

**PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA**

**REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION AND PERIODIC EVALUATION DOCUMENT
AY 2022/23-2026/27**

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) and periodic evaluation processes are critically important faculty responsibilities. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. Whereas the president makes final decisions on RTP, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The Department RTP (DRTP) document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, the dean, the College RTP Committee (CRTPC), the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies, including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Policy Nos. 1328 and 1329 (formerly Appendix 16 and Appendix 10 respectively) of the University 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 department policies.

The CBA requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the DRTP document within two weeks of the start of the faculty member's first academic term at Cal Poly Pomona. The primary purpose of the DRTP document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and, in particular, what they must achieve in order to be granted RTP. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that faculty members are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college missions, visions, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate an aspirational model of a faculty colleague.

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting faculty members who are in the RTP process, providing them 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 those in the RTP process to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

I.1. Definitions: Policy No. 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

- a) **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action or periodic evaluation in the current cycle.
- b) **RTP Committee members** must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) during

Fall or Spring terms may serve if elected and willing and with prior approval by the Provost. Any faculty member who will be a candidate for any action or periodic evaluation may not serve on the DRTPC.

- c) **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the DRTP document and in Policy No. 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The aforementioned documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules or procedures. DRTP criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the CRTPC for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or the president's designee.
- d) A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.
- e) A faculty member is **eligible to apply for the first promotion** at the time of application for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible to apply for a subsequent promotion** after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**.
- f) **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities, and university service.
- g) **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by Policy No. 1329 of the University Manual and the CBA.
- h) **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the DRTPC and includes a face-to-face classroom visit (or an online classroom visit in synchronous courses, or a review of the online course environment, for example content on CANVAS, for asynchronous courses), review of course syllabus and other teaching materials, and a written report provided by the peer evaluator no more than 2 weeks (14 calendar days) from the FTF or online class visit or review of the online course environment.
- i) A **candidate for reappointment or periodic evaluation must use the DRTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.
- j) A **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.
- k) **Performance review** is an actionable evaluation process by the DRTPC, Dean, URTPC, and Provost that results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment,

tenure and/or promotion, using the Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form) consistent with CBA 15.38.

- 1) A **periodic evaluation** is a non-actionable intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the DRTPC, and Dean. Periodic evaluation does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions. Reports from the DRTPC and Dean are issued to the probationary faculty member with feedback and guidance. A periodic evaluation is sometimes referred to as an RTP action.

I.2. DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY – The Psychology Department hopes that a hiring decision will lead to a tenure decision. Thus, the RTP process should be viewed as a collaborative effort in which the department is as motivated as the candidate to see the candidate move through the tenure and promotion process. Candidates will receive constructive feedback throughout their probationary years. It is expected that candidates will either show consistently good performance or will show steady progress toward successful tenure. In other words, if candidates show good performance early in the period, it is expected that they will continue to perform well and not show regression, resting upon their good early performance; if the department identifies some areas that need to be improved early in the candidates' respective careers, it is expected that they will address these areas in a corrective manner and not ignore them until the very last probationary year. Candidates should develop a Professional Plan stating goals consistent with their abilities and interests and the DRTPC criteria. This will be used to help guide the candidates in areas they want to pursue and assist the DRTPC in evaluating the degree to which the candidates are making progress towards their stated goals. Of course, such goals can change over time, and candidates are free to revise their Professional Plans in consultation with the DRTPC.

SECTION II – PROCEDURES

II.1. Policy No. 1328 describes RTP procedures in complete detail. A summary is provided here.

II.2. DEPARTMENT RTP PROCEDURES

2.1. The chair of the department will always be a member of the DRTPC. The rest of the DRTPC will consist of full-time, tenured, and FERP faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The membership size shall be consistent with Policy No. 1328. Also consistent with Policy No. 1328, in promotion considerations, only members of the DRTPC who “have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion” will review and vote on a specific faculty member’s RTP action or periodic evaluation (Policy No. 1328).

2.2. Election

2.2.1. During the first term of each academic year, the department chair shall submit to department faculty members the names of all those who are currently full-time and tenured as nominees to the DRTPC for the following academic year, excluding the department chair and those who serve on either College or University RTP committees.

