as indicated in the Senate policy.

The Appendix of the Portfolio shall include the following items:

- a. For teaching faculty, syllabi for all courses taught at the current rank. When teaching multiple sections of the same course, only one syllabus from each course is required, unless significant changes were implemented.
- b. Supporting materials directly relevant to the accomplishments described in the self-assessment narratives (e.g., copies of scholarly or creative work, external letters of support, evidence of faculty development activities, evidence of equity/anti-racist pedagogical efforts, and any other specific documentation of accomplishments as required by the approved PPS or GPS). See Appendix B for terminology to describe stages of publication.

The Appendix of the Portfolio may include the following *optional* items:

- a. For teaching faculty: evidence of teaching effectiveness (may include evidence of assessment of teaching practices and student learning outcomes). Some examples could include key assignments, supplemental teaching materials, service-learning projects, culturally relevant pedagogy, unsolicited student feedback, other evidence of student success beyond graduation, and successful Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) applications related to course SLOs.
- b. If applicable, evidence of cultural taxation, invisible labor, or other forms of hidden service not readily visible in traditional categories of evaluation.

Structure of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC)

For information on the structure of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC), Section E of SP 22-11 specified that the Program Personnel Committee (PPC) shall be constituted as follows, in accord with Article 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA):

1. At the outset of every other academic year, the probationary and tenured faculty of the Department shall elect a single three-member Program Personnel Committee (PPC) of tenured faculty for the purpose of evaluating and recommending faculty who are being considered for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.
2. In accord with the CBA, all PPC members shall have a higher rank/classification than all faculty being considered for promotion in a given year. Therefore, if program faculty members are under consideration for promotion to Full Professor, all PPC members shall

hold the rank of Full Professor.

3. When there are insufficient eligible program faculty to constitute the PPC according to CBA requirements, the PPC shall include faculty from a related academic discipline(s).

4. In accord with the CBA stipulation that faculty unit employees shall not serve simultaneously on more than one level of peer review, faculty members already elected to the URTPC are ineligible to serve on the PPC.

5. In accord with the CBA, faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on PPCs.

6. At the request of a program, the President may agree to permit faculty participating in FERP to stand for election to membership on a PPC. However, the PPC shall not be composed solely of faculty participating in FERP.

7. A Memorandum of Understanding shall determine PPC membership for joint appointment faculty and shall also specify the PPS to be used for review of joint appointment faculty. The Memorandum of Understanding shall comply with the CBA language on the constitution of PPCs for faculty members holding joint appointments (see article 15 in SP 22-11).

General Instructions

Faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service shall not be “double counted,” despite the recognition that many contributions may straddle multiple categories. When such overlap occurs, faculty shall describe which components of their contributions fall into each of the following categories. For example, student research or community-based research may be counted in research, service, or teaching, depending on the specific activities or may include phases that fall into distinct categories. It is up to the faculty member to justify which contributions correspond to each category.

Section 1.7.e (SP 22-11 RTP Policy): “Each program shall indicate in its PPS how faculty use of and participation in high-impact teaching and learning practices that promote student success, especially for historically underrepresented groups, (e.g., culturally-relevant pedagogy, study abroad, embedded research, experiential/service learning, learning communities, anti-racist pedagogical practices/curriculum development, etc.) shall be considered when evaluating faculty contributions in the area of Teaching and/or Professional Activities for purposes of retention, tenure, and/or promotion.”¹

TEACHING

We at CSUCI regard teaching as a cyclical process composed of three required elements:

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 responsive change.

Each element informs the other two, and this cycle reflects the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher dedicated to continuous improvement. Standards for tenure and promotion in the area of teaching are based on these three elements.

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on academic year stateside teaching, and, when appropriate, teaching in other programs (e.g., Extended University [EU] Summer and Winter Sessions)¹, depending on the structure of the program in question. Evaluation of teaching shall include all courses—including assigned Extended University courses—that are taught as part of the Academic Year assignments. Evaluation of teaching shall prioritize Academic Year assignments including Summer session if it is part of the degree program. Courses taught as additional employment through Extended University or Summer or Winter Sessions shall be considered by reviewers if the candidate argues that said classes contributed to the faculty member's development and contributions in the area of Teaching. In either case, faculty shall clearly note which classes were taught stateside and which classes constituted their Academic Year assignments.

