

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

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION DOCUMENT
AY 2022/23 –AY 2026/27**

I. Introduction

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion process (RTP) 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. Whereas 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 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, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Policy Numbers 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 departmental 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 their 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 reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the faculty members are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, 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 candidates to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

1.1 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 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. Any faculty member who will be a candidate for any action may not serve on the DRTPC.

c) **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the DRTP criteria 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 College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or the president's designee.

d) A faculty member without any credited years of service is **typically 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 1329 of the University Manual and the CBA.

h) **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the DRTPC and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabi and other teaching materials, and a written report.

i) A **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.

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.

l) 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.

1.2. Department Philosophy

The History Department hopes that candidates engage in the RTP process as an opportunity for personal and professional development. The History faculty view the RTP process as a collaborative effort in which tenured faculty members set fair standards, provide clear guidance, offer effective mentoring, and communicate how and how well candidates are progressing towards their goals. Candidates begin the process with the creation of a professional plan that defines their goals in relation to their teaching, scholarship, and university service. The DRTPC will verify that this plan aligns with DRTPC Criteria, sets performance and achievement goals at levels that meet or exceed department expectations, and then use it to gauge candidates' progress. Candidates should learn from the cyclical reviews and work towards the fulfillment of goals that meet or exceed the department's thresholds for retention, tenure, or promotion. In turn, the DRTPC should clearly report how and how well candidates meet or exceed cyclical thresholds so that candidates have a clear and timely indication of how and how well they are meeting their goals. Both the candidates and the DRTPC shall treat the professional plan as dynamic and open to amendment in a manner that helps candidates meet their goals. The RTP process should support candidates' development as teachers, scholars, and members of an academic community in a manner that matches candidates' abilities, ambitions, and aspirations.

II. Procedures

II.1. Policy number 1328 describes RTP procedures in complete detail. A summary is provided here.

II.2. Department RTP Procedures



II.2.1. The chair of the department will always be a member of the DRTPC. The rest of the DRTPC will consist of tenured or **FERP** faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The membership size shall be consistent with the policies in 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 (Policy No. 1328).

II.2.2. Election

1. **2.2.1.** Before March 1st of each academic year, the department chair shall submit to department faculty members the names of all those who are full-time and tenured as nominees to the DRTPC, excluding the department chair and those who serve on either College or University RTP committees.

2. **2.2.2.** The department chair will automatically be a member of the DRTPC, and before March, 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 department faculty.
3. **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).

II.2.3. Duties of the DRTPC

1. **2.3.1.** The DRTPC discusses, evaluates, and interprets all personnel policies for tenured and tenure track History faculty related to reappointment, tenure, and promotion 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 College RTP Committee, in accordance with the official calendar for each academic year.
2. **2.3.2.** DRTPC members are expected to attend RTP meetings and, prior to the meetings, to have reviewed available pertinent materials requiring actions, and those relevant documents guiding the actions. Each member will conduct a thorough review of all candidates' documents prior to the meeting in which final assessments are to be developed.
3. The DRTPC does not typically include external members. However, 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. 
4. All members of the DRTPC are responsible for timely and detailed review of the candidate's complete package. They should carefully compare the submitted material with the appropriate DRTP document (depending upon whether the candidate chooses to use the document current at time of hire or a more recent one), to assess the degree to which specific criteria have been fulfilled. 


II.2.4.1. DRTPC Chair Duties and Responsibilities

II.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.

II.2.4.1.2. As required, the DRTPC Chair drafts proposed changes to DRTP policies and procedures, for submission to History faculty for approval in accordance with university policies.

II.2.4.1.3. 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 may serve

as an advisor to candidates seeking RTP action. 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.

II.2.4.1.4 The Chair of the DRTPC is available as an adviser to candidates preparing packages. The Chair will ensure that the candidate is fully informed of all time and calendar requirements, and may review the RTP package with the candidate, prior to its formal submission, to ensure fulfillment of all requirements. 

II.2.4.2. DRTPC Terms of Office

The DRTPC Chair serves as Chair for one academic year.

II.2.4.5. RTP and Periodic Evaluation Procedures

II.2.4.5.1. Faculty members eligible for RTP actions or periodic reviews are so informed by the Office of Faculty Affairs and given a timetable for RTP package submission deadlines and action dates. The DRTPC follows up with a specific request that each candidate submit a personal goals statement related to the primary goals of the Department Strategic Plan and the DRTP criteria, and an outline of the means intended to reach the stated goals. This statement should contain both short-term and long-term goals.

