DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION
ACADEMIC YEAR 2023/24-2027/28

Table of Contents:

1.0 INTRODUCTION, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to fostering productivity, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The Department RTP Criteria Document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies include Unit 3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), Policy 1328, and Policy 1329 of the University Academic Manual define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

1.1 Criteria. The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member shall be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the department webpage to be available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members, and in particular, how to align a faculty member's career aspirations in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidates are encouraged to develop their careers in alignment with the department and college mission. Department criteria should be consistent with the department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate a model of the departmental faculty college to which the candidate should aspire.

1.2 Purpose. The purpose of the RTP process is not simply a matter of evaluation. Candidates submit a narrative consisting of a self-evaluation of their teaching and scholarly competence, in addition to explaining their commitment to service. Directions for completing the narrative can be found in sections 1.4.3 and 1.4.4 of this document. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting candidates, providing them

with the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for candidates to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

1.3 Department Mission Statement. The Political Science Department is a collaborative learning community that seeks positive and significant impact in the world by: acquiring and conveying substantive knowledge about politics, government, and public life; encouraging our students to develop certain critical skills necessary for informed, active participation in political communities; and facilitating and encouraging experiential learning as a complement to the traditional pedagogies of the academy. The department is dedicated to collectively acknowledging injustices as a scholarly community, and committing to empowering students to build a future where minoritized communities, and by extension, all people, have the social, political, and economic power to succeed.

For candidates to be successful in their promotion requests, we expect them to have completed adequate levels of activity across the stated criteria, for all three of our areas, teaching/instruction, research/scholarly output, and service.

1.4 RTP Procedures. The following summarizes department RTP procedures. University Policy 1328 provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures.

1.4.1 RTP Definitions. Some important definitions are provided here:
- **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- **Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)** members must be full-time tenured faculty members. FERP faculty members may be elected to the DRTPC, according to Policy 1328 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. DRTPC members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing, with approval by the president or designee. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected but may only participate on reappointment cases—no in promotion or tenure recommendations.
- **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenure and probational faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or designee.
- **Probationary year** of service is consecutive fall and spring semesters. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.
- **Probationary faculty** are tenure-track faculty members who have not yet received tenure and/or promotion.
- **Performance review** is an actionable evaluation process by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), dean/or director by each level of review that results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.
- **Periodic evaluation** is an intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and dean. Periodic evaluation

does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions.

- **Pre-RTP** is a unique form of periodic evaluation that occurs in year one. Pre-RTP is not actionable and will be reviewed only by the DRTPC and Dean.
- **Reappointment** is the basis of the probationary period for candidates. Probationary faculty receive an initial appointment of two years. In the spring semester of the first year, probationary faculty submit a Pre-RTP packet. Probationary faculty apply for reappointment in the fall semester of their second year. Evaluators at any level of review may recommend that a probationary faculty member undergo a periodic evaluation or a performance review in the following year. Probationary faculty will undergo a minimum of three full performance reviews (unless awarded early tenure or promotion).
- **Professional Development Plan** is an articulation of the faculty member's goals, areas of interests, and accomplishments that they *expect* to achieve in each of the areas of evaluation in order to meet expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In no way is the professional development plan meant to serve as a contract. The achievement of all stated goals does not necessarily guarantee tenure; nor does the failure to achieve these goals mean that tenure will not be granted. The specific purpose would be to engage candidates in a dialogue with the department, department chair, and dean to clarify university, college, and department expectations and the goals a candidate should establish to meet those expectations. A professional development plan should be submitted for Pre-RTP and periodic evaluations.
- **Eligibility to apply for tenure** occurs at the beginning of the sixth probationary year.
- **Eligibility to apply for the first promotion** occurs at the time the candidate applies for tenure.
- **Eligibility to apply for a subsequent promotion** occurs after having served for four years in the current rank.
- **Eligibility to apply for early actions** can occur after the candidate has completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective date of those actions.
- **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession.
- **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by Policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabus and materials, informal conversation, and a written report.
- **Candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP Criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.
- **Candidate for tenure or promotion may choose between the criteria** in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

1.4.2 Department RTP Committee. In the proceeding spring semester (before March 1), the department's tenured and probationary full-time faculty shall vote to elect (by secret ballot and

majority vote) the DRTPC members for the next academic year, and then the Departmental RTP Committee shall elect a chair (by secret ballot and majority vote) to serve during the following academic year. In promotion considerations, RTP committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion

Per Policy 1328, the department RTP committee (DRTPC) shall consist of full-time tenured and FERP faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The membership size for a DRTPC shall be: three (3) to seven (7) for departments with ten (10) or fewer faculty eligible to serve, five (5) to nine (9) for departments with eleven (11) to seventeen (17) faculty eligible to serve, seven (7) to fifteen (15) for departments with eighteen (18) or more faculty eligible to serve. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members.

