

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND  
STATISTICS  
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES  
for  
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND  
PROMOTION

Academic Years 2023-2024 through 2027-2028

Revised draft 08/29/2023

APPROVED

13	<a href="#">1 Table of Contents</a>	
14	<b>1 Preface</b>	<b>1</b>
15	<b>2 Statements of Responsibility</b>	<b>1</b>
16	<b>2.1 The Candidate</b>	<b>1</b>
17	2.1.1 Full Performance Review (full RTP Package)	1
18	2.1.2 Periodic Evaluation (brief RTP package)	2
19	<b>2.2 The DRTPC</b>	<b>2</b>
20	<b>3 Expectations and Assessment of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service</b>	<b>3</b>
21	<b>3.1 Teaching</b>	<b>3</b>
22	Performance Areas	5
23	3.1.1 Effectiveness in Communicating and Elucidating Course Content	5
24	3.1.2 Maintenance of Appropriate Academic Standards	5
25	3.1.3 Additional Activities Related to Teaching	5
26	3.1.4 Efforts towards improving teaching quality	5
27	Evaluation of Teaching Performance	6
28	<b>3.2 Scholarship</b>	<b>8</b>
29	3.2.1 Attendance of Meetings, Seminars, and Workshops (averaged value, 0–1 pt. max)	8
30	3.2.2 Service to the Discipline (averaged value, 0–3 pts. max)	8
31	3.2.3 Presentations (cumulative total, 0–9 pts. max)	8
32	3.2.4 Publications (unlimited pts.)	9
33	3.2.5 Grants (unlimited pts.)	9
34	3.2.6 Scholarly Contributions to the Profession (cumulative total, 0–4 pts. max)	9
35	3.2.7 Other Activities (cumulative total, 0–3 pts. max)	10
36	<b>3.3 Service</b>	<b>10</b>
37	3.3.1 Attendance of a Department Committee	11
38	3.3.2 Participation in general department service	11
39	3.3.3 Contributing Member in a Department, College, or University Committee	11
40	3.3.1 to 3.3.3 Combined	11
41	3.3.4 Leadership or Significant Service	11
42	3.3.5 Other Significant Service	12
43	<b>4 The Criteria</b>	<b>12</b>
44	<b>4.1 Reappointment</b>	<b>13</b>
45	<b>4.2 Tenure</b>	<b>14</b>
46	4.2.1 Normal Tenure	14
47	4.2.2 Early Tenure	15
48	<b>4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor</b>	<b>16</b>
49	4.3.1 Normal Promotion to Associate Professor	17
50	4.3.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor	18
51	<b>4.4 Promotion to Full Professor</b>	<b>19</b>
52	4.4.1 Normal Promotion to Full Professor	19
53	4.4.2 Early Promotion to Full Professor	20
54	<b>5 Procedures</b>	<b>21</b>

55	<b>5.1</b>	<b>DRTPC Selection .....</b>	<b>21</b>
56	<b>5.2</b>	<b>Duties of the DRTPC Chair .....</b>	<b>22</b>
57	<b>5.3</b>	<b>RTP Document Review .....</b>	<b>22</b>
58	<b>5.4</b>	<b>Evaluation of Faculty on Leave, in Academic Governance Positions, in Administrative Positions, or</b>	
59		<b>Performing Administrative Duties.....</b>	<b>23</b>
60			

61

## 62 1 Preface

63 The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility.  
64 RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational  
65 quality for our students. While the president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure, and  
66 promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations,  
67 create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed  
68 recommendations to the president.

69 This document sets forth the expectations of quality of instruction, scholarship, and service held by the  
70 faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. The use of the word “mathematics” in this  
71 document is to be understood as encompassing mathematics, mathematics education, and statistics.  
72 The criteria and procedures contained herein shall be used to determine whether a faculty member  
73 eligible for Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion is meeting those expectations (such a faculty member  
74 will be referred to here as a Candidate). This document also describes the responsibility of the  
75 Candidate and of the Department's RTP Committee (DRTPC) in all matters of the RTP process.

## 76 2 Statements of Responsibility

### 77 2.1 The Candidate

78 It is the responsibility of the Candidate to be familiar with the expectation of quality, criteria, and  
79 procedures in this document. The Candidate must be familiar with the University Manual, especially  
80 Appendix 10 and Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as Appendix 16), which speak directly to matters  
81 concerning the RTP process. During the first week of fall semester of a year of eligibility, the Candidate  
82 shall notify the DRTPC Chair in writing of the intent to request an RTP action(s) or that no action will be  
83 requested. This notification will be non-binding.

84 It is the responsibility of the Candidate to furnish the necessary documentation showing that all criteria  
85 for the action(s) requested have been met. This documentation must be specific and verifiable. All  
86 decisions will be based only on material contained in the Personnel Action File (PAF), the supporting  
87 documentation submitted by the Candidate, and on the Candidate's self-evaluation statement.  
88 Therefore, the Candidate shall maintain a complete portfolio of all evidence and documentation in the  
89 areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service supporting the Candidate's requested actions to be made  
90 available upon request. Suggestions of possible material to include in this portfolio are given in the  
91 respective sections.

#### 92 2.1.1 Full Performance Review (full RTP Package)

93 The Full Performance Review is a request for action such as reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The  
94 Candidate shall use the provided university template for full performance review.

95 For the first part of the Faculty Performance Review Form, the Candidate should strive to list all  
96 applicable items, such as classes taught, committees served on, publications, presentations, and so on.  
97 Failure to list something in this report does not preclude the Candidate from including the item in a later  
98 performance review that covers the period under review. For example, an item missing from an annual

99 review may be included later in the cumulative review for tenure and promotion as long as the time of  
100 the item falls into the relevant period of review.

101 The Candidate's self-evaluation statement is an important part of the information to be used in the RTP  
102 decision process. Here the Candidate should explain how their professional activities and  
103 documentation decisively show that the Candidate has met the criteria for each area of responsibility.  
104 This documentation must include a detailed description of the teaching, scholarship, and service  
105 performed; additional documentation shall normally be placed in the Candidate's portfolio. The  
106 Candidate, however, may place specific additional documentation in the submitted RTP package if they  
107 feel that it is necessary for a proper evaluation and should consult the DRTPC Chair if unsure where to  
108 place such materials. In their self-evaluation, the Candidate should carefully demonstrate how the  
109 documentation establishes the quality of the activity and should not rely solely on quantity of activities.  
110 The Candidate should not request points for professional activities but rather shall be clear enough in  
111 their self-evaluation that the importance of a given activity can be judged properly by the DRTPC. If this  
112 document describes expectations for the Candidate regarding involvement in specific activities (such as  
113 college or university level committee work) and those expectations are *not* met by the Candidate, they  
114 must address that failure, specifically, in the self-evaluation. While such a failure may be significant, it  
115 does not necessarily preclude the success of a sought-after action. Candidates for reappointment must  
116 discuss their progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure. All Candidates must discuss progress  
117 made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle.

#### 118 2.1.2 Periodic Evaluation (brief RTP package)

119 The periodic evaluation is an opportunity to get feedback and advice partway through a 2-year  
120 appointment. The Candidate shall use the provided university template for periodic evaluation.