2.2.2. The department chair will automatically be a member of the DRTPC, and before the end of the fall term, full-time tenured and probationary faculty shall, by secret ballot, elect the remainder of the membership of the DRTPC for the following year by majority vote. The number of individuals on the DRTPC may vary from year-to-year, according to established policies, but must be an odd number, and the number of individuals on the DRTPC will also be voted upon by the faculty.

2.2.3. The term of office for membership on the DRTPC shall be for the 10-month academic year (thus, any faculty who are on sabbatical that year are ineligible to serve).

2.3. Duties

- 2.3.1.** The DRTPC discusses, evaluates, and interprets all personnel policies for tenured and tenure track Psychology faculty related to RTP actions and periodic evaluations. The development and continuing revision of the DRTP document by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty is the responsibility of this committee. Revisions are forwarded simultaneously to the College Dean and the CRTPC, in accordance with the official calendar for each academic year.
- 2.3.2.** DRTPC members are expected to attend RTP meetings and, prior to the meetings, to have reviewed available pertinent materials requiring actions or evaluations, and those relevant documents guiding the actions or evaluations. Each member will conduct a thorough review of all candidates' documents prior to the meeting in which final assessments are to be developed.

2.4. The Chair and Vice Chair

2.4.1. Duties

- 2.4.1.1.** The DRTPC Chair is elected by the DRTPC, and develops the department calendar of RTP activities, receives materials from the candidates, students, and appropriate faculty members and agencies, and organizes these materials for the DRTPC.
- 2.4.1.2.** As required, the DRTPC Chair drafts proposed changes to DRTP policies and procedures, for submission to Psychology faculty for approval in accordance with university policies.
- 2.4.1.3.** The Vice Chair, also elected by the DRTPC, fulfills the duties of the Chair if the Chair becomes unable to complete the above duties.

2.4.2. Composition, Election, and Responsibilities

- 2.4.2.1.** The DRTPC Chair and Vice Chair are elected by the DRTPC.
- 2.4.2.2.** The DRTPC Chair and Vice Chair must hold the rank of Professor.
- 2.4.2.3.** The Chair of the DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that all applicable university, college, and DRTP directives, policies, and procedures are complied with. The Chair or Vice Chair may serve as advisors to candidates seeking RTP action or being evaluated. The DRTPC Chair is responsible to be sure that each candidate has a current copy of the DRTP document at the beginning of the RTP cycle.
- 2.4.2.4.** The Vice Chair of the DRTPC is responsible for acting as Chair in the absence of the regular Chair, and for the compilation of proposed RTP document changes during the year.

2.4.3. DRTPC Terms of Office

2.4.3.1. The DRTPC Chair serves as Chair for one academic year.

2.4.3.2. The Vice Chair serves as Vice Chair for one academic year.

2.4.4. Responsibilities

2.4.4.1. The Chair of the DRTPC is available as an adviser to candidates preparing for performance reviews or periodic evaluation reports. The Chair and Vice Chair will ensure that candidates are fully informed of all time and calendar requirements, and may review submission materials with candidates, prior to their formal submission, to ensure fulfillment of all requirements.

2.4.4.2. The remaining members of the DRTPC are responsible for timely and detailed review of candidates' formally submitted materials. They should carefully compare the submitted materials with the appropriate DRTP document (depending upon whether the candidate is allowed to choose to use the document current at time of hire or current at time of action), to assess the degree to which specific criteria have been fulfilled.

2.4.5. RTP Action and Periodic Evaluation Procedures

2.4.5.1. Faculty members eligible for RTP actions or periodic evaluation are so informed by the Office of Faculty Affairs and given a time-table for submission deadlines and action dates (if applicable).

2.4.5.2. Adoption of RTP criteria and procedures is by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty.

2.4.5.3. All RTP action and periodic evaluation requests are initiated by the candidate. RTP action and periodic evaluation requests are initiated by completing a self-evaluation in the format specified by university policy. Formatting requirements and required forms can typically be found on the Faculty Affairs website at <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/tenure-line-faculty/evaluation.shtml>

2.4.5.3.1. When a faculty member undergoes a performance review, the faculty member shall submit an RTP package that is comprised of the following items:

1. An updated curriculum vitae;
2. 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 your narrative, highlight, as applicable, how your accomplishments support CPP's core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;

3. All peer evaluations 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);
4. 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);
5. The Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form); and
6. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

2.4.5.3.2. 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 five items:

1. An updated curriculum vitae;
2. A self-assessment narrative, not to exceed four pages, discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities and service from the current review period. In your narrative, highlight, as applicable, how your accomplishments support CPP’s core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;
3. Two peer evaluations from the period of review (or more if required by the department);
4. Statistical summaries of student survey scores and reviews from the current review period (student teaching evaluations from each course during the current evaluation period); and
5. Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the current evaluation period.