The department chair shall be a member of the committee and have no separate voice as department chair in the RTP process, consistent with qualification requirements specified in Policy 1328. Non-tenured department chairs, or chairs who are candidates for an RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC. If requested by majority vote of the full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the president (or designee), faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may be included as members of the DRTPC expect that the DRPC shall not be solely comprised of faculty participating in the FERP.

The DRTP Committee Chair shall perform the following duties during the fall semester:
- Ensure that candidates have the information they need, including about what actions they can apply for, information they need to prepare requests, and department criteria.
- Assists candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages through formal mentoring meetings, as needed.
- Encourage candidates to attend RTP workshops hosted by Faculty Affairs, the Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence, and/or CFA (California Faculty Association).
- Informs Faculty Affairs of request for RTP actions.
- Ensures that packages are complete.
- Provides the department recommendation to the candidate.

The DRTP Committee Chair shall perform the following duties during the academic year:
- Ensures that peer evaluations are conducted (according to 1.4.4) for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action in the future.
- Ensures that reports are provided to candidates within two weeks of the class visit.

1.4.3 Performance Review Procedure. Performance review is an actionable evaluation process, where the candidate is reviewed by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), dean/or director that results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

When a faculty member undergoes a performance review, the faculty member shall submit an RTP package that is comprised of the following items:
- An updated curriculum vitae;
- A self-assessment narrative (no page limit) discussing the DRTP criteria regarding strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service from

the current review period. In the narrative, the candidate shall highlight, as applicable, how their accomplishments support CPP's core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;

- All peer evaluation since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all peer evaluations since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);
- Statistical summaries of student survey scores since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all student survey scores since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);
- The Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form); and
- Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

Based on the performance review, evaluators at any level of review may recommend that a probationary faculty member undergo another performance review rather than a periodic evaluation in the following year. Per Policy 1328, personnel recommendations or decisions relating to reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall be based on the Personnel Action File (PAF). The DRTPC and Department Chair are able to consult the PAF for additional relevant materials.

A request for external review of materials submitted by a faculty unit employee may be initiated at any level of review by any party to the review. Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an outside reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee. Candidates to be the external reviewer can be nominated by any party in the review process, but is selected by secret ballot and majority vote of the department's tenured and probationary full-time faculty.

1.4.4 Periodic Evaluation Procedure. A periodic evaluation is an intermittent evaluation process that includes only review by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and dean. Periodic evaluation does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions. Pre-RTP candidates submit a periodic evaluation in the first year of their appointment.

In interim years when a probationary faculty member is not applying for reappointment, a periodic evaluation will be conducted. The probationary faculty member shall submit a "periodic evaluation report" comprised of the following items:
- An updated curriculum vitae;
- A self-assessment narrative, *not to exceed four pages*. The department asks candidates to consider their strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, service, and other professional activities by completing a **professional development plan.** A professional development plan is an articulation of the faculty member's goals, areas of interests, and accomplishments that they *expect* to achieve in each of the areas of evaluation in order to meet expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In no way is the professional development plan meant to serve as a contract. The achievement of all stated goals does not necessarily guarantee tenure; nor does the failure to achieve these goals mean that tenure will not be granted. The specific purpose

would be to engage candidates in a dialogue with the department, department chair, and dean to clarify university, college, and department expectations and the goals a candidate should establish to meet those expectations.

- Two peer evaluations from the period of review;
- Statistical summaries of student survey scores and reviews from the current review period; and
- Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

The DRTPC, the department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and the dean shall produce a report with constructive feedback and clear guidance for improvement in the preparation of the next year's performance review. No recommendation for RTP actions will be permitted during a periodic evaluation.

1.4.5 Student evaluation of teaching. The department faculty shall review and adopt a standard form for student evaluation of teaching. This form shall be developed and administered in accordance with Policy 1329 and Policy 1328.

Each year, each faculty member will complete end-of-semester student evaluations in all sections of each undergraduate and graduate class taught, consistent with university policy. Each candidate's RTP package must include the summary statistical evaluations of all student evaluations conducted during the period under review for which the candidate is responsible.

1.4.6 Peer evaluation of teaching. The department faculty shall review and adopt guidelines for conducting peer evaluations in accordance with Policy 1329 and Policy 1328.