121 For the first part of the Periodic Review Form, the Candidate should list all applicable items, such as  
122 classes taught, committees served on, publications, presentations, and so on. Failure to list something  
123 in this report does not preclude the Candidate from including the item in a later performance review  
124 that covers the relevant period of time.

125 The self-evaluation for the periodic evaluation has a maximum page count. The Candidate is not  
126 expected to give full citations or provide a complete list and explanation of all activities in the self-  
127 evaluation. Rather, the self-evaluation is an opportunity to give an overview of their efforts in teaching,  
128 scholarship, and service, and to reflect upon their efforts. The Candidate will receive a report  
129 recognizing their efforts and providing suggestions or advice for the following years. The Candidate  
130 should make note of this advice in writing future performance reviews.

#### 131 2.2 The DRTPC

132 It is the responsibility of the DRTPC to evaluate the quality of the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, and  
133 service activities and to award an appropriate number of points based on the information supplied by  
134 the Candidate. After examining, verifying, and evaluating the documentation in the PAF of the relevant  
135 evaluation period and that submitted by the Candidate and in accordance with this document's criteria  
136 and procedures, the DRTPC will judge the quality and acceptability of the activities. This evaluation may  
137 involve the solicitation of recommendations of colleagues from off-campus, in which case the Candidate  
138 may suggest names of such colleagues.

139 Based on this examination and evaluation, the DRTPC will decide whether the Candidate meets the  
140 criteria for the requested action(s). The DRTPC’s evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by  
141 a simple majority of all the DRTPC members eligible to vote on the action. Abstentions shall count as  
142 negative votes. This may entail multiple decisions, one for each requested action. The DRTPC will make  
143 a positive recommendation on a requested action(s) if the Candidate was found to meet the criteria and  
144 will make a negative recommendation otherwise. The DRTPC shall explain its decision in writing. Any  
145 minority report shall be part of the DRTPC recommendation. The DRTPC must also include a discussion  
146 of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle. For action  
147 requests covering a range of time such as promotions or tenure, the DRTPC will honor the point totals  
148 awarded by all previous DRTPC.

149 Since the decision made by the DRTPC is that the Candidate met or did not meet the criteria for the  
150 requested action, the DRTPC's written explanation of their decision is an important part of the  
151 information to be used in the RTP decision process beyond the Department. As the members of the  
152 DRTPC will often be more experienced in teaching, scholarship, and research than the Candidate, it is  
153 important for them to guide the Candidate in their efforts to be a quality teacher-scholar. As Candidates  
154 will often emphasize one area or other of teaching, scholarship, and service, it is also important for the  
155 DRTPC to respect this choice of activities and evaluate the Candidate holistically. The clarity and logic of  
156 this explanation of their decision will assist others in the process and will serve both the Candidate and  
157 the Department. Therefore, the DRTPC must fully and completely explain how its evaluation of the  
158 Candidate's activities and documentation led them to their decision. In this written evaluation, the  
159 DRTPC must identify and explain any exceptional qualities exhibited by the Candidate in the areas of  
160 teaching, scholarship, and service. The DRTPC should also address any concerns that arose in their  
161 evaluation of the Candidate so the Candidate understands the collective recommendation of the DRTPC.  
162 If eligible to evaluate the Candidate, the Department Chair may write a separate recommendation for  
163 inclusion in the Candidate’s RTP package.

### 164 3 Expectations and Assessment of Teaching, Scholarship, and 165 Service

#### 166 3.1 Teaching

167 The faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes the primary importance of  
168 teaching performance among the responsibilities and duties of its members and the wisdom of  
169 promoting a diverse set of learning opportunities for students of mathematics. Candidates have the  
170 freedom to employ pedagogies that promote learning. The use of teaching and learning methods such  
171 as lecture, board work, technology, homework, projects, presentations, small group techniques, and  
172 course management software shall be valued to the extent that they promote student learning.

173 The DRTPC’s evaluation of the Candidate’s teaching will include, but will not necessarily be limited to, a  
174 statement summarizing and interpreting the results of student instructional assessments, peer  
175 evaluations, signed student and faculty comments, a comparison of student evaluations and peer  
176 evaluations, and other supporting evidence for quality of teaching.

177 Either the DRTPC Chair or the Department Chair will invite input from faculty, staff, and students via  
178 prominently posted signs and emails. These signs and emails will include the name of each RTP  
179 Candidate, with the specific RTP action sought, and instructions for the submission of these comments.

180 A specific deadline (date and time) for these submissions will be included, as well as the name of the  
181 DRTPC Chair to whom these submissions must be given. Only signed comments will be accepted. In  
182 addition, a student submission must also include the student's Bronco ID number.

183 Using departmental forms, the Candidate must conduct student evaluations in all non-supervisory  
184 classes. An exception is made only under special circumstances, such as (1) a class size of 6 or fewer  
185 students so that anonymity cannot be reasonably inferred; or (2) when an instructor has been on leave  
186 for a significant portion of the term. Such exceptions shall be requested by the DRTPC Chair to Faculty  
187 Affairs. Summaries of evaluations conducted during the period of review shall be included in the  
188 Candidate's PAF.

189 Student evaluations will be conducted according to current University policy to ensure anonymity and  
190 validity. For online evaluations, faculty may encourage the class a whole to complete the student  
191 evaluations, but shall not advocate for specific types of feedback. In particular, soliciting of student  
192 evaluations with any specific viewpoint by the faculty member or by other parties on behalf of a faculty  
193 member is considered unprofessional and is prohibited. Additionally, faculty should take care that  
194 anonymity is preserved by leaving the classroom whenever students have the opportunity to complete  
195 evaluations during class.

196 The departmental forms for student evaluations shall be shared with all tenured and probationary  
197 faculty within the first 14 days of each term. Any modification or revisions to these questions shall be  
198 designed and voted on by the department's tenured and probationary faculty.

199 A minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching performance shall be conducted in different semesters  
200 in each academic year using the Department RTP Classroom Performance Evaluation Form. The specific  
201 procedures for conducting peer evaluations may be found in Policy No: 1328 of the University Manual.  
202 Each peer evaluator is encouraged to review the departmental RTP criteria prior to conducting a peer  
203 evaluation. The written evaluation should specifically address those criteria in relation to course  
204 materials supplied and the performance of the Candidate during the classroom visitation. Peer  
205 evaluations do not need to be done by DRTPC members. Any request by the Candidate to receive a peer  
206 evaluation by a non-member of the DRTPC should be directed to the DRTPC Chair. The author of the  
207 peer evaluation should include strengths and weaknesses observed during the visit or in the supplied  
208 class materials, and shall specifically note if no deficiencies are observed. The peer observation shall be  
209 sent to the Candidate and to the Chair of the DRTPC within two weeks of the observation.

210 All official student evaluations and all peer evaluations conducted during the period under review must  
211 be submitted by the Candidate as part of their RTP package. The Candidate is expected to discuss the  
212 manner in which these tools have influenced their teaching. In addition, the Candidate shall put  
213 together a teaching portfolio containing syllabi, exams, handouts, and other relevant documentation  
214 pertaining to teaching-related activities. The DRTPC may refer to the teaching portfolio in evaluating  
215 teaching performance. This portfolio will not accompany the Candidates RTP package, but will be listed  
216 in an appendix under "additional materials available upon request".