2.4.5.4. In accordance with university policy, any faculty member, student, or academic administrator may submit written input to the Committee. Notice requesting faculty and student letters will be posted 20 working days prior to the deadline for candidates’ packages to be received by the DRTPC, displaying a deadline that is 10 working days prior to the deadline for candidates’ packages to be received by the DRTPC. Copies of any letters received up to the deadline will be provided to the candidate, who will then have 10 days to respond before they must submit their packages. Any letter received after the deadline will not be accepted for the current RTP cycle but may be used in the subsequent RTP cycle. Any information received after the official closing date will be forwarded to the University RTP Committee for their approval in order for it to accompany the package.

2.4.5.5. The DRTPC will assure that peer observations are made by at least two of the department’s full-time, tenured faculty members in two different terms of each academic year. Members will individually submit a written report of the observation

to the candidate and the Committee including the standard form developed by the department. An observation schedule will be developed in consultation between the DRTPC Chair, the department chair, or the department chair's designee and the candidate. Only in the event that the DRTPC and department fail to do this will a peer review be accepted from the Fall term following the period of review.

2.4.5.6. The DRTPC will consider the evaluations and recommendations submitted, the candidate's RTP Package or periodic evaluation report and related materials, and formulate a summary response.

2.4.5.6.1. The summary response for a performance review will include a recommendation regarding action. This summary recommendation will detail the relation of the applicant's performance to the overall goals of the Department Strategic Plan, as well as the consonance of the candidate's self-evaluation, stated career plan, and DRTP criteria.

2.4.5.6.2. The summary response for a periodic evaluation shall provide constructive feedback and clear guidance for improvement in preparation for the next year's performance review. No recommendation for RTP actions will be permitted during a periodic evaluation. A copy of the report shall be placed in the candidate's PAF. The dean will also provide a report.

2.4.5.7. The DRTPC may ask the candidate to meet with the Committee to exchange additional information. The goal of such a meeting is to further clarify information regarding criteria fulfillment.

2.4.5.8. In RTP matters involving promotion, the DRTPC will be responsible for making the department-level recommendation concerning promotion for each candidate.

2.4.5.9. A differential weighting matrix will be used by the DRTPC in arriving at the final basis for recommendation or periodic evaluation response (see section III of this document for additional details about this matrix). Following a complete review of all materials submitted, each committee member will complete a matrix form for each candidate. These preliminary signed matrices will be shared among the committee members and discussed prior to the preparation of a final consensus matrix. The committee will meet in extended sessions as needed to allow time to prepare the consensus matrix. The concluding recommendation or periodic evaluation response for the DRTPC will be guided by the numeric value of the total score from the matrix.

2.4.5.10. Following completion of the deliberations, and signing of the forms, the DRTPC informs the candidate of the DRTPC's decisions and recommendation or periodic evaluation response, and provides a copy of all written materials received and a summary evaluation prepared by the Committee for the candidate. In the event the candidate requests a meeting about the recommendation, the DRTPC Chair will arrange for appropriate meetings with the Committee and the candidate, conforming to university calendar guidelines. Based on the review of the RTP

package or periodic evaluation report and evaluation of progress towards tenure and promotion, 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. This recommendation is not subject to appeal although the probationary faculty member can submit a rebuttal. The Provost makes the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

2.4.5.11. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the DRTPC to perform the following duties in the Fall term:

1. Ensure that candidates have information they need, including information about the actions they must or may apply for, periodic evaluations they must undergo, information they need to prepare requests, and department criteria.
2. Assist candidates in understanding expectations and preparing RTP packages or periodic evaluation reports.
3. Inform Faculty Affairs of requests for actions.
4. Ensure that packages or periodic evaluation reports are complete.
5. Provide the department recommendation to the candidate.

It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the DRTPC to perform the following duties throughout the academic year:

1. Ensure that peer evaluations are conducted for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action or periodic evaluation in the future.
2. Ensure that peer evaluation reports are provided to candidates in a timely manner—within 2 weeks (14 calendar days) of a classroom visit.