For each academic year, candidates are required to include at least two peer evaluations from, ideally, at least two different semesters as part of their RTP packet. Ideally, a minimum of two peer evaluations should be conducted for two different classes in each academic year by two different faculty. Probationary faculty and associate professors are required to complete two peer evaluations each academic year. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. Peer evaluators are selected at the first department meeting in fall semester by joint agreement of tenured and probationary full-time faculty in the department.

Peer evaluation of teaching shall include classroom visits and a review of the course syllabus, Canvas page, and related materials. Classroom visits should be followed within no more than two weeks by a written report. The report must be submitted to the faculty member and to the DRTPC chair. For candidates who are teaching in an online setting, we encourage them to follow the above process, taking into account that the learning management system and other relevant platforms also make up the "classroom." A "visit" to an asynchronous course constitutes a review of at least a week's worth of material. We also require an informal meeting with the evaluator at some point of the peer review process.

1.4.7 Self-Evaluation of Teaching. Each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion shall conduct a self-evaluation of their teaching by submitting a performance review. This evaluation will include a description of the faculty member's teaching philosophy, how that was reflected in the courses taught, an analysis of information obtained from the student evaluations and how it

influenced future instruction, an analysis of the peer valuations and how they influenced future instruction, and a description of the evolution of one's teaching, influenced by their experience and activities such as pedagogical workshops or conferences the faculty member attended. Both the candidate and the DRTPC shall address any recommendations for improvement made in the previous RTP cycle.

The period of evaluation for a candidate applying for reappointment shall be the time since the previous performance review, or if it is the first reappointment, since the original appointment.

The period of evaluation for a candidate applying for tenure or promotion shall be the time since original hiring or the last tenure or promotion decision involving that faculty member.

1.4.8 Candidates and Future Candidates Serving in Administrative Positions or On Leave. This section explains how candidates and future candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave.

Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP request by email. It will be the candidate's responsibilities to meet all deadlines.

Individuals who accept positions outside their departments (i.e., in administrative positions, in academic governance positions, or otherwise temporarily on leave from teaching duties) while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations in relation to teaching and scholarship, during the time they are away. The department shall articulate expectations for these exceptional situations in a written interpretation of the department criteria in light of the special circumstances agreed to by the candidate and the DRTPC. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the dean, URTPC chair, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs before the leave.

1.4.9 Elements of Performance and Evaluation. In evaluating candidates for RTP actions, the DRTPC shall apply the criteria listed in 2.0 through 4.0 of this document, the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement, and Policies 1328 and 1329 of the University Academic Manual.

In acknowledgement of the increasing workload requests and the increased demands on physical, emotional, and financial resources since the COVID-19 pandemic, faculty are encouraged to use their self-evaluation and professional development plan to thoughtfully reflect on the percentages of labor devoted to teaching, scholarship, and service. For a tenure-track faculty member, the default workload assignment devoted to teaching is typically 12 WTU per semester (or 80% of workload), whereas 3 WTU per semester (or 20% of workload) is reserved for scholarship and service to the university, profession, and community. Given that tenure-track faculty are being employed to do this work, typically, on a 10-month contract, the percentages devoted to teaching, scholarship, and service deserve careful consideration by the faculty member in their self-evaluation and professional development plans.

The department expects adequate contributions in each of the three areas, and although the standards specify separate criteria in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, there is often synergy amongst these areas in the projects that faculty members undertake. For instance, faculty often draw on their research to inform the subject matter of their courses. Also, many faculty engage

their students in their research, or offer innovative classes and teaching practices, drawing on the pedagogical literature.

In accordance with Policy 1328, early actions shall place emphasis on teaching and requires exceptional performance and extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarship and service. Explicit criteria for early actions are elaborated upon in sections 2.5, 3.4, and 4.5.

2.0 CRITERIA FOR COMPETENCE IN TEACHING

2.1 Definition of Teaching Competence. Teaching competence entails a demonstrable commitment to conveying subject matter and imparting the analytical skills necessary for students to master the subject matter of a particular course. This presupposes that the faculty member is current in the literature of the field and that they bring to bear the fruit of ongoing scholarship to the classroom. Course objectives and standards shall be clearly delineated; textual materials shall be current and consistent with course objectives; tests or other instruments used in grading shall be clear, well-designed, and fair; classes shall be taught with a seriousness of purpose and entail a rigorous analysis of the subject matter.

Advising is part of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities. Advising competence is accomplished both through assigned interaction in advisement sessions and less formal interaction growing out of the normal teaching function. Ideally, faculty advisors communicate the values that ground the university – an enthusiasm for learning, a respect for human dignity and openness to new experiences, and informing students of the meaning of a liberal arts education. The qualities of an excellent advisor are accessibility and knowledge.