217 The Candidate's self-evaluation statement should clearly state their teaching principles and approach to  
218 teaching and should explain how they meet the department's criteria for teaching. The Candidate  
219 should supply evidence of success in these areas through appropriate documentation. In the case of  
220 non-traditional courses (such as supervising student teaching, etc.), sufficient documentation of the

221 teaching activities should be provided by the Candidate to allow the DRTPC to evaluate the assignment.  
222 The DRTPC will consider all documentation regarding the quality of teaching provided by the Candidate  
223 that contributes to the Candidate's effectiveness. As indicated below (3.1.1-3.1.4), the DRTPC's main  
224 concerns will be with the Candidate's (i) ability to effectively communicate and elucidate mathematical  
225 concepts; (ii) ability to maintain appropriate academic standards; (iii) involvement in teaching activities  
226 outside the classroom; and (iv) efforts to continuously improve their teaching. Generally, activities in the  
227 following subsections will be considered in the DRTPC's evaluation.

## 228 Performance Areas

### 229 3.1.1 Effectiveness in Communicating and Elucidating Course Content

- 230 1. effectively organizing the course
- 231 2. clearly communicating ideas and concepts
- 232 3. effectively answering students' questions, both in and outside of class
- 233 4. effectively using teaching and learning methods

### 234 3.1.2 Maintenance of Appropriate Academic Standards

- 235 1. adequate coverage of course content
- 236 2. coverage of course content at an appropriate level of difficulty for a particular course
- 237 3. evaluation of the student's learning

### 238 3.1.3 Additional Activities Related to Teaching

- 239 1. supervising undergraduate research projects
- 240 2. supervising students in independent study
- 241 3. supervising master's theses
- 242 4. developing a new course or significantly revising an existing course
- 243 5. tutoring or mentoring students or faculty in a structured program
- 244 6. supporting students in mathematics-related activities such as contests, math clubs, conferences
- 245 7. sponsoring students in programs designed to prepare students for graduate studies

### 246 3.1.4 Efforts towards improving teaching quality

- 247 1. participating in faculty development workshops/activities
- 248 2. experimenting with and/or assessing new teaching methods
- 249 3. efforts towards increasing equity and inclusion in the classroom
- 250 4. teaching practices that close equity gaps and increase student success
- 251 5. using assessment results to improve performance
- 252 6. peer mentoring and observation
- 253 7. measurable improvements in student pass rates

254 In discussing one's effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content, the Candidate should  
255 refer to data provided by the following items on the student evaluation form: Item 1, item 2, item 4,  
256 and item 8, as well as to all relevant comments made in any peer evaluations from the period of review.  
257 The following items should be referred to in the Candidate's discussion of how they maintain  
258 appropriate academic standards: Item 3, item 11, and item 15. The Candidate should also refer to all  
259 relevant comments made in any peer evaluations from the period of review. In addition, trends in the  
260 Candidate's student evaluation scores and peer evaluations may be used when discussing efforts to  
261 continually improve their teaching. If the Candidate has modified their teaching techniques in response



262 to previous evaluations or engaged in efforts listed in 3.1.4, those activities and their effects should be  
263 described here. The Department wishes to cultivate in the Candidate a curiosity about their evaluation  
264 scores in relation to their teaching practices.

### 265 Evaluation of Teaching Performance

266 Standards of acceptable performance in teaching will be based on several types of evidence, that at a  
267 minimum will include student evaluations, peer evaluations, signed student and faculty input, additional  
268 teaching-related activities, and demonstrated improvement in problematic areas identified previously.  
269 Under no circumstance will the quality of a Candidate's teaching be determined by only one of these  
270 measures. It is expected that great care will be exercised by the DRTPC when these guidelines are  
271 utilized to frame a comprehensive evaluation of the Candidate's teaching.

272 Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the standard for  
273 student evaluations described in this section. The standard is the *overall effectiveness of the instructor*  
274 (student evaluation question 14), cumulative across all courses taught during the review period. While  
275 the candidate's classes are evaluated on the responses of all questions, emphasis will be placed in  
276 question 14. The general expectation for teaching performance is that student evaluation scores should  
277 improve as candidates gain experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial standard of 50% or  
278 more student responses in the Very Good and Good categories combined for new faculty. The standard  
279 increases to 65% or more in the Very Good and Good categories combined for faculty seeking  
280 reappointment to their final probationary year. Student evaluation scores below these standards but  
281 within the range specified in Table 1 may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action,  
282 depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as  
283 described in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

284 *Table 1 Minimum range of Very Good and Good responses for Question 14 of the student evaluations during probationary years.*

Reappointment to Probationary Year (PY)	Expected Percentage Responses in the Very Good and Good Categories Combined	Minimum Percentage Responses in the Very Good and Good Categories Combined
PY 3	50% or higher	40% - 50%
PY 4	55% or higher	45% - 55%
PY 5	60% or higher	50% - 60%
PY 6	65% or higher	55% - 65%

285

286 *Student evaluations.* In evaluating the Candidate's quality of teaching as perceived by students, the  
287 DRTPC will refer to the percentage of very good and good student assessments.

288 *Peer evaluations.* Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for  
289 improvement. All Candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to  
290 address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the review period. In addition,  
291 Candidates must document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during the previous  
292 RTP cycles have been corrected. Student and peer evaluations will be compared for coherence.

293 *Signed student and faculty input.* The DRTPC Chair invites signed letters from students and faculty.  
294 Letters should not be solicited outside of this process. Any letters received at least 10 days prior to the  
295 due date for the Candidate must be included in the RTP package submitted by the Candidate. The  
296 DRTPC recognizes that Candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input, so there is  
297 no expectation that Candidates receive such letters. Although there is no requirement for signed  
298 student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the  
299 DRTPC in making its recommendation.

300 *Additional activities.* Involvement in activities such as those that appear in subsection 3.1.3 and 3.1.4  
301 may be considered in evaluating teaching effectiveness provided that student evaluation scores are  
302 within or above the minimum range specified in Table 1. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of  
303 additional activities for Candidates whose student evaluation percentages are at the low end of the  
304 teaching performance range specified in Table 1.

## 305 3.2 [Scholarship](#)

306 The faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes scholarship as part of the  
307 professional responsibility of each of its members. This section examines the Candidate's scholarship in  
308 mathematics, mathematics education, and/or statistics. Scholarship activities may be collaborative or  
309 sole efforts. These activities have been organized into seven categories. Some activities, of course, may  
310 not easily fit into a particular category. In this case, the Candidate is encouraged to seek the advice of  
311 the DRTPC. Ideally, the Candidate will participate in a range of activities that embrace several  
312 categories. The DRTPC will evaluate the Candidate's performance in each of the categories. In each  
313 case, the name of the category is followed by the range of points, which may be earned by the  
314 Candidate in that category.

315 Before examining each category, we highlight the different assessment approaches used.

- 316 1. Averaging: Categories 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 involve a modified averaging method. Each year, points  
317 are awarded. The mean of these annual point awards is calculated over the number of years in  
318 the period under review. The DRTPC will award no fewer points than this mean, rounded to the  
319 nearest integer, and no more points than the cap of each category.
- 320 2. Unlimited Accumulation: In Categories 3.2.4 and 3.2.5, points are awarded to each item. No  
321 upper limit is given for the points that accumulate in these categories over the period of review.
- 322 3. Limited Accumulation: In Categories 3.2.3, 3.2.6 and 3.2.7, each item is awarded points. These  
323 points accumulate over the years in the period of review until the cap of the category is  
324 reached.