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

II.2.4.5.3. All RTP and periodic review requests are initiated by the candidate. Requests are initiated by completing a self-evaluation on the university approved form. The RTP package is the working Personnel Action File (PAF) for the purposes of RTP evaluation and consists of the Faculty Performance Review Form and accompanying materials. However, the chair of the DRTPC and administrators should consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials.

II.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.

II.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.


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. The DRTPC will assure that classroom visitations are made by at least two of the department’s full-time, tenured faculty members in two different terms, and are completed by the end of the academic year preceding the evaluation. Members will individually submit a written report of the visitation to the Committee including the standard form developed by the department, which is included in Appendix A. A visitation schedule will be developed in consultation between the DRTPC Chair, the department chair, or the department chair’s designee and the candidate.

II.2.4.5.4. The DRTPC will consider the evaluations and recommendations submitted, the candidate’s RTP Package and related materials, and formulate a summary recommendation. 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.

II.2.4.5.5. 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.

II.2.4.5.6. In RTP matters involving promotion, the DRTPC will be responsible for making the department-level recommendation concerning promotion for each candidate.

II.2.4.5.7. A rubric will be used by the DRTPC in arriving at the final basis for recommendation (see section III.1.3). Following a complete review of all materials submitted, each committee member will complete a rubric for each candidate. These rubrics, signed by the DRTPC member who composed them, will be shared among the committee members and discussed prior to the preparation of a final consensus rubric. The committee will meet in extended sessions as needed to allow time to prepare the consensus rubric. The concluding recommendation for the DRTPC will be guided by the consensus rubric.

II.2.4.5.8. Following completion of the deliberations, and signing of the forms, the DRTPC informs the candidate of the DRTPC's decisions and recommendation and provides a summary evaluation prepared by the Committee for the candidate.  In the event the candidate requests a reconsideration of a recommendation, the DRTPC Chair will arrange for appropriate meetings with the Committee and the candidate, conforming to University Calendar guidelines. At the reconsideration meeting, the DRTPC will review all information again, including the candidate's response. Candidates should submit written justification for their reconsideration requests. Each committee member will then complete a new differential weighting matrix, which will then be used to compile a consensus matrix for the Committee. The results of the reconsideration recommendation will be indicated on the RTP forms, the candidate will be informed, and the package forwarded to the Dean and CRTPC within the time deadline.

II.2.4.5.9. 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, information they need to prepare requests, department criteria.
2. Assist candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages.
3. Inform Faculty Affairs of requests for actions.
4. Ensure that packages 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 classroom visitations are conducted for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action in the future.
2. Ensure that 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

II.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.

II.3.2. The university requires that all courses (except independent study types of courses) receive a Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI).

II.3.3. Per policy No. 1329 of the University Manual, at any time a student may submit a letter/petition expressing his/her 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 signators. The department chair/chair of the appropriate department evaluation committee must provide the faculty member with copies of such letters/petitions. The faculty member shall be allowed 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 at least 10 days before the deadline for the candidate to submit their RTP package.

II.4. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

II.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.

II.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 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. The report must be submitted to the faculty member and to the department chair. A faculty member being evaluated may request that the class be revisited by the evaluator if more than two weeks passes between the time of initial visit and submission of the written report.

II.4.3. Each probationary faculty member shall conduct a self-evaluation of teaching for each academic year while on probation. 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 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.

II.4.4. Each candidate for tenure and/or promotion shall conduct a self-evaluation of teaching as part of the application. The period of the evaluation shall be the time since original hiring unless the candidate has been tenured or promoted, in which case the period of evaluation shall be the time since the previous application for promotion/tenure. 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 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:

1. a) Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must or may apply for action 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.
2. b) The DRTPC shall consider relevant work done off-campus while the candidate was on professional leave from Cal Poly Pomona.
3. c) Individuals who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action 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 and Evaluation Procedures for RTP Action

III.1. Elements of Performance and Evaluation

III.1.1. Departmental Evaluation of Candidates:

III.1.1.1. The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless stated in writing, to the agreement of the candidate, the DRTPC Chair, the Department Chair, the Dean, the URTP Committee, and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

III.1.1.2. Criteria for reappointment decisions shall be the criteria that were in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus.