Candidates are also encouraged to describe their teaching commitments in relation to their professional development plan in the periodic evaluation. For example, candidates can explain how their teaching contributes to their broader professional development goals; how their ongoing and long-standing commitment to specific teaching activities have made substantial contributions throughout time; and/or how their teaching activities may have shifted or evolved to support their professional development goals.

2.2 Minimum Teaching Competence Requirements. Beginning from the first year but continuing throughout their appointment and promotion in the department, all members of the department are expected to meet the following criteria:
- Demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter in the candidate's assigned teaching areas
- Clear, organized, relevant, and effective presentations in the classroom
- Effective involvement of students in learning
- Effective use of a variety of teaching methods, including lectures, discussions, in- and out-of-class assignments, and examinations that encourage critical thinking on the part of students
- Effective use of appropriate technology for teaching, including but not limited to professional development in delivering class content in various instructional modes
- Effective evaluation of student performance and regular and timely feedback to students on their performance, as evidenced by appropriate classroom assessments
- Regular attendance at all classes with appropriate consultation with the department chair for any absences

- A well-designed syllabus which clearly lays out learning objectives, the course calendar, and how students will be evaluated, including "substantial writing components" when appropriate
- Competent advising of students, which includes having knowledge of basic university academic rules and regulations, holding regular advising sessions, being available in a timely manner with respect to registration, and being able to use the appropriate online advising tools
- Participation in faculty development programs appropriate to their current level of skill and experience in teaching

2.3 Additional Teaching Competence Related Activities. In addition to the minimum requirements described above, the candidate can also choose to additionally engage in activities indicating their commitment to teaching and advising. These additional activities are required for actions beyond reappointment, but candidates are **not** required to complete *all* items in the following areas of teaching competence. In their narrative, candidates are to describe the meaningfulness of their teaching in the areas they claim.

Some *examples* of these activities include but are not limited to:

2.3.1 Curriculum Development
- The candidate has actively participated in the development of new courses as part of the department's efforts to improve the curriculum
- The candidate has made substantial changes to existing courses as part of the department's efforts to improve the curriculum
- The candidate has developed courses or programs to assist the department, college, or university in meeting university objectives in areas such as service learning, international education, online learning, assessments of learning outcomes, K-12 teacher preparation, PolyX or other such pedagogical initiatives as may emerge as university priorities

2.3.2 Advising and Mentoring
- The candidate has assumed responsibility for special advising tasks such as working with at-risk students
- The candidate has coordinated internship programs
- The candidate has been adviser for curricular-related programs (Political Science Club, Pi Sigma Alpha, College Republicans, College Democrats, etc.
- The candidate has been adviser for specialized programs of study (e.g. pre-law, study abroad, service-learning, Model UN, Model OAS, Mock Trial, Judicial Internship, graduate programs).
- The candidate has mentored students through Office of Undergraduate Research programs
- The candidate has supervised an independent study
- The candidate has served as an MPA thesis or project chair
- The candidate has served as an MPA thesis or project committee member
- The candidate has mentored an undergraduate thesis project outside of assigned teaching responsibilities

- The candidate has served as an Honors thesis advisor
- The candidate has provided effective mentoring in pedagogy to junior colleagues through informal and formal consultation and constructive peer evaluations

2.3.3 Professional Development
- The candidate has participated in a number of teaching related workshops (CAFE, ACUE, Chancellor's Office etc.)
- The candidate has attended regional or national teaching conferences
- The candidate has applied for and received internal or external teaching grants
- The candidate has received a teaching award
- The candidate has received an advising award

2.3.4 Dissemination of Knowledge
- The candidate has made presentations on particular topics on which they are knowledgeable in the classes of colleagues, campus groups, or outside organizations
- The candidate has presented their work at regional or national teaching conferences
- The candidate has published their work in peer-reviewed journals that focus on teaching
- The candidate has organized teaching-related workshops

2.4 Sources of Information. Examples of sources of information for determining whether or not these criteria are being met include, but are not limited to:
- Peer observations of classroom instruction
- Attendance of advising workshops and work with departmental colleagues on advising issues
- Attendance at workshops on service learning, assessment of learning, learning-centered teaching, and teaching future schoolteachers
- Attendance at faculty development workshops
- Demonstrated and/or articulated efforts in improving pedagogical techniques to improve student learning
- Student evaluations of teaching, which are to be interpreted by the faculty member in their narrative identifying how trends and patterns have helped with the development of the faculty member's teaching
- Signed letters from students and other documented information received by the chair to which the faculty member has had an opportunity to respond. At any time a student may submit a letter/petition expressing their opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter/petition must be signed and addressed either to the chair of the appropriate department or to the chair of the appropriate departmental evaluation committee. The letter/petition must include the Bronco Identification Number of all student signers. The department chair/chair of the appropriate department evaluation committee must provide the faculty member with copies of such letters/petitions in a timely manner. The faculty member shall be allowed at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal. Any rebuttal provided by the faculty members shall be attached to the original letter/petition and placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF). Letters/petitions received as the result of appropriate solicitations by the evaluation

committee (Section 3.2 of Policy 1328 of the University Manual) may be collected and presented as a group to the faculty member