### 325 3.2.1 [Attendance of Meetings, Seminars, and Workshops \(averaged value, 0–1 pt. max\)](#)

326 The DRTPC will award **0-1 point(s)** for each item in this category, however, no more than a total of 1  
327 point will be awarded for this category for any given year. When the Candidate goes up for action, the  
328 annual awards will be averaged over the number of years in the period under review. The points  
329 awarded in this category will be no less than the annual average, rounded to the nearest integer, and no  
330 more than 1 point. The Candidate should provide a sufficiently detailed description of how attending the  
331 meetings has enhanced their scholarship so that the DRTPC can accurately judge the significance of the  
332 meetings or workshops attended by the Candidate.

### 333 3.2.2 [Service to the Discipline \(averaged value, 0–3 pts. max\)](#)

334 The DRTPC will award **0-3 points** for each item in this category, however, no more than a total of 3  
335 points will be awarded for this category in any given year. Activities in this category include, but are not  
336 limited to: Reviewing mathematics books, reviewing journal articles (i.e., writing summaries of articles  
337 for an organization such as American Mathematical Society). The DRTPC will generally award more  
338 points to activities that are more demanding. For example, reviewing several graduate level texts might  
339 be awarded 3 points, while reviewing a single undergraduate text might receive 2 points. When the  
340 Candidate goes up for action, the annual totals will be averaged over the number of years in the period  
341 under review. The points awarded in this category will be no less than the annual average, rounded to  
342 the nearest integer, and no more than 3 points.

### 343 3.2.3 [Presentations \(cumulative total, 0–9 pts. max\)](#)

344 The DRTPC will award 0-3 points for **each different item** in this category. This category includes  
345 presentations in contributed sessions and colloquium talks, which typically receive 2 points each.

346 Invited presentations, presentations at national and international meetings, and presentations of longer  
347 duration may be expected to receive 3 points each. The Candidate should give complete citations of  
348 each presentation and explain clearly how presentations are different from one another. When going up  
349 for action, the Candidate may sum up the points awarded for no more than **three** different  
350 presentations given during the period of review. The Candidate may submit more than three  
351 presentations for consideration. In this case, the DRTPC will count the three presentations receiving the  
352 most points. Even though this category is capped at three presentations, Candidates are encouraged to  
353 give additional presentations.

#### 354 3.2.4 Publications (unlimited pts.)

355 The DRTPC will award **0-5 points** for **each publication** in this category. These points accumulate during  
356 the period of review. What constitutes a refereed article varies across the sub-disciplines of the  
357 Department of Mathematics and Statistics. For the purposes of this document a *refereed article* is  
358 defined as an article that has undergone a peer-review process that is considered appropriate for the  
359 sub-discipline, examples of this process include the blind referee process as well as review by an  
360 editorial board. The DRTPC will give more weight to refereed articles published in professional journals  
361 and to texts published by well-known publishers. Articles that have been formally accepted for  
362 publication, but have not yet appeared in print, qualify as publications. The Candidate should give  
363 complete details of the publication and specify if the journal is a refereed journal. In awarding points,  
364 the DRTPC will consider 3 points to be the nominal award for a research article that is published in a  
365 refereed journal. Publications that might be awarded fewer than 3 points include papers published in  
366 proceedings of conferences. Many conference proceedings have a thorough review process; the  
367 candidate should provide details for such a publication. Publications that might merit more than 3 points  
368 include textbooks, as well as exceptional research articles. *Technical Reports* may be awarded 0 - 3  
369 points, as long as the content of that article is distinct from any of the Candidate's published articles. (A  
370 technical report is an article that is published by a university or technical firm and is subject to less  
371 rigorous qualifying methods than those employed by referees of research journals.)

#### 372 3.2.5 Grants (unlimited pts.)

373 The DRTPC will award **0-4 points** for **each grant** in this category. These points accumulate during the  
374 period of review. Travel grants are not considered scholarly in nature and will not be awarded points.  
375 Intramural grants, such as Cal Poly Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) mini-grants might  
376 receive 2 points, while 3 or 4 points might be awarded to extramural grants, such as federally or  
377 internationally competitive grants, or discipline-related grants from foundations or other sponsors.  
378 Often the complexity of grant implementation requires Co-Principal Investigators (Co-PI), as opposed to  
379 a single Principal Investigator (PI), the Candidate should provide a sufficiently detailed explanation so  
380 that the DRTPC can accurately judge the Candidate's role in obtaining grant funds and/or contributing to  
381 implementation of the grant(s).

#### 382 3.2.6 Scholarly Contributions to the Profession (cumulative total, 0 – 4 pts. max)

383 The DRTPC will award **0-2 points** for **each item** in this category. These points accumulate during the  
384 period of review; however the DRTPC will award no more than a total of 4 points for this category for  
385 any action under review. Contributions include, but are not limited to: Serving on the editorial board of  
386 mathematical journals, refereeing papers for journals (not to be confused with reviewing articles, acting  
387 as a referee for a specific journal involves in-depth examination of article submissions to determine if

388 they are of high enough quality and of significant importance to current research in a given area to  
389 warrant publication in that journal), and organizing major conferences or special sessions (only if it  
390 involves the use of discipline expertise, for example reading articles or abstracts to prepare questions  
391 for presenters or to develop the presentation schedule). Such scholarly work dedicated to co-organizing  
392 a Sectional AMS Special Session might receive 1 point, while the more intensive scholarly work devoted  
393 to organizing an international conference or refereeing journal articles would be awarded 2 points. The  
394 Candidate and DRTPC should note that this category is dedicated to items that involve considerable  
395 work and time. The Candidate is responsible for providing detailed information so that the DRTPC can  
396 accurately assess these activities.

### 397 3.2.7 Other Activities (cumulative total, 0 – 3 pts. max)

398 The DRTPC will award **0-3 points** for **each item** in this category, however, no more than a total of **3**  
399 **points** will be awarded for this category for any action under review. Such activities include, but are not  
400 limited to leading seminars that meet on a regular basis and successfully directing a graduate student's  
401 thesis to completion based on an open research question (the results must be of quality similar to those  
402 presented at a regional mathematics conference). Thesis projects that are expository in nature do not  
403 qualify. The Candidate is responsible for providing detailed information so that the DRTPC can accurately  
404 assess these activities.

405 The Candidate is encouraged to contact the chair of the DRTPC for more information regarding these  
406 activities. In particular, the chair of the DRTPC will aid the Candidate in determining the most  
407 appropriate category in which a specific activity should be placed. The DRTPC will award 0 points to any  
408 activity which is evaluated as lacking merit or unrelated to the category in which it appears. The  
409 Scholarship section of the Candidate's portfolio may contain items such as reprints of publications,  
410 copies of grant proposals, and other information that the Candidate believes will support their  
411 contributions in the above categories, e.g. verification of manuscript acceptance.