II.3. Student Evaluation of Teaching

- 3.1.** The department faculty shall review and adopt a single standard form for student evaluation of instruction. This form shall be developed and administered in accordance with Policy Nos. 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual.
- 3.2.** The university requires that all courses (except independent study types of courses) receive a Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI).

II.4. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

- 4.1.** The department faculty shall review and adopt guidelines for conducting peer evaluations of teaching in accordance with Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual and the CBA.
- 4.2.** A minimum of two peer evaluations in different courses, and in different terms, in each academic year shall be conducted for each probationary faculty and for each tenured faculty member who may subsequently seek promotion. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. Peer evaluation of in-person teaching shall include classroom visits and a review of the course syllabus and related material. Classroom visits should be followed within no more than two weeks (14 calendar days) by a written report.

Peer evaluation of online instruction should include a review of the course syllabus, a thorough review of the online course environment (e.g., Canvas), and, for synchronous courses, a visit to a synchronous class meeting. For synchronous courses, a written report should be provided within no more than two weeks (14 calendar days) of the visit to the synchronous class meeting. For asynchronous courses, a written report should be provided no more than 2 weeks (14 calendar days) from the review of the online course environment. The report must be submitted to the faculty member and to the department chair. A faculty member being evaluated may request a different peer evaluation if more than two weeks passes between the time of initial visit and submission of the written report.

- 4.3. Each probationary faculty member going up for RTP action shall conduct a self-evaluation of teaching for each academic year during the current review period. This self-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 evaluations and how they influenced future instruction, and descriptions of any activities such as workshops or conferences the faculty member attended that focused on teaching skills and strategies and how they influenced future instruction. The probationary faculty member will also address any recommendations and suggestions made during the previous review cycle regarding instructional performance.
- 4.4. Each candidate for tenure and/or promotion shall conduct a self-evaluation of teaching as part of the application. The period of review for the self-evaluation shall be the time since original hiring unless the candidate has been tenured or promoted, in which case the period of review shall be the time since the previous application for promotion/tenure. This self-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 evaluations and how they influenced future instruction, and descriptions of any activities such as workshops or conferences the faculty member attended that focused on teaching skills and strategies and how they influenced future instruction. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will also address any recommendations and suggestions made during the previous review cycle regarding instructional performance.

II.5. Candidates and Future Candidates “serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties. . . serving in positions of academic governance . . . [or] temporarily on leave from teaching duties (such as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching and administrative assignment for the university, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution),” as cited in Policy No. 1328, are instructed as follows:

- a) Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must or may apply for RTP action or be evaluated shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by electronic transmission, and must provide contact information to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

- b) Individuals who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action or periodic evaluation must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The DRTPC shall commit to writing an interpretation of the department criteria for each special circumstance. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the dean, URTPC chair, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

III. CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION OR PERIODIC EVALUATION

DIFFERENTIAL WEIGHTING MATRIX

AREA	ALL ACTIONS (REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION) AND PERIODIC EVALUATION	
I	Instructional Competence	4
II	Professional Productivity	3
III	Service	3
Performance Indexes:	Far Exceeds Department Expectations	5
	Above Department Expectations	4
	Meets Department Expectations	3
	Below Department Expectations	2
	Far Below Department Expectations	1
	No Evidence of Performance in Area	0

A candidate is expected to achieve a minimum of 30 points overall as determined by the average of the scores of the candidate's committee. The candidate must achieve a minimum of 10.7 points in Category I as determined by the average of the scores of the candidate's committee. The candidate is also expected to address any recommendations and suggestions made during the previous review cycle regarding performance in instructional competence, professional productivity, and service.

III.1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION

1.1. Area I—Instructional Competence

- 1.1.1.** University policy requires that all courses (except independent study types of courses) be evaluated by students during an academic year (SEIs). In addition, the university requires at least two peer evaluations per year (in different terms) for faculty who are still being considered for promotion (one copy goes to the candidate and one copy goes into the PAF). The official peer reviews shall include the form developed by the department. Faculty members may also request other classroom visitations or reviews of

online course environments. The DRTPC will consider all SEIs and peer evaluations done since the last RTP action. In other words, no SEIs or peer evaluations conducted since the last RTP action may be eliminated from consideration. The DRTPC will provide detailed analysis of the SEIs and peer evaluations included.