- Signed letters from others concerning the teaching and/or mentoring skills of the candidate (e.g. from those who invited the candidate to speak to outside groups or classes, junior colleagues)
- A portfolio of teaching materials prepared by the candidate that includes the faculty member's self-evaluation (see 1.4.7 above) of their teaching, syllabi, tests, assignments, other teaching materials, examples of graded student work
- Records of missed class meetings and missed office hours
- Copies of advising resources developed for students (e.g., handouts, guides)
- Copies of peer evaluations of others prepared by the candidate
- Professional association conference program and/or agenda
- Copies of published work
- Certificates
- Documentation of invitation to provide a guest lecture

2.5 Teaching criteria for actions.

2.5.1 Reappointment. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 2.2.

2.5.2 Tenure. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 2.2. In addition to the minimum requirements, the candidate has also engaged in additional activities in at least one of the four areas described above (2.3.1 through 2.3.4)

2.5.3 Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 1.2. In addition to the minimum requirements, the candidate has also engaged in additional activities in at least two of the four areas described above (2.3.1 through 2.3.4)

2.5.4 Promotion to Full Professor. Since the time of promotion, the candidate has continued to satisfy the minimum requirements specified in 2.2. In addition to the minimum requirements, the candidate has also engaged in additional activities in at least two of the four areas described above (2.3.1 through 2.3.4)

2.5.5 Early Tenure. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 2.2. In addition to the minimum requirements, the candidate has also engaged in additional activities in at least two of the four areas described above (2.3.1 through 2.3.4)

2.5.6 Early Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 2.2. In addition to the minimum requirements, the candidate has also engaged in additional activities in at least three of the four areas described above (2.3.1 through 2.3.4)

2.5.7 Early Promotion to Full Professor. Since the time of promotion, the candidate has continued to satisfy the minimum specified in 2.2. In addition to the minimum requirements, the candidate has also engaged in additional activities in at least three of the four areas described above (2.3.1 through 2.3.4)

3.0 CRITERIA FOR COMPETENCE IN SCHOLARSHIP

3.1 Definition of Scholarly Competence. Scholarly competence lies in a demonstrable commitment to continued learning and research. While the research and scholarship will most often be focused on substantive areas within the discipline, research and scholarship on pedagogy and interdisciplinary research will also be recognized and encouraged. The department also encourages co-authorship and, as such, single-authored and co-authored work will be weighted equally. A commitment to continued learning and research is required of all faculty at all levels in the Political Science Department.

Candidates are also encouraged to describe their scholarship commitments in relation to their professional development plan in the periodic evaluation. For example, candidates can explain how their scholarship contributes to their broader professional development goals; how their ongoing and long-standing commitment to specific scholarship activities have made substantial contributions throughout time; and/or how their scholarship activities may have shifted or evolved to support their professional development goals.

3.2 Areas of Scholarly Activity. A commitment to continued learning and research can be demonstrated by faculty via efforts across several areas of scholarly activity. For reappointment, we expect candidates to complete two activities within any of these areas. For other actions, candidates are expected to demonstrate breadth by undertaking several different activities and/or to demonstrate depth in publishing peer-reviewed journal articles (or equivalencies specified in 3.2.1). In their narrative, candidates are to describe the meaningfulness of their scholarship in the areas they claim.

Some *examples* of these activities include but are not limited to:

3.2.1 Publish Scholarly Work(s). These include peer-reviewed journal articles, non-peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters (one chapter is equivalent to one peer-reviewed journal article), books (equivalent to three peer-reviewed journal articles), original web-based materials of high scholarly quality, public scholarship of high scholarly quality (e.g. policy reports), and original data sets and archives appropriate to their specialty area.

3.2.2 Progress Toward Research. These include fieldwork and data-gathering activities appropriate to the candidate's field (including, but not limited to, compiling literature reviews, conducting interviews, conducting field surveys, conducting archival research, and building datasets), progress toward publication (in the form of a "revise and resubmit" from a peer-reviewed journal or a portion of a book manuscript with a contract), and successful application to internal competitive grants (including, but not limited to, Teacher's Scholar and Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities) or external reputable organizations (including, but not limited to, the National Science Foundation or the Fulbright Scholars Program).