### 412 3.3 Service

413 The faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes service as part of the  
414 professional responsibility of each of its members. Active involvement in the work of governance and  
415 business of the department, college, or university is expected of each member. This includes  
416 attendance at department meetings, participation in assigned departmental committees, and service at  
417 the college or university level. Faculty members should strive to develop some depth in a particular  
418 area of service, and ultimately take on a leadership role in at least one setting.

419 The Candidate should provide adequate documentation of their contributions. Documentation must  
420 include a sufficiently detailed description of the service. The Candidate should also indicate if any service  
421 activity was partially compensated by reassigned time or stipend. The Candidate may also include  
422 additional information such as written reports, minutes of meetings, products developed by the  
423 committee, etc. and may place this additional information in the Service section of their portfolio.

424 Service activities are categorized based on the type of service. Each service activity should be reported  
425 by the Candidate in at most one section below.

426 3.3.1 Attendance of a Department Committee  
427 In the first two probationary years, the Candidate may regular attend committee meetings without  
428 contributing. Credit in this area will not be allowed beyond the 2<sup>nd</sup> probationary year and cannot be  
429 applied more than once to the same committee.

430 3.3.2 Participation in general department service  
431 Starting in the second probationary year, all faculty should participate in general department  
432 governance, such as attendance of department meetings, academic advising, faculty retreats, and  
433 community outreach events as appropriate.

434 3.3.3 Contributing Member in a Department, College, or University Committee  
435 Starting in the second probationary year, the Candidate is expected to become a contributing member  
436 sharing the workload of assigned departmental, college, or university committees.

437 3.3.1 to 3.3.3 Combined  
438 A maximum of 3 points can be awarded each year for all activities in categories 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3  
439 combined. No points are awarded for category 3.3.1 for reappointment to 4<sup>th</sup> year or higher, that is, for  
440 work beyond the first two probationary years.

441 3.3.4 Leadership or Significant Service  
442 Before applying for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, the Candidate is expected to take on a  
443 leadership role, either formally or informally, in some aspect of department, college, or university  
444 service. This role may be formally recognized, such as serving as a chair of a committee or a  
445 coordinator. The Candidate can also describe service that is not formally recognized by a title, but that  
446 represents taking on a leadership role in some aspect of service. As an example, the Candidate may  
447 have taken on responsibility to spearhead a change in department practices, such as diversity and equity  
448 initiatives, evaluation processes, or major curricular changes. Another example might be a Candidate  
449 that overhauls some part of the Department infrastructure, such as the department webpage or  
450 department physical spaces. Significant service may include service on a department, college, or  
451 university committee with an unusually high workload in a particular year. The Candidate is encouraged  
452 to confer with the Department Chair and the DRTPC Chair before beginning such projects.

453  
454 Some examples of leadership may include:

- 455 • Significant service on a department, college, or university committee.
- 456 • Chair of a Department, College, or University Committee, with documentation of the work done  
457 by the committee.
- 458 • Discipline Area Coordinator (Pure Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, Mathematics Education,  
459 Statistics)
- 460 • Service Area Coordinator (e.g. Assessment, Curriculum, Graduate, Early Start)
- 461 • Course Coordinator
- 462 • Other leadership roles on a department, college, or university committee.

463  
464 Points are awarded for service in category 3.3.4. In general, items in this category may earn 0-3 points  
465 in a given year, depending on the workload and documentation provided.

466

### 467 3.3.5 Other Significant Service

468 The DRTPC will recognize other service activities for which the Candidate documents and requests  
469 recognition. To be recognized in this area, the service should represent a sustained effort over time.  
470 Such service activities include, but are not restricted to:

- 471 1. Holding an office in a professional organization
- 472 2. Serving on a committee of a professional organization
- 473 3. Participating in efforts to increase diversity and equity in the discipline
- 474 4. Participating in fund raising activities
- 475 5. Participating in professionally related student activities
- 476 6. Participating in professional consultation of benefit to the university
- 477 7. Participating in special assignments
- 478 8. Grading college board exams (such as AP Calculus or AP Statistics)
- 479 9. Judging poster sessions
- 480 10. Organizing conferences or special sessions (if this activity involves discipline related expertise,  
481 the Candidate may list it instead in Scholarship 3.2.6)
- 482 11. Working with local schools to improve mathematics education

483 Points are awarded for service in this category. In general, items in this category may earn 0-3 points in  
484 a given year, depending on the workload and documentation provided. Activities of short duration may  
485 not always qualify for points in any given single year, but a sustained record of regular service may earn  
486 points at the time of action.

## 487 4 The Criteria

488 It is the responsibility of each evaluating body to write a report that clearly explains how the Candidate  
489 was evaluated and rated, using the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Criteria for  
490 Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion. Specifically, the DRTPC will support its recommendation(s)  
491 with a written analysis of the Candidate's numerical scores, including an assessment of the quality of the  
492 Candidate's achievements. In this written evaluation, the DRTPC must identify and explain any  
493 exceptional qualities exhibited by the Candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

494 University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Appendix 10 and  
495 Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as Appendix 16) of the University Manual define university procedures  
496 and expectations. This document is a supplement to these policies and may not conflict with these  
497 policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take  
498 second precedence over departmental policies. The CBA requires that a tenure-track faculty member be  
499 provided a copy of this document within two weeks of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly  
500 Pomona. It is recommended that all department RTP documents be maintained on the department web  
501 page so that they are also available to Candidates for faculty positions.

502 Requests for early tenure or promotion will not be considered unless the Candidate has completed at  
503 least two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective  
504 date of tenure or promotion.

505 The period covered by the self-evaluation ("period of review") should be the time period that has passed  
506 since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are  
507 based on the previous year's performance; tenure evaluations cover the period since original  
508 appointment to the probationary position; and promotion evaluations cover the period since the  
509 previous application for promotion or since original appointment. The following sections of this  
510 document describe the minimum qualifications for each RTP action.

#### 511 4.1 Reappointment

512 A Candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria in effect at the time of their initial  
513 probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply. For reappointment to a third  
514 probationary year, the Candidate will be evaluated by the DRTPC primarily in the areas of teaching  
515 performance and scholarship as the Candidate is not expected to perform any service in the first  
516 probationary year. For reappointment beyond a third probationary year, the Candidate must be  
517 judged by the DRTPC as progressing satisfactorily toward the expectations for tenure in all performance  
518 areas; teaching, scholarship, and service. If any problems were identified in earlier evaluations, the  
519 DRTPC will expect to see evidence of progress made in resolving these problems.

520 *Teaching:* A Candidate for reappointment is expected to exhibit effective teaching or an improving level  
521 of effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, signed faculty and student input,  
522 and other documentation of activities such as those listed in section 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

523 Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the standards for  
524 student evaluations as described in section 3.1 Table 1 on page 7. The general expectation for teaching  
525 performance is that student evaluation scores on question 14 should improve as candidates gain  
526 experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial standard of 50 percent for new faculty. The  
527 minimum standard increases to *65 percent* for faculty seeking reappointment to their final probationary  
528 year. Student evaluation scores below these standards but within the range specified in Table 1 may  
529 also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action depending on the strength of other evidence  
530 that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input  
531 from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as  
532 those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

533 *Scholarship:* Throughout the probationary period, the Candidate should be engaged in scholarly and  
534 creative activities that will make it possible for them to meet the requirements for tenure and  
535 promotion. Although there are no specific requirements for scholarly activities for each probationary  
536 year, the DRTPC recommends that the Candidate get an early start on activities within categories where  
537 a modified average method is used to award points (3.2.1 and 3.2.2). Midway through the probationary  
538 period, a Candidate may benefit from submission of one or more grant proposals or presentation  
539 abstracts as these activities (and collegial feedback associated with them) can assist the Candidate in  
540 solidifying plans and approaches for scholarly work that can lead to funded proposals and/or accepted  
541 publications during the later stages of the probationary period.