The following section defines expectations for and provides examples of how to meet the following three Standards for Teaching, which are based on the required elements listed above in the introduction to the Teaching section. Evidence of success in the category of Teaching can include but is not limited to the examples listed under each of the three Standards defined below.

Standard A: Faculty will demonstrate effective planning, creation, and implementation of course methods, materials, and teaching practices.

Description: The candidate's narrative and appendices on Teaching shall demonstrate how they use specific methods and materials that are appropriate and effective to meet course, program, and University learning outcomes. Additionally, candidates shall demonstrate how they have effectively balanced rigor, access, and equity in their teaching.

¹Stateside teaching refers to courses that are funded in part by the State allocation, while Extended University courses may be self-supported and are not always considered part of a faculty member's academic year assignment unless the degree program includes courses in the Summer session offered on the stateside.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to explain why an activity would fall under teaching and not scholarship or service. Activity can be listed in only one place unless explicitly stated how different aspects of the activity would have components under teaching or scholarship or service.

Evidence for Standard A in teaching can include (but is not limited to) the following:

1. Methods and materials that enable students to achieve the desired learning outcomes.
2. Examples of student work that show how learning outcomes for the course/program/university are being met.
3. Instructional methods and materials that actively engage students in course content.
4. Selected materials that reflect promising pedagogical practices.
5. Syllabi that conform to the requirements of CSUCI Syllabi Policy.
6. Effective collaboration in interdisciplinary and/or team teaching practices.
7. Effective inclusion of service-learning initiatives in courses.
8. Successful utilization of appropriate teaching technologies to improve student learning (e.g. Canvas/LMS platform, Open Educational Resources [OER], etc.).
9. Successful utilization of other **high-impact practices** to improve student learning and retention:
 - a. Intentional and broad incorporation of accessible teaching practice
 - b. Intentional and broad incorporation of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) and/or anti-racist teaching practices
 - c. (Co-)development and public dissemination of an innovative high-impact teaching practice
 - d. Utilization of technology that enhances student access, inclusion and learning in an equitable manner
 - e. Connecting teaching and learning to communities of practice and community-based work
 - f. Faculty member can explain how other practices (e.g., service learning, study abroad), not listed here, are examples of high-impact practices
10. Materials and methods that reflect the instructor's commitment to accessibility and inclusivity.
11. Creation of a new course or extensive revision of an existing course
12. Advising and/or serving as a reader on theses
13. Serving as CSUCI's EdD dissertation chair or reader on a completed dissertation
14. Publishing a commentary or in popular media about teaching pedagogy
15. Guest lecturing in a class in or outside the department, including in the community and in schools.
16. Development of workshops for student growth, programmatic support, professional development, etc
17. Organizing, presenting, or participating in teaching professional development activities (e.g., workshop on inclusive teaching practices)
18. Public recognition of excellence in teaching (an award, invited lecturer/keynote on

- teaching pedagogy nationally or internationally, etc.)
19. Development of a new departmental or interdisciplinary program
 20. Evidence of external impact of teaching (e.g., examples of students applying course learning to their professional practice; student reflections or communications demonstrating how faculty member's teaching influenced their work as educators, counselors, and/or leaders; observed changed in student engagement with policy or community efforts as a result of course content).
 21. Evidence which demonstrates effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
 22. Mentorship of students and alumni, especially from underrepresented groups (e.g., providing teaching and research opportunities)
 23. Engaging in public teaching work, including, but not limited to, hits and positive commentary on social media, blogs and instructional videos on YouTube; invitations to participate in documentaries, podcasts, newspaper and radio interviews and other media formats
 24. Providing effective role modeling in teaching (e.g., providing peer teaching support, providing teaching reviews, working with teaching assistants, opening up one's classroom for observation of teaching techniques, providing pedagogical materials such as syllabi and activities to peers, providing evidence of effectiveness based on student assessments of mentoring/advising)

Standard B: Faculty shall engage in assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and teaching practices.

Description: To meet this standard, candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in a process of evaluation and assessment of student learning outcomes and of their own teaching practices.

Evidence for Standard B in teaching must include the first two items listed below as required per the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP 22-11 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement; additional evidence can include but is not limited to the other examples listed in part III.