III.1.1.3. The DRTPC evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of committee members. The committee shall not assign any of its duties to any other group or individual.

III.1.1.4. The candidate is evaluated in three categories: teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activities, and service.

III.1.1.5. The DRTPC in its evaluation of the candidate shall consider information from the following sources:

- a) Summaries and interpretations of students' evaluations.
- b) Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluations of teaching performance.
- c) Self-evaluation provided by the candidate.
- d) Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package).
- e) Material requested from the candidate by the committee, which may include requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package.
- f) Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the committee before the closing date.

III.1.1.6. All information considered by the DRTPC in making evaluations and recommendations will be included in the RTP package.

III.1.2. Candidate's Responsibilities

III.1.2.1. Candidates shall assemble an RTP package that documents their accomplishments and makes a positive case for the requested action. Candidates are invited to seek counsel from the DRTPC regarding the preparation of the RTP package.

III.1.2.2. Candidates shall provide a self-evaluation as part of their RTP package. In this self-evaluation, candidates should build on the information provided by the RTP process from the previous cycle, if appropriate. This would include reflections on the goals listed in the prior self-evaluation and what candidates had achieved since the last review. Candidates should then explain how they met or exceeded the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested in the current review. The evaluation shall address the DRTPC criteria directly and refer to evidence in support of all assertions. The self-evaluation shall include:

a) Discussion of teaching performance and advising. This includes:

- A list of the classes taught during the period under review.
- A synopsis of the objective and subjective measurements of teaching performance as indicated by student and peer evaluations, and how the candidate learned from and acted on the information that student and peer evaluations provided. The department shall provide copies of student and peer evaluation, which the candidate shall submit with the packet.
- An explanation of the activities and/or actions taken to develop the candidate's teaching effectiveness, with assessments that demonstrate how and how well the candidate promoted valuable, effective, and equitable learning experiences for students.
- A description of advising responsibilities in connection with teaching and departmental responsibilities.
- An explanation of activities and/or actions taken to develop the candidate's knowledge base, skill, and facility as an advisor for students in the department, with a summation of what the candidate gained from these efforts, related to student advising and/or mentoring.

b) Discussion of scholarly and creative activities. This includes:

- Citations for all peer-reviewed creative and scholarly activities during the period under review.
- References for all conference presentations.
- Records related to external and internal grants, fellowships, awards, and other honors.
- Citations for all non-peer-reviewed creative and scholarly activities that relate to the candidate's areas of interest, expertise, and formal academic assignment.

c) Discussion of service to the university, college, department, and community. This includes specific citation of committee assignments, tasks and/or service performed as a committee member, and evidence of assistance provided in a professional capacity to any group.

d) Discussion of actions taken or progress made toward remedying any deficiencies or problems if these were pointed out in previous evaluations.

e) An evaluation of how and how well the candidate worked to support and advance the goals and mission of the department, the college, and the university. This should highlight how the candidate, as they gain experience over time, develop into an academic asset that aligns with the interests and needs of the department, the college, and the university.

f) A summation that concludes with a presentation of goals related to teaching and mentoring, scholarship and creative activities, and service that the candidate plans to achieve before the conclusion of the next evaluation cycle.

III.1.3. Method of Evaluation

The DRTPC will use a rubric to tally and compare the judgments of its members. The Department views teaching and advising effectiveness as having the most important set of responsibilities and areas of evaluation. Although university service is an important duty, for the purposes of RTP, the department has assigned it a value that recognizes participation and a gradual pattern of engagement.

Categories: Evaluation (Point values)	Teaching and Advising (55 percent of weighted score; multiply x5.5)	Scholarly and Creative Activities (25 percent of weighted score; multiply x2.5)	Service (20 percent of weighted score; multiply x2)
4: Exceeds Expectations			
3: Meets Expectations			
2: Near Expectations			
1: Below Expectations			

Each category will take into account a range of action, activities, achievements, and accomplishments. DRTPC members will use the list of criteria to frame candidate evaluations and associated performance indicators connected to various criteria to develop a score that reflects whether the candidate met, exceeded, or fell below department expectations for the requested action.