542 During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded  
543 under categories 3.2.1-3.2.7 (for the period under review) is calculated.

544 *Service:* Candidates are expected to contribute to service with gradually increasing effort and  
545 responsibility. All faculty should participate in general department governance, such as attendance of



546 department meetings, academic advising, faculty retreats, and community outreach events as  
 547 appropriate. In addition, Candidates should meet the expectations as laid out in the chart below. Items  
 548 marked as “E” are expected of Candidates at this stage. Items marked at “R” are recommended and are  
 549 mandatory at least once prior to applying for tenure. Items marked with “O” are optional, but may help  
 550 to earn points required for tenure.

Reappointment to	3.3.1 Attend	3.3.2 General department service	3.3.3 Active service on dept committees	3.3.4 Leadership	3.3.5 Other
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	E				
4 <sup>th</sup> year		E	E		O
5 <sup>th</sup> year		E	E	R	O
6 <sup>th</sup> year		E	E	R	O
Tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor		E	E	E	O

551 In the self-evaluation, the Candidate is encouraged to share their vision and goals for service.

552

## 553 4.2 [Tenure](#)

554 A Candidate for tenure (including early tenure) may choose the department RTP criteria in effect at the  
 555 time of the initial probationary appointment or those in effect at the time of the request for action. In  
 556 either case, current procedures and policies apply. A Candidate requesting both tenure and promotion  
 557 must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

558 A Candidate's credited service period for tenure consideration is the number of years from date of hire  
 559 at this campus plus the number of years for which credit was granted at time of hiring. A probationary  
 560 faculty member is normally considered for tenure during the sixth year of credited service. A faculty  
 561 member may request early tenure prior to the sixth year of credited service.

### 562 4.2.1 [Normal Tenure](#)

563 A Candidate for tenure must demonstrate their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship,  
 564 and service.

565 *Teaching:* A Candidate for tenure is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching  
 566 effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided  
 567 by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated  
 568 by any previous DRTPC.

569 The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student  
 570 evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student  
 571 evaluation question 14, across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental  
 572 expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive 70%  
 573 responses in the *very good* and *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this  
 574 standard but within the range of 60% to 70% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP  
 575 action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching

576 excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the  
577 Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

578 The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address  
579 weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period  
580 and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been  
581 corrected.

582 *Scholarship:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
583 awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 - 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The  
584 Candidate must have a record, sustained over several years, of dedicated efforts and scholarly  
585 achievements. A minimum cumulative total of 10 points in the area of scholarship is required and must  
586 include at least one refereed publication or one significant and successfully funded grant.

587 *Service:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
588 awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. For normal  
589 tenure, Candidates should have demonstrated an ongoing commitment to service by

- 590 • actively participating on assigned department committees and general
- 591 department shared governance and service; and
- 592 • taking on some leadership role as described in Section 3.3.4 at least once during
- 593 the period of review; and
- 594 • participating in service at the University or College level; and
- 595 • Accumulating a total of at least 15 points in categories 3.3.1 -- 3.3.5.

596  
597 A cumulative total of 35 points is required in the combined areas of scholarship and service for normal  
598 tenure, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate their efforts in scholarship or service.

599 The Candidate is encouraged to seek advice from the chair of the DRTPC, as well as from their mentor,  
600 as they progress through the probationary period. Overall, the DRTPC must be convinced that the  
601 Candidate's performance will continue at this level, or higher, in future years. If the Candidate has been  
602 promoted to Associate Professor during the probationary period, it is expected that the level of  
603 performance that justified that promotion will have been maintained in the period between the  
604 promotion and the tenure request.

#### 605 4.2.2 Early Tenure

606 Criteria for early tenure place emphasis on teaching excellence and shall require exceptional  
607 performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service  
608 to the university and profession.

609 *Teaching:* A Candidate for early tenure is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching  
610 excellence as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by  
611 the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by  
612 any previous DRTPC.

613 The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student  
614 evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student  
615 evaluation question 14 (*overall effectiveness of the instructor*), across all courses taught during the

616 review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early tenure will receive at least 90  
617 percent responses in the *very good* or *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this  
618 standard but within the range of 80 percent to 90 percent may also result in a favorable  
619 recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is  
620 committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and  
621 faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in  
622 sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

623 The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address  
624 weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period  
625 and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been  
626 corrected.

627 *Scholarship:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
628 awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 - 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The  
629 Candidate must have a sustained and exceptional record of scholarly achievements.

630 A minimum cumulative total of 20 points in the area of scholarship as described in section 3.2 is  
631 required. This list of scholarly achievements must include:

- 632 1. two refereed publications or
- 633 2. one refereed publication and one significant and successfully funded grant or
- 634 3. two significant and successfully funded grants.

635 *Service:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
636 awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. For early  
637 tenure, Candidates should have demonstrated an ongoing and high commitment to service. In  
638 particular, the Candidate should have:

- 639 • actively participated on assigned department committees and general
- 640 department shared governance and service; and
- 641 • taken on more than one leadership roles as described in Section 3.3.4 during the
- 642 period of review; and
- 643 • participated in service at the University or College level; and
- 644 • Accumulated a total of at least 25 points in categories 3.3.1 -- 3.3.5.

645  
646 In addition, the Candidate should explain how their service has had a significant positive impact on the  
647 department faculty and/or students.

648 A minimum cumulative total of 60 points is required in the combined areas of scholarship and service  
649 for early tenure, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate their efforts in scholarship or  
650 service. Early tenure may be granted for individuals who have demonstrated teaching excellence;  
651 exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities;  
652 and service to the university and profession.

#### 653 [4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor](#)

654 A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor (including early promotion) may choose either the  
655 department RTP criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment or those in effect at

656 the time of the request for action. In either case, current procedures and policies apply. A Candidate  
657 requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

658 A Candidate is normally eligible to apply for promotion to Associate Professor at the time they apply for  
659 tenure. A Candidate may apply simultaneously for early tenure and early promotion to Associate  
660 Professor.

#### 661 4.3.1 Normal Promotion to Associate Professor

662 A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate their accomplishments in the areas  
663 of teaching, scholarship, and service.

664 *Teaching:* A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor is expected to have reached a consistently  
665 high level of teaching effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other  
666 documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for  
667 improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

668 The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student  
669 evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student  
670 evaluation question 14, across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental  
671 expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive 70%  
672 responses in the *very good* and *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this  
673 standard but within the range of 60% to 70% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP  
674 action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching  
675 excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the  
676 Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

677 The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address  
678 weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period  
679 and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been  
680 corrected.