3.2.3 Present Scholarly Work(s). These include original research findings at academic conferences, departmental colloquia, trainings, invited talks, workshops, and seminars. These may include CPP-specific events (e.g., Dean's Lecture Series), professional organizations, community group settings, and other academic institutions.

3.2.4 Review Scholarly Work(s). These include serving as a reviewer for journal articles in

recognized peer-reviewed journals, writing book reviews for peer-reviewed journals, serving as a reviewer for an unpublished book manuscript for a recognized scholarly press, serving as an external reviewer for a colleagues' scholarship file for tenure and promotion at another institution, serving as a reviewer for other scholarly publications.

3.2.5 Edit Scholarly Work(s). These include serving as an editor for an academic journal, an edited book volume, an edited anthology, or other works.

3.2.6 Attend Scholarly Event(s). These include serving as a chair or discussant at academic conferences, symposia, workshops, seminars, or professional development events directly related to their area of specialty.

3.2.7 Procure Internal and External Funding. These include successfully procuring funding through internal competitive grants including (but not limited to) Teacher's Scholar, Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities (RSCA) portal, and external competitive grants from reputable organizations including (but not limited to) the National Science Foundation (NSF) or the Fulbright Scholars Program.

3.2.8 Consult Around Scholarly Content. These include serving as a consultant to political organizations, broadly conceived.

3.2.9 Receive Scholarly Recognition. These include receiving recognition for outstanding and impactful scholarship in the form of awards, honorable mentions, spotlights, community acknowledgements, media attention, and other forms of acknowledgment.

3.3 Sources of Information. Information for determining whether or not these criteria are being met should be provided in a portfolio by candidate that includes, when appropriate, but is not limited to:
- A self-evaluation of research activities and accomplishments and a plan for research activities over the next five years
- Copies of published research
- Copies of papers presented at conferences or elsewhere
- Copies of reviews written by the faculty member
- Reference links to appropriate web materials and datasets
- Copies of letters of invitation to present seminars, conduct reviews, serve on research teams, etc.
- Copies of conference programs indicating your role as discussant or chair
- Copies letters of grant acceptance
- Copies consulting contracts and/or products from consulting work
- Copies of certificates of completion from workshops or programs
- Copies of award, honorable mention, and spotlight notifications

3.4 Scholarship Criteria for Actions.

3.4.1 Reappointment. The candidate has completed one activity in section 3.2.2 and completed one additional activity across one of the other nine areas of scholarly activity (3.2.1, 3.2.3 through 3.2.9)

3.4.2 Tenure. The candidate has published the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles. Alternatively, the candidate will have published the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal articles *and* completed one additional activity from among any of those defined in section 3.2.1 through 3.2.9.

3.4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has published the equivalent of three peer-reviewed journal articles. Alternatively, the candidate will have published the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles *and* completed one additional activity from among any of those defined in section 3.2.1 through 3.2.9.

3.4.4 Promotion to Full Professor. Since the time of promotion, the candidate has published the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles. Alternatively, the candidate will have published the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal article *and* completed one additional activity from among any of those defined in section 3.2.1 through 3.2.9.

3.4.5 Early Tenure. The candidate has published the equivalent of three peer-reviewed journal articles. Alternatively, the candidate will have published the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles *and* completed one additional activity from among any of those defined in section 3.2.1 through 3.2.9.

3.4.6 Early Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has published the equivalent of four peer-reviewed journal articles. Alternatively, the candidate will have published the equivalent of three peer-reviewed journal articles *and* completed two additional activities from among any of those defined in section 3.2.1 through 3.2.9.

3.4.7 Early Promotion to Full Professor. Since the time of promotion**,** the candidate has published the equivalent of three peer-reviewed journal articles. Alternatively, the candidate will have published the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles *and* completed two additional activities from among any of those defined in section 3.2.1 through 3.2.9.

4.0 CRITERIA FOR COMPETENCE IN SERVICE

4.1 Definition of Service. Service to Department, College, University, System, Profession, Community is defined as those activities undertaken in additional to normal teaching, advising, and scholarly activity which make use of the faculty member's professional expertise in service to the department, the college, the university, the California State University system, professional organizations, and to the community-at-large.

Candidates are also encouraged to describe their service commitments in relation to their professional development plan in the periodic evaluation. For example, candidates can explain how their different service activities contribute to their broader professional development goals; how their ongoing and long-standing commitment to specific service activities have made substantial contributions throughout time; and/or how their service activities may have shifted or evolved to support their professional development goals.