- I. **Peer observations of teaching:** A minimum of one peer observation of teaching by a tenured colleague of a higher rank for each probationary year is required by the RTP policy. For tenured faculty, a minimum of one peer observation is required during the period of review. Peer observations should assess the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching methodology, course materials, and course material presentation, and offer constructive suggestions for improvement as appropriate. In general, peer observations of teaching are expected to be positive and/or to demonstrate consistent improvement relative to prior observations as an overall pattern during the faculty member's time at rank. However, these observations are snapshots in time and are not necessarily conducted by trained observers in a consistent manner. As a result, their value in assessing the effectiveness of the faculty member's pedagogical methodology is limited. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on these peer observations in their narratives. It is the

faculty's responsibility to arrange for peer observations, in consultation with their chair.
Per the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements to these observations.

- II. **Student responses to instruction (e.g. Student Ratings of Teaching, aka SRTs):** SRTs are administered in all courses considered as part of the review and shall be considered by all levels of review. SRTs are expected to reveal a generally positive view of the faculty member's teaching. SRTs are not necessarily an accurate direct measure of how effectively students learn in the classroom. As such, their value must be taken in context as part of a holistic evaluation and thus shall normally be considered in light of other indicators of teaching proficiency, including peer observations. Student responses to instruction can, however, provide insights into a number of important dimensions of the faculty member's efforts. In addition, some variation in SRTs is to be expected, for example, for courses with experimental teaching methods and for new course preparations. Such situations should be recognized by the review committee, and addressed by the candidate in the teaching narrative. In addition, bias may be present in SRTs for a variety of reasons, such as (but not limited to) based on race, indigeneity, socioeconomic status, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, age, disability, immigration status, refugee status, spirituality, language, and education (Crenshaw, 1991; Martinez, 2018), as well as on the types of ontologies and/or epistemologies the faculty members grounds their work. Per the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements in response to perceived bias. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on SRTs in their Teaching narrative.
- III. **Assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes:** In addition to peer observation and student responses to instruction, candidates are encouraged to engage in other activities that assess and evaluate student learning outcomes in order to inform and improve their teaching practices. These activities can include the following:
- A. Development of classroom assessment techniques and tools that elicit student feedback on teaching practices (e.g. implementation of formal/informal mid-semester reviews, surveys of student learning, student reflections on their learning, etc.)
 - B. Learning assessment tools that are aligned to learning outcomes

Standard C: Faculty shall engage in efforts to improve teaching and learning, reflection, and responsive change

Description: To meet this standard, the candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher, which is a process of continuous improvement.

Evidence for the three areas of standard C in teaching is listed below. For each category, faculty shall describe how such efforts have led to growth and development in their teaching practice or in student learning.

- I. **Continual effort to improve teaching and learning** described in the teaching narrative. Examples of evidence of continual effort to improve teaching and learning can include but are not limited to the following:
- A. Involvement with/attending faculty development opportunities

- B. Consultation and/or work with colleagues in formal and/or informal ways to implement methods to increase teaching effectiveness
- C. Applying for and/or receiving a teaching enhancement or development grant
- D. Recognition for meeting established criteria for course excellence (e.g., CSU Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) and Quality Matters (QM) instruments.)
- E. Incorporating Improvement Science to teaching and reflection (implementing Plan, Do, Study, Act cycles for assessing innovations)

II. **Reflection on teaching** that demonstrates faculty efforts to continually improve their courses. Examples of evidence can include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Summary of and personal reflection on student responses to teaching and peer observations
- B. Description of changes made in response to formal/informal midterm course evaluation
- C. Revision of curriculum to ensure the infusion of new or innovative teaching practices, such as effective use of instructional technology, into course content and delivery

III. **Responsiveness in teaching** that improves student learning opportunities and experiences. Examples of evidence can include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Redesign of course structure and/or revision of assignments in response to assessments and feedback
- B. Modification of instructional methods and technologies in response to feedback
- C. Use of technologies to enrich student learning
- D. Redesign of course structure to meet needs of English language learners and/or students with special needs
- E. Incorporation of instructional methods and materials introduced during professional development events

Requirements for Retention in Teaching

The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

Faculty member shall address standards A, B and C in each retention review and meet the minimum quantified elements (one peer review, etc. as outlined in the A, B, C standards). For standard(s) which were mentioned by a level of review as a strength or an area of need, the faculty member is encouraged to narrate in subsequent retention reviews how they addressed that area, to build upon it if identified as a strength or addressed if noted as an area of need for growth. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement that shows that they have made appropriate progress towards meeting the standards as described above, consistent with their time at rank, shall earn a rating of “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievements in Teaching that surpass the previous “Meeting Expectations” for their time at rank shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion to Full Professor in Teaching

The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement **across the three areas** (A, B, and C) shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide **multiple points of evidence within and across** standards A, B and C **and** who **make a case in their narrative** for exceeding the standards shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching.

SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

While the Department is deeply committed to both original research – across a variety of ontologies (e.g., realism, empiricism, positivism and postmodernism) and epistemologies (e.g., positivist/post-positivist, interpretive/constructivist, critical, and postmodern/poststructural) – and the dissemination of knowledge to scholarly communities, families and the broader public, the Department states for the record that there is no formal workload for scholarly activities in the 15 units of faculty workload, besides a start-up buy-out from teaching, competitive internal grants, sabbaticals, or external grant buy-outs from teaching (with applications written on the faculty member's own time), which might not even be feasible for faculty without negatively impacting the teaching, the overall program and RTP process. The Department further notes that in the General PPS document developed, this area of professor work has the most demanding, quantifiable expectations but without workload on the CBA.

Standard: Faculty are expected to establish a record of scholarly/creative endeavors that generates, integrates, and disseminates knowledge.

Description: To meet this standard, candidates shall produce refereed publications and/or juried creative activities as appropriate to their discipline. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to contextualize how the type and amount of evidence of performance, the relative weight of authorship roles and authorship order, and the appropriate editorial standards (peer-reviewed, editor-reviewed, etc.) align with their disciplinary conventions to meet the standards of this GPS. Scholarship and/or creative activities that engage with student research are valued equally with activities that draw on traditional methodologies.

While co-authorship is common in the education and educational leadership disciplines it is the faculty member's responsibility to communicate the value of their contributions to the interdisciplinary readers of the portfolio. Faculty may use taxonomies used by other institutions to explain their role in the publications and presentations, from sources such as The Contributor Roles Taxonomy project (Project CRediT) (included as an Appendix).

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1aJxrQXYHW5U6By3KEAHrx1Iho6ioeh3ohNsRMwsoGPM/edit?tab=t.0>

Evidence of achievement in the category of scholarly and/or creative activities can include but is not limited to the following:

It is the faculty member's responsibility to explain why an activity would fall under scholarship and not teaching or service. Activity can be listed in only one place unless explicitly stated how different aspects of the activity would have components under teaching or scholarship or service.

I. TIER ONE:

All specific Tier One items appear under the assumption that the faculty member was a significant contributor (refer to Description section above for examples, in the link, on how to describe the role in publications. It is the faculty member's responsibility to educate the reviewers on the significance of the contributions).

A. Publications in refereed journals

- B. Publications of peer-reviewed book chapters, monographs, textbooks, collections, or anthologies; films, videos, or other electronic media
- C. Publications of authored or co-authored scholarly book (including additional editions of a book) (note: such books shall typically count for three tier one items)
- D. Publication of an edited book of which the faculty member was an editor (including additional editions of a book). Faculty member's responsibility is to articulate their role if they were a co-editor.

II. TIER TWO:

- A. Publications in proceedings of professional meetings and conferences
- B. Submitted applications for large external grants, commissions, fellowships, prizes, other awards if demonstrating significant effort/scholarly progression
- C. Internal grant proposal either submitted or funded (campus/system level)
- D. Creating, editing or reviewing articles/cases/chapters/course materials for academic journals and publications
- E. Dissemination of research aimed to improve teaching, learning, the fields of school counseling, and/or educational leadership (K12 or higher education).
- F. Presentations at professional meetings, seminars, symposia, and conferences
- G. Publications in popular media with national, regional, or local readerships
- H. Media appearances that contribute to the advancement of teaching and/or scholarship
- I. Reports of applied research (e.g., policy paper, briefs, newspaper article)
- J. Published data sets that represent a major scholarly contribution to the discipline
- K. Receipt of an awarded external grant to support scholarship as PI, co-PI, evaluator, or professional consultant. Faculty member's responsibility is to articulate the significance of the award and/or the amount.
- L. Earning patents
- M. Research contributions to public policy, such as developing legislation
- N. Other works that are clearly demonstrated to have widespread and meaningful impact on the faculty member's professional community or other kinds of dissemination appropriate to the nature of the research. Faculty's responsibility is to articulate with support what a widespread and meaningful impact means in the discipline
- O. Organizing research/methodology professional development activities in a research-related venue (e.g., statistical methods workshop, grant-writing boot camp, etc)
- P. Public recognition of excellence in research (an award, invited lecturer/keynote on research expertise nationally or internationally, etc.)
- Q. Successful completion and dissemination of a community-based research project
- R. Development of software
- S. Invited symposia and presentations (internal or external)
- T. Practitioner manuals or publications
- U. Presenting or participating in research/methodology professional development activities (e.g., statistical methods workshop, grant-funding bootcamp, etc)
- V. Signing a book contract