1.1.2. The department SEIs will be used according to the procedure developed for their anonymous completion and collection.

1.1.3. Criteria and Illustrative Performance Indicators:

Major Criteria:

1.1.3.1. Classroom Performance

1.1.3.1.1. Student Evaluations. Source: Student evaluation performance will be described in terms of the average student response for all 14 items on the SEI. Item #8 (overall teaching ability) is also evaluated separately. In addition to all the other indicators of instructional competence described in Area I of this document, the DRTPC is interested in the candidate's mean SEI scores, interpreted in relation to the SEI means across instructors for that course and for that subject (discipline), and in terms of the standard deviations for those groups of instructors. The DRTPC may also consider other statistics that might reflect on the reliability of the measure of central tendency. Signed student letters submitted during the evaluation period may serve as an additional source of student evaluation information.

1.1.3.1.2. Faculty Peer Evaluations. Source: Class visitation records, reviews of online course environments, convention presentations, volunteer colloquia.

1.1.3.2. Instructional Mechanics

1.1.3.2.1. Communication of course objectives via syllabus, prospectus, or outline furnished to students. Source: Copies of same.

1.1.3.2.2. Course orientation via lecture or other media. Source: Student evaluations and peer evaluations.

1.1.3.2.3. Consonance between course objectives and the "expanded course outline" in the approved course proposal. Source: Candidate's statement in RTP package or periodic evaluation report, student evaluations, and peer evaluations.

1.1.3.2.4. Continuing critical evaluation of student performance. Source: Candidate's statement, student evaluations, peer evaluations, and grade reports.

- 1.1.3.2.5.** Equitable and reasonable grading procedure. Source: Syllabus or other course materials, samples of tests and evaluation instruments, past grade distributions, and student evaluations.
- 1.1.3.2.6.** Integration of technology into the classroom and inclusion of innovations in instruction and testing. Source: Candidate's statement, student evaluations, peer evaluations. Candidates are encouraged to examine all teaching methods and to participate in workshops on innovative instructional methods, but are expected to determine for themselves the best teaching strategies.
- 1.1.3.2.7.** Activities related to the preparation of teachers, learning outcomes assessment, service learning, and the internationalization of courses and teaching will be considered and evaluated when addressed by the candidate. Source: Candidate's statement, peer evaluations.

1.1.3.3. Administrative Responsibilities

- 1.1.3.3.1.** Meeting university deadlines, submitting grades in time, adds and drops, incompletes and withdrawals, etc. Source: Candidate's statement, department administrative files.
- 1.1.3.3.2.** Meeting scheduled classes, including final examinations. Source: Student evaluations, peer evaluations, and department administrative files.

1.1.3.4. Faculty–Student Relations

- 1.1.3.4.1.** Demonstrated concern for the dignity and rights of students. Source: Candidate's statement, student evaluations, faculty input.
- 1.1.3.4.2.** Student advisement. Source: Candidate's statement.
- 1.1.3.4.3.** Supervision of student research. Source: Candidate's statement, department administrative files.
- 1.1.3.4.4.** Student mentoring. Source: Candidate's statement.

1.1.3.5. Professional Behavior

- 1.1.3.5.1.** Adherence to professional standards, such as the State Education Code, Section 4306 Title 5, Section 24306; the Code of Ethics of the American Psychological Association (APA); the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics; the Department of Health and Human Services Code of Federal Regulations regarding Protection of Human Subjects; the American Sociological Association (ASA) Code of Ethics. Source: Candidate's statement, student evaluations, faculty input.

- 1.1.3.5.2. Maintenance of professional skills, such as continuing education, teaching workshops, teaching circles. Source: Candidate's statement, some documentation of participation in activities.

1.1.3.6. Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The committee shall not rely only on quantitative student evaluations for the overall evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance, but will also take into consideration faculty judgments of peer review reports, other classroom visitations, guest lectures and presentations, analysis of student evaluations that take into consideration the type of course and other related matters, and other evidence of the candidate's performance.

1.1.3.7. Justification of Release Time

If release time has been granted during the evaluation period, justification for the release time should be presented. Source: Candidate's statement, work products (e.g., articles, course development, 5-year review document).