Evaluators will assess candidate performance through a consideration of how and how well candidates perform in each category. The criteria listed below will allow evaluators to assign a score ranging from 1 to 4. When considering reappointment or tenure and promotion, a score of 3 in each category represents a positive recommendation. The value factor represents the weighted value of the categories for the Department. When calculating overall performance, a total score of 30 indicates that the candidate has met expectations.

For each case, the DRTPC will average their scores and produce a collective evaluation of candidate performance. This average score will indicate whether the committee recommends for or against retention or tenure and promotion.

III.1.4. Teaching and Advising

III.1.4.1. Area 1: Instructional Competence

University policy requires that all courses (except independent study types of courses) be evaluated by students during an academic year. In addition, the University requires at least two peer evaluations per year (in different terms) for faculty who are still being considered for appointment or 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. The DRTPC will consider all evaluations done since the last RTP action. In other words, no evaluation conducted since the last RTP action may be eliminated from consideration. The DRTPC will provide detailed analysis of the evaluations included.

III.1.4.2. The Department Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) will be used according to the procedure developed for their anonymous completion and collection.

III.1.4.3. Classroom Performance

Student Evaluations. Source: Student evaluation performance will be described in terms of the average student response for all 14 items on the Student Evaluation Index. 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 Student Evaluation Index scores, interpreted in relation to the 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.

III.1.4.4. Pedagogical Approach and Methods

Faculty Peer Evaluations. Source: Class visitation records.

III.1.4.4. Breadth and depth of course content. Source: Syllabus or other course materials, samples of tests and evaluation instruments, and student evaluations.

III.1.4.6. Currency of topics. Source: Syllabus or other course materials, samples of tests and evaluation instruments, and student evaluations.

III.1.4.7. Relevancy of assignments. Source: Syllabus or other course materials, samples of tests and evaluation instruments, and student evaluations.

III.1.4.8. Effectiveness and fairness of grading. Source: Syllabus or other course materials, samples of tests and evaluation instruments, and student evaluations.

III.1.4.9. Faculty may present other evidence of accomplishment in this area such as development of new courses, revision of course outline for existing courses, service learning, preparation of teaching, integration of technology and other innovative approaches to teaching.

III.1.5. Area 2: Advising and Mentoring

Student advisement. Source: Candidate's statement; skill-building activities, such as continuing education, student success workshops, effective mentoring or supervision of student research. Source: Candidate's statement, department administrative files, creating and teaching digital research project courses, teaching HST 3300 sections, or teaching HST 4610-4620 Thesis sequence.

III.1.5.1. Administrative Responsibilities

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

III.1.5.2. Faculty–Student Relations

Demonstrated concern for the dignity and rights of students. Source: Candidate's statement, student evaluations, faculty input.

III.1.5.3. Overall Evaluation of Teaching and Advising

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.

For retention, the Department expects candidates to achieve Student Evaluation Index scores between 2.2 and 2.0 initially and show improvement in subsequent academic terms. By the first evaluation cycle candidates shall achieve an average score of 2.0 or better across all measured categories on the Student Evaluation Index.

For tenure and promotion, the Department expects candidates to achieve Student Evaluation Index scores that range between 1.5 and 2.0 in every evaluation category. Performance indicators relating to other criteria should demonstrate the candidate's improvement over cycles and their clear mastery of the skills, behaviors, and attitudes that make candidates effective, inclusive, and resourceful teachers, advisors, and mentors. In addition, the department expects candidates to have successfully taught the full range of required core courses related to their assignment (HST 3300, HST 449x, and HST 4610-4620; for Pre-Credential Advisors, also HST 4463). In other areas relating to curriculum, advising, and mentoring, the department expects

candidates to have become trusted, accurate resources of information with a demonstrated ability to help students succeed. This includes:

- A mastery of program curricular and potential course substitutions or options.
- The ability to guide students through university regulations and policies relating to the major, the college, General Education, graduation, transfer credit, and other topics essential to student retention and success.
- The ability to marshal the advising and student support resources available within the department and from the college and university when and however needed to help students succeed.
- The ability to mentor students in specialized and general topics in and beyond HST 3300 and HST 4610-4620 seminar settings.

Pre-credential advisors have additional responsibilities that demand time and activity distinct from and beyond the standard level of engagement and attention expected of other faculty members. Candidates who serve as pre-credential advisors will address this in their cyclical reports and the DRTPC will take the additional time, effort, and achievements associated with this assignment into consideration in their reviews.