681 *Scholarship:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
682 awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 - 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The  
683 Candidate must have a record, sustained over several years, of dedicated efforts and scholarly  
684 achievements. A minimum cumulative total of 10 points in the area of scholarship is required and must  
685 include at least one refereed publication or one significant and successfully funded grant.

686 *Service:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
687 awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. For normal  
688 promotion to associate professor, Candidates should have demonstrated an ongoing commitment to  
689 service by

- 690 • actively participating on assigned department committees and general
- 691 department shared governance and service; and
- 692 • taking on some leadership role as described in Section 3.3.4 at least once during
- 693 the period of review; and
- 694 • participating in service at the University or College level; and
- 695 • Accumulating a total of at least 15 points in categories 3.3.1 -- 3.3.5.

696 In the self-evaluation, the Candidate is encouraged to share their vision and goals for service. When  
697 applying for tenure and promotion, the Candidate is also encouraged to draft a plan for service after  
698 receiving tenure and promotion.

699 The Candidate is encouraged to seek advice from the Chair of the DRTPC, as well as from their mentor,  
700 as they progress through the probationary period.

#### 701 4.3.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor

702 Criteria for early promotion to Associate Professor place emphasis on teaching excellence and shall  
703 require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative  
704 activities, and service to the university and profession.

705 *Teaching:* A Candidate for early promotion to Associate Professor is expected to have reached a  
706 consistently high level of teaching excellence as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and  
707 other documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need  
708 for improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

709 The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student  
710 evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student  
711 evaluation question 14 (*overall effectiveness of the instructor*), across all courses taught during the  
712 review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early promotion to Associate  
713 Professor will receive at least 90 percent responses in the *very good* or *good* categories combined.  
714 Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 80 percent to 90 percent may also  
715 result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that  
716 the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from  
717 students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those  
718 listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

719 The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address  
720 weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period  
721 and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been  
722 corrected.

723 *Scholarship:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
724 awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1-3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The  
725 Candidate must have a sustained and exceptional record of scholarly achievements.

726 A minimum cumulative total of 20 points in the area of scholarship as described in section 3.2. is  
727 required. This list of scholarly achievements must include:

- 728 1. two refereed publications or
- 729 2. one refereed publication and one significant and successfully funded grant or
- 730 3. two significant and successfully funded grants.

731 *Service:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
732 awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. For early  
733 promotion to Associate Professor, Candidates should have demonstrated an ongoing and high  
734 commitment to service. In particular, the Candidate should have:

- 735                   • actively participated on assigned department committees and general  
736 department shared governance and service; and  
737                   • taken on more than one leadership roles as described in Section 3.3.4 during the  
738 period of review; and  
739                   • participated in service at the University or College level; and  
740                   • Accumulated a total of at least 25 points in categories 3.3.1 -- 3.3.5.

741  
742 In addition, the Candidate should explain how their service has had a significant positive impact on the  
743 department faculty and/or students.

744 A cumulative total of 60 points is necessary in the combined areas of scholarship and service for early  
745 promotion to Associate Professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate their efforts in  
746 scholarship or service.

#### 747 [4.4 Promotion to Full Professor](#)

748 A Candidate for promotion to Full Professor (including early promotion) may choose either the  
749 department RTP criteria at the time of the initial probationary appointment or those in effect at the time  
750 of the request for action.

751 If the Candidate has already been awarded tenure, they are eligible to apply for a subsequent promotion  
752 after having completed four years of service at the rank of Associate Professor.

##### 753 [4.4.1 Normal Promotion to Full Professor](#)

754 A Candidate requesting promotion to Full Professor must have an extensive record of achievements.  
755 There should be a continued involvement in professional development activities and a continued  
756 engagement in service activities.

757 *Teaching:* A Candidate for promotion to Full Professor is expected to have maintained a consistently  
758 high level of teaching effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other  
759 documentation provided by the Candidate.

760 The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student  
761 evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student  
762 evaluation question 14, across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental  
763 expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Full Professor will receive 75% responses  
764 in the *very good* and *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but  
765 within the range of 65% to 75% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action,  
766 depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as  
767 described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's  
768 involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

769 The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address  
770 weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period  
771 and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been  
772 corrected.

773 *Scholarship:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
774 awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 – 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The

775 Candidate must have a sustained record of dedicated efforts and scholarly achievements and shall  
776 accumulate in total a minimum of 10 points over the period of review. This record must include at least  
777 one refereed publication or one significant and successfully funded external grant on which the  
778 Candidate serves a primary role as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.

779 *Service:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
780 awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. In the area  
781 of service, an increase in involvement is expected, compared to what is expected from a Candidate for  
782 promotion to Associate Professor. A Candidate must have assumed positions of leadership and  
783 responsibility at the department, college, or university levels serving as Chair of at least one committee  
784 and contributing actively to at least one committee external to the department. A minimum cumulative  
785 total of 15 points in the area of service is required.

786 A cumulative total of 40 points is required in the combined areas of scholarship and service for  
787 promotion to Full Professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate their efforts in  
788 scholarship or service.

#### 789 4.4.2 Early Promotion to Full Professor

790 The DRTPC must be persuaded that the strength of the Candidate's achievements compensates for the  
791 abbreviated time period.

792 Criteria for early promotion to Full Professor place emphasis on teaching excellence and shall require  
793 exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities,  
794 and service to the university and profession.

795 *Teaching:* A Candidate for early promotion to Full Professor is expected to have reached a consistently  
796 high level of teaching excellence as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other  
797 documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for  
798 improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

799 The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student  
800 evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student  
801 evaluation question 14 (*overall effectiveness of the instructor*), across all courses taught during the  
802 review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early promotion to Full Professor will  
803 receive at least 90 percent responses in the *very good* or *good* categories combined. Student evaluation  
804 scores below this standard but within the range of 80 percent to 90 percent may also result in a  
805 favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the  
806 Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from  
807 students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those  
808 listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

809 The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address  
810 weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period  
811 and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been  
812 corrected.

813 *Scholarship:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
814 awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 – 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. A  
815 minimum cumulative total of 20 points in the area of scholarship is required and must include:

- 816 1. two refereed publications or
- 817 2. one refereed publication and one significant and successfully funded external grant on which  
818 the Candidate serves a primary role as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator or
- 819 3. two significant and successfully funded external grants on which the Candidate serves as a  
820 primary role Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.

821 *Service:* During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points  
822 awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. In the area  
823 of service, a significant increase in involvement is expected, compared to what is expected from a  
824 Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor. A Candidate for early promotion to Full Professor must  
825 have assumed positions of leadership and responsibility in service activities at the department, college  
826 or university levels serving as Chair of at least one committee and making notable contributions to at  
827 least two committees external to the department. A minimum cumulative total of 24 points in the area  
828 of service is required.

829 A cumulative total of 65 points is required in the combined areas of scholarship and service for early  
830 promotion to Full Professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate their efforts in  
831 scholarship or service.

## 832 5 Procedures

### 833 5.1 DRTPC Selection

834 Full-time tenured faculty and, if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty  
835 members of the department and approved by the President, faculty participating in FERP are eligible for  
836 the DRTPC membership. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may  
837 serve if elected and willing subject to the stipulations in the Acceptance of Paid Professional Leave form.  
838 A tenured faculty member who will be a Candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only  
839 participate on reappointment cases and may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations.

840 The DRTPC shall consist initially of seven (7) and three (3) alternate full-time, tenured and FERP faculty  
841 members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The DRTPC shall be elected in the spring  
842 semester preceding the beginning of service and shall meet during this semester to select a chair. Its  
843 term of service shall begin in the subsequent fall semester and last for one calendar year. During the  
844 semester transition, the DRTPC for 2018-2019 academic year will be elected in the winter 2018 quarter  
845 and preceding service starting in the fall 2018 semester will elect a chair. The DRTPC elected for the  
846 2017-2018 period will serve through spring quarter 2018. The DRTPC is responsible for all issues arising  
847 from its recommendation even if they arise after the completion of its term of service.

848 The election of the DRTPC shall be by means of an anonymous ballot. The ballot shall contain the names  
849 of all full-time, tenured faculty members able to serve. The Department Chair is not eligible to serve on  
850 the DRTPC in any capacity. The ballot will be distributed by the Department Chair to all probationary  
851 and tenured faculty members of the department and shall contain the instruction: "Vote for no more  
852 than seven and rank all individuals on the ballot with 1 being your first choice, 2 being your second



853 choice, etc.” If there are no ties, the seven individuals having the highest vote totals comprise the  
854 DRTPC while the remaining individuals make up the alternate list in order of their vote totals. In the  
855 event of ties, individuals having a lower sum of ranks will be placed on the DRTPC before others (the  
856 sum of ranks statistic will also determine the order of individuals on the alternate list in the case of ties).  
857 In the unlikely event, that the sum of ranks is also tied then a random procedure (e.g. coin flip) will be  
858 used to break these ties. Any faculty member whose name was included in the vote and has not  
859 achieved a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty, must be ratified by a majority of the  
860 probationary and tenured faculty in another separate confirmation vote in order to serve on the DRTPC.

861 Any member of the initial DRTPC who becomes a Candidate for promotion shall be ineligible to  
862 participate in DRTPC committee deliberations concerning promotion or tenure. In promotion  
863 considerations, the DRTPC members deliberating must have a higher rank than the Candidate being  
864 considered. If the initial seven-member DRTPC has fewer than three members senior in rank to all  
865 promotion Candidates, then the DRTPC shall be increased in size by selecting such individuals until there  
866 are three members senior in rank to all promotion Candidates.

## 867 5.2 Duties of the DRTPC Chair

868 The DRTPC Chair shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of this document and those of  
869 Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as Appendix 16) of the University Manual are carried out. The DRTPC  
870 Chair will be the official overseer of the RTP package for the period between the submission of the  
871 package to the DRTPC by the Candidate and the forwarding of the package to the Dean's office.  
872 Specifically, in this period the DRTPC Chair and only the DRTPC Chair shall be responsible for additions to  
873 the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of  
874 any additions or changes.

875 In the fall semester , the DRTPC Chair: (i) ensures that Candidates have information they need, including  
876 information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests,  
877 department criteria, and the names of their prospective peer evaluators; (ii) assists Candidates in  
878 understanding expectations, preparing packages; (iii) informs Faculty Affairs of requests; (iv) ensures  
879 that packages are complete; and (v) provides the DRTPC's recommendation to the Candidate.  
880 Throughout the year, the DRTPC Chair ensures that the minimum number of peer evaluations are  
881 conducted on behalf of faculty who remain eligible for RTP action(s); ensures that reports written by  
882 peer evaluators are provided to Candidates within two weeks of a classroom visit; and forwards peer  
883 evaluations in a timely manner to the Dean for inclusion in the Candidate's PAF.

884 The DRTPC Chair will respond to any requests for an external review of materials. Such a request may  
885 be initiated at any level of review and by any party to the review. Requests for external review of  
886 materials shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an external reviewer, and (2)  
887 the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. Upon receipt of such a  
888 request, the DRTPC Chair will forward the request to the Dean and to the Faculty Affairs office. The  
889 request must be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee.

## 890 5.3 RTP Document Review

891 Each year the department shall appoint a RTP Document Review Committee. This committee shall be  
892 viewed as an adjunct of the RTP Committee for the sole purpose of proposing changes in departmental  
893 RTP criteria and procedures. The RTP Document Review Committee shall work with the Mathematics

894 and Statistics Department, the DRTP Committee, the College of Science RTP Committee, the Dean's  
895 office, and other segments of the University involved in the RTP process to produce a document that  
896 reflects the University's commitment to quality education.

897 Proposed revisions shall be submitted in writing to all probationary and tenured faculty members of the  
898 department. During the week following this submission, critical comments or alternative proposals may  
899 be communicated in writing to the Document Review Committee Chair. The committee shall  
900 subsequently consider such written communications and finalize the proposed revisions.

901 Following the submission of the finalized revision proposals to the probationary and tenured faculty, a  
902 department meeting shall be held, no later than March 1, to discuss the acceptance or rejection of the  
903 proposed revisions. No further changes in the RTP Criteria and Procedures document will be proposed  
904 by the Department after this meeting. Ratification of the finalized revision proposals on an item-by-item  
905 basis shall take place by means of a written mail ballot. Adoption of each item shall require the approval  
906 of a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty. The RTP document with ratified revisions shall be  
907 forwarded to the CRTPC and the College Dean for review no later than April 1.

#### 908 5.4 Evaluation of Faculty on Leave, in Academic Governance Positions, in Administrative 909 Positions, or Performing Administrative Duties

910 A faculty member who is still eligible for some RTP action and whose assigned duties vary from normal  
911 faculty duties (see list given below) will prepare a Memo of Understanding (MOU) detailing activities and  
912 conditions of evaluation for RTP purposes during the leave so that existing and appropriate RTP  
913 Document criteria will apply. This MOU, which must be jointly developed by the current DRTPC, the  
914 Chair, and the Candidate, will detail precisely what is expected of the Candidate for each action still  
915 pending. Candidates shall observe the same criteria, procedures, and timelines as Candidates in  
916 residence, unless the MOU explicitly states otherwise. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by  
917 fax, and must provide fax numbers or addresses to be used for sending recommendations to the  
918 Candidate. It will be the Candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines. It is recommended that the  
919 Candidate acquire assurances that the work duties associated with the leave will allow for fulfillment of  
920 the activities in the MOU. A faculty member serving as Chair of the Department who is still eligible for  
921 some RTP action should prepare a similar memo of understanding with the Dean of the College prior to  
922 beginning their term of office.

923 Situations in which the Candidate's assigned duties may vary from the norm:

- 924 1. Serving in administrative positions such as Department Chair
- 925 2. Performing administrative duties
- 926 3. Serving in positions of academic governance
- 927 4. Taking sabbatical leave
- 928 5. Taking fellowships
- 929 6. Teaching overseas
- 930 7. Taking a position at another university such as Visiting Professor/Scholar

931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952

**MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS DEPARTMENT RTP CLASSROOM  
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM**

1. Candidate's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Class Visited (MAT/STA Number and Section): \_\_\_\_\_
3. Time: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Performance Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964 5. Evaluator's Name/Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ /

965 6. Date of Evaluation Submission: \_\_\_\_\_

966

967 7. Candidate's Name/Signature:

968