4.2 Minimum Service Requirements. Beginning from the first year but continuing throughout their appointment and promotion in the department, all members of the department are expected to participate in the following department-level service:

- o Regular attendance and participation at faculty meetings
- o Faculty search committees (committee-of-the-whole for the finalist stage)
- o Capstone Paper grading
- o Capstone Presentation evaluations
- o Capstone Conference attendance & planning
- o Peer evaluations (first-year faculty are only assigned one adjunct)
- o Participation in program review and assessment efforts

At minimum, candidates are expected to adhere to the following timeline in completing service to the **department, college, and university service**:

- First and second year of appointment: With consultation of the department chair, the candidate is assigned to at least one specific department-level service commitment or committee. Examples include but are not limited to alumni outreach, California Government Exam administrator, department webmaster, Pi Sigma Alpha advisor, internship advisor, Political Science Club advisor, Scholarship Committee Chair, Capstone Conference & Assessment Chair, Undergraduate Journal Advisor, Union Representative, and Study Abroad Advisor.
- Third and fourth year of appointment: With consultation of the department chair, the candidate is additionally assigned to at least one specific college-level service committee. Examples include but are not limited to the Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Committee, the Inclusive Excellence Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Student Success Committee, the Teacher Scholar Committee, and the College RTP Committee.
- Fifth and sixth year of appointment: The candidate will choose at least one university-level service committee or task force to serve upon. The duration of the service commitment should ideally be a semester or year-long appointment. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice about appropriate university-level commitments from the DRTP chair and tenured members in the department.

This timeline of service to the department, college, and university is accelerated for those with service credit or seeking early action.

At minimum, candidates are expected to participate in the following level of service to the **profession**:
- The candidate will have active membership in at least one professional association within the first three years of their appointment.

At minimum, candidates are expected to participate in the following level of service to the **community**:
- The candidate will demonstrate volunteer work, relationship building, or public service that contributes to the common welfare of the community-at-large. The community service requirement is to encourage the candidate to develop and maintain connections with communities outside of the university, broadly defined, in ways that allow them to share their knowledge and expertise to the broader public and/or reach their professional

development goals. Minimum service obligation includes volunteer work to support one event, activity, or program for an off-campus organization within the first three years of appointment.

While candidates are encouraged to contribute to **service to the CSU system**, the department does not have a minimum requirement for service to the system.

4.3 Additional Service Commitments. In addition to the minimum requirements described above, the candidate can also choose to additionally further their service commitments to the department, college, university, system, profession, and community in multiple ways. Tenured faculty in the department shall mentor candidates on the appropriate nature of taking on additional service requirements. These additional service requirements are required for actions beyond reappointment, but candidates are **not** required to complete *all* items in the following areas of service. In their narrative, candidates are to describe the meaningfulness of their service in the areas they claim.

Some *examples* of these activities to further service commitments include, but are not limited to:

4.3.1 Department
- The candidate has been an advisor to a department-sponsored, ASI recognized student organization such as (but not limited to): Mock Trial, Model United Nations, Model Organization of American States.
- The candidate has been an advisor to a department-sponsored organization such as Judicial Internship, Bronco Advocacy and Policymaking, Study Abroad or Study Away.
- The candidate has served on the subcommittee to review applications and semi-finalists for a faculty search.
- The candidate has participated in recruitment efforts for a faculty search, including traveling to a conference to recruit and social media outreach.
- The candidate has served on an ad hoc committee with major deliverables.
- The candidate has served as Department Chair.
- The candidate has served as Associate Chair.
- The candidate has served as MPA Director.
- The candidate has served as summer orientation advisor.
- The candidate has served as the Department RTP Chair.
- The candidate has been elected to the Department RTP Committee (tenured members).
- The candidate has been elected to the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee (tenured members).
- The candidate has participated in NASPAA accreditation efforts.
- The candidate has helped to review student scholarship applications as a part of the department scholarship committee.

4.3.2 College
- The candidate has committed to administrative responsibilities as a faculty member (e.g. chair of a college committee, director of a college center)
- The candidate has taken an administrative assignment (e.g. , associate dean, dean) in the CLASS Dean's Office

- The candidate serves as an advisory board member, faculty fellow, or collaborator for a CLASS center or program (e.g. the Weglyn Center, California Center for Ethics & Policy, the Ahimsa Center)
- The candidate has provided service in addition to their teaching and department service duties with another department in CLASS, including advising of students outside of the department, planning and/or presenting at events sponsored by other departments, etc.