1.2. Area II—Professional Productivity

Major Criteria:

- 1.2.1. Publications including books, book chapters, monographs, and articles. Source: Publication list submitted as an addendum to candidate's statement.
- 1.2.2. Activity at a professional meeting including presentation of papers, symposium discussant, organizing or chairing symposia, chairing paper sessions, organizing professional conferences, serving as chair, co-chair, or active member on committees organizing professional conferences, serving as chair or co-chair of a program committee, serving on committees or being chair of committees of professional organizations, or being an office holder in professional organizations. Source: Copy of program, letters documenting committee or organization service, or other similar sources of evidence.

Additional Evidence:

- 1.2.3. Editor of a professional journal including editor-in-chief, member of editorial board, and special issue editor. Source: Copy of journal masthead.
- 1.2.4. Invited speaker at a professional meeting. Source: Copy of program.
- 1.2.5. Professional papers including reports from consultations, book reviews, refereeing of papers, articles in newsletters, and publication of newsletters. Source: Publication list submitted as an addendum to candidate's statement.

- 1.2.6. Research proposals, sabbatical leaves, fellowships, and grants developed or approved. Source: Copy of proposals, title page, foundation or granting agency records.
- 1.2.7. Such activities as consulting, survey research, policy analysis, etc., shall be considered under professional productivity. It is expected such activities shall result in a tangible product (survey research report, agency evaluation report, etc.) that reflects scholarly growth. Should one engage in therapy or counseling and want this to count as professional productivity, this activity must result in a tangible piece of evidence, such as a published case history.
- 1.2.8. Formal training and qualification for certification, licensing, or the maintenance thereof, such as licensure as a Marriage and Family Therapist or Psychologist. Source: Certification from granting agency.
- 1.2.9. Additional professional training and development, such as NSF Short Courses, seminars in one's academic discipline, teacher training, or workshops. Source: Certification from granting agency.

1.3. Area III—Service

Service is defined as those activities undertaken in addition to normal teaching and scholarly activity that make use of the faculty member's professional expertise in service to the department, the college, the university, the California State University System, to professional organizations, and to the broader nonacademic community. Service is something beyond mere membership and includes serving on committees, holding offices, and preparing special studies or reports. Service to the department, college, and university entails concerned, informed, and insightful participation in decision-making processes that direct the policies of the university. University service includes the timely and appropriate implementation of policies. Service to the broader community includes activities such as volunteer work and serving on advisory boards or committees for community organizations.

Possible sources: Candidate's statement, department administrative files, minutes of meetings, committee chair's evaluation, "Related Duties" report, letters from organizations or individuals, presentations to lay groups, and faculty and student letters.

1.3.1. Service to the Department

- 1.3.1.1. Regular attendance at scheduled department meetings.
- 1.3.1.2. Teaching courses as needed, consistent with department goals, including times, days, frequency.
- 1.3.1.3. Meeting department emergencies.
- 1.3.1.4. Consistently displaying professional demeanor and ethical behavior in interactions with students, colleagues, staff, and other university personnel.

Actively supporting department goals. Both candidates and senior faculty should be aware that evaluation of candidates in this area requires significant interaction. Both candidates and senior faculty are therefore encouraged to find opportunities for such interaction both in scheduled meetings and more informally.

- 1.3.1.5.** Active support of department goals and objectives by implementation, cooperative effort, and program enhancement or development.
- 1.3.1.6.** Serving on department committees, including regular attendance, participation, and constructive contribution.
- 1.3.1.7.** Development of new courses, options, or other programs, or revision of outdated course outlines, consistent with department goals when needed.
- 1.3.1.8.** Participation in events and activities as a member or representative of the department.
- 1.3.1.9.** Willingness to be of service to peers and administration beyond mandated activities (such as conducting peer evaluations).

1.3.2. Service to the University or College

- 1.3.2.1.** Chair, vice-chair, or active member of university or college committees.
- 1.3.2.2.** Consultation with or representing the university, college, or department to intramural or extramural organizations, to other university organizations, or to other schools.
- 1.3.2.3.** Academic program development at the university or college level.
- 1.3.2.4.** Academic governance.