- W. Providing role modeling and mentoring of research at any educational level within and outside of the CSU
- X. Participation in research-oriented career development activities (e.g., seeking and using a research mentor, NCFDD workshops, etc.)
- Y. Commentaries (e.g., encyclopedia entries, book reviews, journal article reviews, case studies, blogs, op-eds, newsletters, and popular press publications, documentaries)
- Z. Expert and technical consultation on research projects
- AA. Invited commentary (e.g., book foreword, invited editorials, invited book reviews, invited legal testimony, invited practitioner publication)
- BB. Non-refereed book chapters, technical reports, and monographs
- CC. Evidence of cultural, societal, or disciplinary impact of research

Note: Some Tier 2 items may merit being counted as Tier 1 items if justified by the faculty member due to the magnitude of the work done, the impact, or the recognition level. It is the faculty member's responsibility to educate the interdisciplinary reviewers of the significance of the work presented in the portfolio.

Requirements for Retention in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

While we expect faculty members to ultimately achieve three Tier One activities for Promotion and Tenure, a sustained record of Tier Two activities demonstrates growth and development towards this goal during retention.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement that indicates timely progress towards three significant demonstrations of scholarly/creative activity shall earn "On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards" in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence that they will achieve more than three significant demonstrations of research and scholarly/creative activity at their current rank shall earn a rating of "On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards" in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion to Professor in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a minimum of three demonstrations (publications) of scholarly/creative activity from Tier One and two Tier Two activities during the time in rank shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence of activity beyond requirements for “Meet Standard” shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards”.

PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL, PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Standard: Faculty shall take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the University, the profession, and the community through good citizenship and application of professional expertise.

Description: To meet this standard, candidates are expected to maintain appropriate and consistent service activity throughout the period of review for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Service contributions are expected of all program faculty regardless of rank. However, reviewers at all levels shall take into account the need for assistant professors to prioritize their teaching and scholarly/creative activities during their probationary years.

Therefore, assistant professors may choose to primarily focus their service contributions in support of their department activities. This means that assistant professors shall not be held to the same standard of service contributions as more senior faculty (i. e., associate and full professors with tenure). In other words, greater depth of service and roles of greater responsibility shall be expected as faculty are promoted through the ranks (such as, but not limited to, serving as committee chair, school-wide or university-wide service).

Evidence: While there is not a set number or type of service commitments that a faculty member must undertake to meet standards, they shall clearly show that they have assumed a service load appropriate to the three (3) WTUs² that all tenure-track faculty are assigned for this purpose; for some faculty, this will mean sustained engagement in a Senate committee that meets regularly and has a high workload, while for others it will mean participation in multiple, less time-consuming committees or community and professional engagements. It is up to each faculty member to describe the responsibilities and significance of the service that they perform.

While some Departmental service is needed from all Department tenure track and tenured faculty for degree programs and other departmental governance and operations, the Department encourages faculty members to align other service opportunities with their broader interests.

² The weighting system used by the California State University to determine the appropriate teaching credit for instructional assignments. According to the CBA, a full load of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service is considered to be 15 Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) per semester. However, there is no regularly awarded workload for research beyond an assistant professor’s course buy-out for the first two years, competitive internal grants, sabbaticals, or possibly through externally awarded grants.

Note: It is the faculty member's responsibility to explain why an activity would fall under service and not under teaching or scholarship. Activity can be listed in only one place unless explicitly stated how different aspects of the activity would have components under teaching or scholarship or service. Faculty should explain how their service extends beyond the extra reassigned time given to fulfill their initial 3 WTUs as well

Any service that is compensated with additional release time shall be clearly stated by the faculty member and shall not normally be considered as part of their primary service requirement, though it may be considered as part of the overall service contributions as outlined in the narrative. For example, if a faculty member receives reassigned time for a service role, they should explain what other service they engage in that fulfills their initial 3 WTUs for service; in the case where a faculty member is given extra release time for a service role, but that service role is exceptionally large.

Evidence of performance in the categories of service to the Degree Program, Department, School of Education, University, Community and Profession is unique to each faculty member. The following list of possible evidence is neither a checklist nor exhaustive.

The PPS also recognizes that there are different levels of service. For example, chairing a departmental search committee (DSC) is more time intensive than serving on one. It is the faculty member's responsibility to explain the nature and commitment of their service.

The service can include, but is not limited to in each of the areas, the following activities:

Degree Program, Department, School of Education, and University

1. Department and School of Education service activities. Examples include but are not limited to: work projects, governance or offices, committee or subcommittee activities, program and course development activities, program evaluation, admissions, and/or recruitment activities;
2. Academic Senate activities, work projects, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
3. Campus division activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
4. Participation or advisory roles for student organizations;
5. University or CSU system-wide activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities;
6. Chairing a department or SOE committee
7. Chairing a departmental search committee (DSC) inside or outside the department
8. Serving on a degree program, department, or SOE Committee
9. Serving on a departmental search committee (DSC) inside or outside the department
10. Participation in faculty governance
11. Mentoring of peers and colleagues formally and informally
12. Involvement in departmental, SOE, or campus committees or task forces related to DEIAJ
13. Providing statistical and/or methodological consulting for students and faculty
14. Organizing, presenting, and/or participating in service/leadership professional development activities
15. Re-authorization and re-accreditation activities, either as a leader, co-leader or active participant.
16. Review of tenure/promotion cases from the department, the SOE, and other departments on campus
17. Serving as faculty sponsor/club advisor for student activities
18. Providing role modeling and mentoring at any educational level relating to service or leadership activities
19. Writing letters of recommendation or support for colleagues
20. Nominating students or colleagues for fellowships, awards, etc.
21. Grant proposals submitted and/or funded as PI, co-PI, evaluator, or professional consultant related to service and leadership activities (it is the faculty member's responsibility to decide and explain whether this would be service or scholarship)
22. Service on Program Advisory Boards
23. Review of tenure/promotion cases from the department, the SOE, and other departments on campus

Community

24. Engagement with community organizations or governing bodies;
25. Establishing or participating in community partnerships (e.g., internship for students; partnerships with school districts, charter schools, county offices, community colleges, other universities)
26. Service on community, state, regional, or federal-level boards and commissions

Profession

27. Service in professional organizations at local, regional, national, or international levels, including elective or appointed positions;
28. Service on editorial boards or editorial responsibilities for books and/or journals with national or international significance
29. Reviewing manuscripts for journals, books, and book chapters, as well as reviewing research/grant proposals
30. A leadership role in a professional association (e.g., governing board member or executive board member—president, vice president, secretary/treasurer, program coordinator, or ex-officio role)
31. Participation in professional activities (e.g., board member, officer, committee member, organizing conferences or workshops, site visits, in-service training)
32. Writing a popular press article or providing a media interview
33. Contributions to public policy, such as developing legislation
34. Public recognition of excellence in service, mentorship, mentorship and/or leadership (an award, etc.)
35. Serving as an external reviewer of tenure/promotion cases for other colleges/universities

To minimize any subjective interpretations by the different levels of review on the significance of the faculty member's service and to communicate the significance of service performed, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to articulate the **depth, quality, and quantity** of service (DQQS) in their narrative. The portfolio does not need to provide a time sheet of service, but a compelling narrative and supporting evidence of the DQQS.

For instance, faculty might describe the time intensity and institutional importance of committee work, leadership roles, or community engagement. While the portfolio does not require a formal time accounting, a brief explanation of approximate time commitments or service intensity may assist reviewers in evaluating workload expectations. Faculty seeking guidance on how to represent this may consult Faculty Development or FASE, which may offer sample tables or narrative formats.

A faculty member's service roles can be undertaken via leadership and/or participatory roles. The level of achievement in the area of Service can be determined and described in a variety of ways,

including but not limited to the following:

- a. details of the role (e.g., elected; chair role; secretary; etc.)
- b. the degree of initiation and/or consistency of the commitment to a task or tasks;
- c. the impact of the service to the Department, SOE, University and/or other constituencies;
- d. impact of service to colleagues and others;
- e. positive feedback from colleagues and others to the work's impact on DEIA and antiracist outcomes or other aspect which illustrates the meaning of the service;
- f. tangible products, results, or concrete accomplishments from the service provided.

The faculty member is encouraged to address any issues of cultural taxation and identity taxation that have impacted their professional growth and accomplishments in the area of Service.

In The term “cultural taxation” was coined in 1994 by scholar Amado Padillo “to describe the expectation placed on faculty of colour to address diversity-related departmental and institutional affairs,” then expanded by Joseph and Hirschfield “to include extra burdens that stem from faculty of colour's commitment to campus diversity issues and the lack of legitimacy they experience from colleagues challenging their existence in the academy” (Joseph & Hirschfield, 2023). They later adopted the term “identity taxation” to include and emphasize the extra labor performed by members of a variety of different marginalized groups because of their intersectional identities” (Joseph & Hirschfield, 2023). For further discussion of these terms refer to, for example:

Requirements for Retention in Service

The faculty member shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed the criterion.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a consistent track record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with the three (3) WTUs assigned for this purpose shall earn “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Service.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide 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 three (3) WTUs for service and any additional assigned time for service commitments shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Service. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to exceed these criteria by describing their service depth and scale beyond “Meeting Standard.” In general, depth refers to a variety of leadership roles (such as, but not limited to, search committee chair roles) or service with significant time commitments (such as, but not limited to, accreditation or incoming student application reviews and interviews).

Requirements for Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion to Full Professor in Service

The faculty member shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed the criterion by narrating their contributions and the significance of their various service commitments. The department encourages service which is meaningful both to the faculty member and the recipients.

For tenure and promotion, the faculty member shall demonstrate service beyond the program, department and School of Education. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a consistent record of service comparable to their three (3) WTUs of release time shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Service.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide 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 three (3) assigned WTUs for service shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards.” In general, depth refers to a variety of leadership roles (such as, but not limited to, search committee chair roles) or service with significant time commitments (such as, but not limited to, accreditation, course or program modification, or incoming student application reviews and interviews).

References

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.

Kreitzer, R.J., Sweet-Cushman, J. “Evaluating Student Evaluations of Teaching: A Review of Measurement and Equity Bias in SETs and Recommendations for Ethical Reform.” *Journal of Academic Ethics* 20, 73–84 (2022).

Martinez, R. A. (2018). Intersectionality and possibility in the lives of Latina/o/x Children of immigrants: Imagining pedagogies beyond the politics of hate. *Occasional Paper Series*, 39. <https://doi.org/10.58295/2375-3668.1197>

Tiffany D. Joseph & Laura E. Hirshfield (2023). “Reexamining racism, sexism, and identity taxation in the academy.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 46:6, 1101-1108, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2022.2143719

APPENDIX

CRediT: Contributor Role Taxonomy

Going beyond authorship

What is CRediT?

The Contributor Roles Taxonomy project (Project CRediT) emerged to address recognition that the concept of ‘authorship’ in producing scientific scholarly output is outdated and no longer fit for purpose. Project CRediT aims to provide transparency to the contributions of researchers to scholarly published work, to enable discoverability and to improve attribution, credit, and accountability.

Following a workshop hosted by Harvard University and the Wellcome Trust in 2010, a working group was formed consisting of members of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), Amy Brand (then at Harvard University) and Liz Allen (formerly Head of Evaluation at the Wellcome Trust). The working Group developed a high-level taxonomy that could be used to represent the diverse roles of contributors to scientific scholarly output.

The 14 roles taxonomy was developed, tested with the scientific community, and is now being tested in live implementations to allow researchers to describe their contributions to scholarly output.

While the taxonomy was developed initially with the biomedical community, it was designed to be broadly applicable to research contributions.

Who leads CRediT?

Once the taxonomy was developed the project Chairs worked with Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration (CASRAI) and National Information Standards Organization (NISO) to refine the taxonomy. Since 2014, it has been openly available for the scientific community to use, test and provide feedback on (See <http://casrai.org/CRediT>). That site also has references to international workshops and other publications related to authorship and credit.

Amy Brand and Liz Allen remain the project Co-Chairs. CASRAI is acting as the coordinator and is available to support trials and implementations of the taxonomy in various scholarly output workflows.

What roles are included?

The taxonomy provides a high-level classification of the diverse roles performed in the work leading to a published research output in the sciences.

CRedit Terms

Contributor Role	Role Definition
Conceptualization	Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims.
Methodology	Development or design of methodology; creation of models.
Software	Programming, software development; designing computer programs; implementation of the computer code and supporting algorithms; testing of existing code components.
Validation	Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs.
Formal Analysis	Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyze or synthesize study data.
Investigation	Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection.
Resources	Provision of study materials, reagents, materials, patients, laboratory samples, animals, instrumentation, computing resources, or other analysis tools.
Data Curation	Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later reuse.
Writing – Original Draft Preparation	Creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation).
Writing – Review & Editing	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre- or post-publication stages.
Visualization	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualization/data presentation.
Supervision	Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team.
Project Administration	Management and coordination responsibility for the research activity planning and execution.
Funding Acquisition	Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication.

Who uses CRedit?

Several organisations are already testing the value of this structured taxonomy of contributor roles in a live environment : Cell Press have been encouraging their authors to describe contributions according to the CRedit Taxonomy; Aries Systems has included the taxonomy in version 13.0 of Editorial Manager manuscript submission and peer review system; and the Mozilla Open Badges project, released in September 2015. The badges project is a really exciting experiment; not only does it use the digital infrastructure which is increasingly in place to bring connectedness to the objects, products and outputs associated with researchers and their research (see ORCID), but it aims to provide a recognised currency of accolades and credit that are transparent, validated and available for funding agencies and employers to check out for a whole range of uses.

What benefits will CRediT bring?

Among the many reasons why change is needed:

- Relying on author position as a proxy for contribution to the research resulting in a published article is increasingly inaccurate as author numbers grow, particularly in physics and the life sciences;
- Information about an individual's publication output and contributions are often used to further careers, therefore contribution information should be accurate and transparent;
- Searching for peer reviewers, collaborators, and seeking individuals with specialized skills can be challenging. With defined roles and published contributions, this will be easier;
- For publishers, there are obvious benefits to greater transparency in contributor assignment as it would help to reduce the volume and time involved in managing authorship disputes.

How is it implemented?

Implementing the CRediT taxonomy into regular workflows depends on the type of information system used, and in what step of the research life-cycle. If implemented by publishers, repositories and funders (to name a few) the return-on-investment will be accelerated. In the case of a publisher consider including in your manuscript workflow:

- which version of the CRediT standard you will support?
- will you support the optional 'degrees of contribution' aspect of the standard (equal, supporting or lead)?
- will you collect 'other' contribution types not yet covered in the standard taxonomy (for feeding back into the next version)?
- which types of manuscripts are appropriate to 'tag' with the CRediT taxonomy?
- will you 'tag' both authors and co-authors?

Frequently asked questions

Could one person contribute in multiple roles? When there are multiple people serving in the same role a 'degree of contribution' should be further specified as either 'lead', 'equal', or 'supporting'. Roles are intended to apply to all those who contribute to a project — and it is recommended that, if possible, all contributors be listed, whether or not they are formally listed as authors. It is also intended that multiple roles be assigned to a single person where appropriate.

Do you anticipate this being a mandatory taxonomy? No, the taxonomy is envisioned as voluntary and each system would choose whether and how to implement. We do see value in the entire community eventually agreeing on a single set of terms, but at a pace appropriate for each stakeholder.

Would this taxonomy be implemented as a drop-down box in software? That is one potential mode of implementation during data entry. We envision multiple ways of implementing the taxonomy — suited to each implementation. But we hope the content of the implementations can be common and standardized.

About CASRAI

CASRAI is an international nonprofit membership initiative led by research institutions and their partners. Our **mission** is to adapt the principles and best practices of open standards and data governance to lead and facilitate key stakeholders in annual deliberations to develop 'standard information agreements' that serve as bridges between research information users. CASRAI agreements cover all the key information requirements that relate to the management of research throughout its life cycle. This includes information requirements related to applications for funds, CVs, project and funds management, compliance requirements, reporting as well as research data management and scholarly communications. Our **vision** is for all stakeholders (institutions, funders,

publishers and software providers) to adopt the resulting ‘invisible infrastructure’ in their local software and processes so we can collectively enable stable, predictable and comparable results when sharing research information throughout the life cycle.

Get Involved

Stakeholder engagement is our lifeblood. We can only live up to our part of the bargain on developing ‘standard information agreements’ when the user communities engage and agree on their specific needs. The various user constituencies and contexts bring a richness to the table through exposure of the diversity of issues that researchers and other information users are dealing with.

To learn more about CASRAI and to get involved please visit us at casrai.org