4.3.3 University
- The candidate has served on the Academic Senate.
- The candidate has served on an Academic Senate Standing Committee.
- The candidate has served an administrative assignment (e.g. Provost's fellow, Associate Vice President, Presidential appointment) at the university level in addition to their teaching duties.
- The candidate serves as a director, advisory board member, faculty advisor, or collaborator for a a university center or office (e.g. Inclusive Excellence Council, Office of Interdisciplinary Ethnic Studies Teaching and Scholarship, Care Center, CFA, PolyX Committee etc.)
- The candidate has provided service in addition to their teaching and department service duties with another college at Cal Poly Pomona, including advising of students outside of the college, planning and/or presenting at events sponsored by other colleges, etc.
- The candidate has been an advisor to a non-department sponsored, ASI recognized student organization and/or participant in their events.
- The candidate has served on an ad hoc committee at the university level or with another college at Cal Poly Pomona (e.g. President's Scholars Scholarship Committee, Kellogg Honors College application review etc.)

4.3.4 System
- The candidate has served on the CSU Academic Senate.
- The candidate represents the department in CSU system organizations, committees, caucuses, work groups, etc., such as SSRIC or political science department associations.

4.3.5 Profession
- The candidate is an active member of a national professional association.
- The candidate has served as a chair at a panel of papers at a professional association conference.
- The candidate has served as a discussant at a panel of papers at a professional association conference.
- The candidate has served as a section chair at a professional association conference.
- The candidate has served on a committee for a professional association.
- The candidate has served as an elected officer for a professional association.
- The candidate has developed professional development workshops, activities, and programs for a professional association.
- The candidate has participated in mentorship activities to support junior scholars within their field.

- The candidate has participated in mentorship activities to support women scholars, scholars from historically marginalized communities, and/or first-generation scholars within their field.

4.3.6 Community
- The candidate has demonstrated that they are building relationships with off-campus organizations.
- The candidate has been elected to public office (if eligible).
- The candidate was appointed to a public commission or committee.
- The candidate serves on an advisory board for a public organization.
- The candidate serves on a board of directors for a non-profit organization.
- The candidate advises or is a part of a public-facing project or program led by a public organization, non-profit organization, civic group, etc. (e.g. provides technical research assistance, scholarly expertise, grant writing assistance)

4.4 Sources of Information. Examples of sources of information for determining whether these criteria are being met include, but are not limited to:
- Documentation of service appointments or recognitions from the university, public organization, non-profit organization, professional association, etc.
- Professional association conference program and/or agenda
- Documentation of invitation to participate in event, activity, or program
- Promotional materials for event, activity, or program

Documentation is not needed for every service commitment, especially for department and college commitments.

4.5 Service criteria for actions.

4.5.1 Reappointment. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 4.2.

4.5.2 Tenure. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 4.2. In addition to assigned responsibilities, the candidate has also taken on additional service requirements in at least two of the six areas of service (4.3.1 through 4.3.6)

4.5.3 Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 4.2. In addition to assigned responsibilities, the candidate has also taken on additional service requirements in at least three of the six areas of service (4.3.1 through 4.3.6).

4.5.4 Promotion to Full Professor. Since the time of promotion, the candidate has continued to satisfy the minimum service requirements specified in 4.2. In addition to assigned responsibilities, the candidate has also (1) maintained participation in at least two department-level committees (or commitments described in 4.2 and 4.3.1) and (2) taken on additional service requirements in at least four of the six areas of service (4.3.1 through 4.3.6).

4.5.5 Early Tenure. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 3.2. In addition to assigned responsibilities, the candidate has also taken on additional service requirements in at least three of the six areas of service (3.3.1 through 3.3.6)

4.5.6 Early Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has met the minimum requirements specified in 3.2. In addition to assigned responsibilities, the candidate has also taken on additional service activities in at least four of the six areas of service (3.3.1 through 3.3.6)

4.5.7 Early Promotion to Full Professor. Since the time of promotion, the candidate has continued to satisfy the minimum service requirements specified in 3.2. In addition to assigned responsibilities, the candidate has also (1) maintained participation in at least four department-level committees or commitments described in 3.2 and 3.3.1 and (2) taken on additional service activities in at least five of the six areas of service (3.3.1 through 3.3.6).

5.0 APPENDIX

5.1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form

POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
Peer Evaluation Form

Professor Evaluated:	Class Evaluated:
Evaluator:	Date Class Evaluated:

Instructions to Evaluator: Please elaborate on your judgments of the professor's performance. Discuss their strengths and give suggestions, where possible, for enhancing teaching effectiveness. Please make sure to review the syllabus and relevant course materials (texts, assignments, and supplemental materials). When teaching in an online setting, consider the learning management system and other relevant platforms that make up the "classroom".

Signature of Evaluator   Date

I have received and read this evaluation.

_____   _____
Signature of Professor Evaluated   Date