1.3.3. Service to the Profession

- 1.3.3.1.** Office holder in local, state, regional, or national professional organization.
- 1.3.3.2.** Membership in professional organizations, such as APA, Western Psychological Association, California Psychological Association, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, etc.
- 1.3.3.3.** Other memberships in scientific, honorary, or community organizations of a professional nature, e.g., Psi Chi Psychology Honor Society, Sigma Xi Scientific Research Society, Western Social Science Association, etc. Source: Candidate's statement, organizational documents.

1.3.4. Service to Community Projects or Organizations

III.2. Criteria for Reappointment

As stated above, the candidate must obtain a minimum score of 30 in the department matrix. Moreover, the candidate must obtain a minimum average score of 10.7 in Area I, Instructional Competence, as described below:

- 2.1. Instructional Competence.** The candidate must perform satisfactorily on each of the teaching criteria listed in III.1.1. The SEIs and the peer evaluations will constitute the major part of the department's assessment of instructional competence. The peer evaluations will consist of both classroom visits to view direct instruction and examinations of syllabi, tests, and other classroom materials that constitute instructional mechanics. For remote instruction, evaluations will consist of reviews of analogous virtual course environments as well as visits to synchronous virtual class sessions for synchronous courses. From these criteria, the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 4. Thus, a candidate's score can range from 0 to 20 in instructional competence. The candidate must obtain a minimum average score of 10.7 across all eligible DRTPC members.
- 2.2. Professional Productivity.** The candidate must demonstrate activity in the two major areas of the professional productivity criteria listed as III.1.2.1 and III.1.2.2. Evidence in the additional criteria listed as III.1.2.3–III.1.2.9 will also be considered, but activity in these areas will not substitute for activity in the major criteria areas. From all criteria in this category, the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate's score can range from 0 to 15 in professional productivity.
- 2.3. Service.** The candidate must demonstrate activity in service to the department and at least one other area (college, university, profession, and community). Again, service goes beyond mere membership in a committee or organization but entails active involvement with these entities. From all criteria in this category, the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate's score can range from 0 to 15 in service.

III.3. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

As stated above, the candidate must obtain a minimum score of 30 in the consensus matrix. This assessment will be for the candidate's entire probationary period. Moreover, the candidate must obtain a minimum average score of 10.7 in Area I, Instructional Competence, as outlined below:

- 3.1. Instructional Competence.** The candidate must perform satisfactorily on each of the teaching criteria listed in III.1.1. The SEIs and the peer evaluations will constitute the major part of the department's assessment of instructional competence. The peer evaluations will consist of both classroom visits to view direct instruction and examinations of syllabi, tests, and other classroom materials that constitute instructional mechanics. For remote instruction, evaluations will consist of reviews of analogous virtual course environments as well as visits to synchronous virtual class sessions for

synchronous courses. From these criteria, the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 4. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 20 in instructional competence. The candidate must obtain a minimum average score of 10.7 across all eligible DRTPC members. These criteria will be applied across the candidate’s probationary period in order to come to an assessment of overall instructional competence across this period. It is expected that candidates will maintain acceptable scores across this period or show steady improvement. In other words, candidates receiving high marks in this area early in the period should continue to show high marks and not perform poorly the last few years before the tenure decision. Candidates receiving relatively poor marks at the beginning should show steady improvement in addressing problem areas and not wait until the very last year before the tenure decision is to be rendered.

3.2. Professional Productivity. The candidate must be successful in the two major areas of the professional productivity criteria listed as III.1.2.1 and III.1.2.2. In other words, actual publications and activities in professional meetings must be completed by the time of tenure assessment. Evidence in the additional criteria listed as III.1.2.3–III.1.2.9 will also be considered, but activity in these areas will not substitute for success in the major criteria areas. From all criteria in this category, the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 15 in professional productivity. This assessment will be for the entire probationary period.

3.3. Service. The candidate must demonstrate activity in service to the department and at least one other area (college, university, profession, and community). Again, service goes beyond mere membership in a committee or organization but entails active involvement with these entities. From all criteria in this category, the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 15 in service.

III.4. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

As promotion to Associate Professor comes with tenure, the criteria stated in III.3 Criteria for Tenure will apply to the department’s assessment of promotion to Associate Professor. Satisfactory performance in instructional competence, professional productivity, and service across the probationary period will be assessed.