III.1.6. Scholarship and Creative Activities

III.1.6.1. The History Department recognizes that research, scholarship, and creative activities are the cornerstone of effective teaching. It also recognizes that scholarship is multifaceted, and those aspects need to be taken into consideration during RTP deliberations. As part of the RTP process, the candidate and the DRTPC will establish clear, measurable, attainable goals that will serve as a basis for cyclical evaluation. These goals may initially be aspirational and grow more defined across cycles.

III.1.6.2. Major Criteria

The department expects candidates to achieve a threshold of scholarly and creative activity that involves steady work over time to establish expertise, experience, and depth as well as the completion of works that establish the candidate as an expert in their academic specialty. The department expects candidates to demonstrate engagement in this area of evaluation annually and the DRTPC has separate criteria for cyclical evaluation relating to reappointment and for the granting or tenure and promotion.

For reappointment, as candidates work on complex projects that develop slowly, they shall also produce and present scholarly and creative work annually. During each review cycle, candidates shall demonstrate active efforts to participate in scholarly communities on and beyond campus. The DRTPC expects candidates to annually accomplish three or more achievements that demonstrate ongoing scholarly and creative activity. These may include:

- Published book reviews.
- Obtaining internal and external grants that support research or scholarly activity.

- Participation in NEH or similar seminars and workshops that help candidates develop their scholarship.
- Serving as a consultant for a museum, library, or archive.
- Articles in scholarly and commercial publications.
- Encyclopedia entries.
- Serving on the editorial staff of an academic journal.
- Conference presentations.
- Conference participation involving service as a discussant or the organization of panels.
- Community presentations.
- Reviewing draft publications for academic publishers.
- Editing and contributing to virtual discussion groups (e.g., H-Net) that focus on topics related to the candidate's areas of academic training and expertise.

For tenure and promotion, the department recognizes the publication of a peer-reviewed monograph by an academic press, completed during their time as a faculty member at Cal Poly Pomona, as fulfilling its expectations for the granting of tenure. Candidates may choose to fulfill their scholarly obligations in other ways. Candidates may meet or exceed the department's threshold and gain tenure by completing two or more from among the following, recognizing that this list is not exclusive:

- The publication of one or more original, research-based articles in academic journals.
- The publication of peer-reviewed books or articles that represent contributions to the scholarship of integration, application, and/or teaching.
- The publication of book chapters.
- The editing or co-editing of books.
- The development of programs that support, educate, and inform a regional, statewide, or national audience.
- The creation and establishment of programs, supported by external funding, that expand the educational reach of the department (e.g., teacher-training workshops, public history internship programs).
- The creation and release of online materials that are peer-reviewed and that contribute to the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and/or teaching.

III.1.6.3. A candidate for reappointment may submit work in progress in the above categories.

III.1.6.4. The DRTP Committee will evaluate the quality and significance of such professional development based on reviews of the candidate's published works and expert opinion of the quality of the candidate's scholarship. Outside experts who are agreed upon between the candidate and the DRTP committee may be consulted if their opinion is required in the RTP process. Policy number 1328 provides the guidelines for such cases.

III.1.7. Service to the Department, University and Community

III.1.7.1. The department expects a candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion to render service to the department, university, and their community. Above all the department expects a

candidate to aid in the fulfillment of the goals of the department, college, and university. Candidates shall work towards the fulfillment of the department's goals and mission first. Service to the college and the university come in addition to, not at the expense of the department and its students. The DRTPC will evaluate the quality and significance of such service.

III.1.7.2. Service should include the following:

Service on Department, College, and/or University committees is required.

Service may also include the following:

- Service to students as an advisor to the History Club, Phi Alpha Theta, and other Cal Poly Pomona student groups.
- Service to students as a mentor in the college-based programs to develop future teachers and professors. The administrative duties of this position stand distinct from the normal level of participation and interaction that the department expects of all its members.
- Service in the Academic Senate and Senate committees and other campus groups devoted to the improvement of the university and/or to the enhancement of faculty responsibility and self-governance on campus, such as the Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence.
- Service in nearby communities reflecting creditably on the department and university.
- Service and participation in professional organizations or in organizations devoted to the improvement of relations between the university and the community.
- Service in regional, statewide, or national organizations devoted to upgrading the quality of education.
- Implementing the program funded by an external grant.
- Participation in on-going teacher-training programs at Cal Poly Pomona or under the direction of outside agencies or partners.

Candidates for reappointment begin working within the department as assigned. As candidates successfully navigate cycles of evaluation, their experience will allow them to represent the department on college committees. These come as assigned by the department. As candidates approach tenure, their service experience, interaction with peers, and increasing knowledge of the university, its mission, and its operation qualifies them for service on university committees. While the department does not mandate this pattern of service, candidates should consult with department faculty about the opportunities that come with various committee posts.

College and university service comes in addition to, not at the expense of, department service.

III.1.7.3. Evaluation

Candidates who demonstrate a willingness to serve and who effectively represent the department with their service (e.g., providing information gained from service for the department's benefit, communicating department needs, actions, and achievements that relate to the responsibilities and duties of committees, submitting and presenting required documents, products, and/or

information as required to committees) meet the department's criteria for retention. For tenure and promotion, candidates shall, across cycles, serve and effectively represent the department beyond the department level in more than one committee or in a setting outside the campus.

III.1.8. Special Departmental Requirements

III.1.8.1. Terminal Degree: All candidates applying for tenure and promotion must possess a Ph.D.

IV. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

IV.1. An Associate Professor is expected to show progressive commitment to and demonstrated skills in teaching excellence and mentoring of students. Advising student majors and aiding non-majors are considered important ingredients of the Associate Professor's duties. In addition to refining current courses, an Associate Professor is expected to show collegial interest and assistance in developing new and revised course offerings in the department. At the time of evaluation, the candidate must comply with all requirements indicated under "Teaching and Advising" (**III.1.4**) To grant promotion, the DRTP Committee will also expect:

- Student Evaluation Index scores below 2.0 in all categories on all student evaluations.
- Peer evaluations that demonstrate consistent and effective teaching performance in a range of classroom situations.
- Performance indicators relating to other criteria should demonstrate the candidate's improvement over cycles and their clear mastery of the skills, behaviors, and attitudes that make candidates effective, inclusive, and resourceful teachers, advisors, and mentors.

IV.4.2. Scholarship and Creative Activities: An Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate accelerated progress in Research and Scholarly Activities. An Associate Professor shall meet all the requirements of a candidate for tenure in this area (see section III.1.6.2, above).

To grant promotion separate from the granting of tenure, the DRTPC will also expect to see evidence of new and continued scholarly activity beyond the projects that a candidate initiated upon arrival.

IV.4.3. An Associate Professor is expected to serve on committees (or equivalent assignments) at the department, college, Academic Senate, and/or university level, regularly attend and participate in department meetings, give evidence of service to the wider community, and show a commitment to representing the department, college, and university in the larger community. The DRTPC expects that a candidate who seeks promotion separate from the granting of tenure will have a strong record of service outside the department. This includes but is not limited to the leadership of one or more college or university committees, service as an officer in the California Faculty Association, or service as a member of the Academic Senate.

IV.4.4. Special Departmental Requirements

IV.4.4.1. Terminal Degree: All candidates applying for tenure and promotion must possess a Ph.D.

V. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The criteria stated in **III.1** will apply to the Department's assessment of promotion to Professor. Satisfactory performance in teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, and service across the evaluation period are expected and evaluated. Candidates may build on and extend the foundations that they established to earn tenure or pursue novel areas of interest that expand their skills, abilities, and range in any or all of the three categories of concern. The candidate is expected to have addressed any areas of concern noted in the previous RTP evaluation in the self-evaluation.

V.1. Teaching and Advising: The candidate must continue to present a record of satisfactory performance for each of the teaching and advising criteria listed in III.1.4, which are expected of all faculty members, and show 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.

V.2. Scholarship and Creative Activity: The candidate remains actively engaged with the discipline and demonstrates clear accomplishments in scholarly and creative activities by fulfilling the requirements for reappointment expected by the department annually and by completing a second book based on original scholarship, or a combination of activities that may substitute for such as defined in **III.1.6.2**.

V.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.

VI. Criteria for Early Tenure and 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, 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, the College, and 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.

VII. 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 VI. Criteria for Early Tenure and for Early Promotion to Associate Professor.

VIII. Appendices

VIII.1. Department's approved Student Evaluation.

VIII.2. Department's approved Peer Evaluation Form.