III.5 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

The criteria stated in III.5 will apply to the department’s assessment of promotion to Professor. Satisfactory performance in instructional competence, professional productivity, and service across the evaluation period are expected and will be assessed. In addition, the candidate’s performance will be evaluated for progress in meeting goals identified in the candidate’s Professional Plan for the period under review. The candidate is expected to have addressed any areas of concern noted in the previous RTP evaluation in the self-evaluation.

- 5.1 Instructional Competence.** The candidate continues to present a record of satisfactory performance for each of the teaching criteria listed in III.1.1, which are expected of all faculty members, and shows consistency of performance throughout the period between promotion to Associate Professor and application for promotion to Professor. The candidate is also expected to demonstrate an ability to help provide departmental direction and guidance in the area of instruction and advising (e.g., assisting junior colleagues in effective teaching, active participation in the development and refinement of the department's curriculum, assisting the department in reaching university objectives related to pedagogy, and/or successfully taking on increased responsibilities for advising), consistent with the candidate's Professional Plan.
- 5.2 Professional Productivity.** The candidate remains actively engaged with the discipline and demonstrates clear accomplishments in scholarly and creative activities by fulfilling the requirements for reappointment (III.1.2) and by demonstrating success in the major criteria categories (professional publications and presentations) for the review period. In addition, the candidate has evidenced a firm commitment to continuing scholarly work and to advanced scholarly activities (e.g., collaboration with and/or assistance to junior colleagues conducting research, review of manuscripts for refereed journals and publishers, and/or service as an editorial board member of an academic publication), as identified in the candidate's Professional Plan.
- 5.3 Service.** The candidate has compiled a tangible record of achievement, demonstrating active participation and/or positions of leadership in the area of service for the period under review. Although the specific service activities will vary according to the candidate's Professional Plan, they may include activities such as department, college, and university committees, leadership positions in regional, state, or national professional organizations, and/or professional contributions to the wider community.

III.6. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE

Consistent with Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual, in considering early actions, special emphasis is placed on teaching ability and accomplishment. Early actions also require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and university service. Specifically, the candidate shall exhibit unusual teaching gifts in tangible ways. Unusual teaching gifts would be demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following types of evidence: Winning teaching awards, obtaining scores consistently above the department average on our SEI, or using distinctly innovative teaching techniques that demonstrate careful crafting of courses. In addition to demonstrable excellence in teaching, candidates for early tenure must produce evidence of persistent and ongoing scholarly work that brings at least a regional reputation for excellence or originality in the form of published books, articles, reviews, or monographs. Scholarly papers presented at recognized professional conferences would also constitute evidence of distinguished work, as would active participation on conference panels. The candidate must also provide exceptional administrative service to the department and to the university. Documented and active service on department, college, and university committees is required as well as participating exceptionally actively in professionally related public service. The RTP document submitted by the candidate for early tenure shall be based on the candidate's entire period of service at Cal Poly Pomona. This

submission must be evaluated by the DRTPC as reflecting performance far exceeding department expectations in all three areas of evaluation.

III.7. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Consistent with Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual, in considering early actions, special emphasis is placed on teaching ability and accomplishment. Early actions also require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and university service. Specifically, the candidate shall exhibit unusual teaching gifts in tangible ways. Unusual teaching gifts would be demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following types of evidence: Winning teaching awards, obtaining scores consistently above the department average on our SEI, or using distinctly innovative teaching techniques that demonstrate careful crafting of courses. In addition to demonstrable excellence in teaching, candidates for early tenure must produce evidence of persistent and ongoing scholarly work that brings at least a regional reputation for excellence or originality in the form of published books, articles, reviews, or monographs. Scholarly papers presented at recognized professional conferences would also constitute evidence of distinguished work, as would active participation on conference panels. The candidate must also provide exceptional administrative service to the department and to the university. Documented and active service on department, college, and university committees is required as well as participating exceptionally actively in professionally related public service. The RTP document submitted by the candidate for early promotion to Associate Professor shall be based on the entire period of service at Cal Poly Pomona. This submission must be evaluated by the DRTPC as reflecting performance far exceeding department expectations in all three areas of evaluation.

III.8. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

As in the criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, the application for Early Promotion to Full Professor shall be based on the candidate's entire period of service since the last RTP evaluation. This submission must be rated by the DRTPC as reflecting performance far exceeding department expectations in all three areas of evaluation. Such extraordinary performance should reflect the language cited in section III.6 Criteria for Early Tenure/III.7 Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor.