

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

**REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION DOCUMENT  
AY 2019/2020 – AY 2023/2024**

**SECTION I – INTRODUCTION**

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. 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 Nos. 1328 and 1329 (formerly Appendix 16 and Appendix 10 respectively) of the University Manual, define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement, and may not conflict with, these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over department policies.

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

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting faculty members who are in the RTP process, providing them the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for those in the RTP process to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

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

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

faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) during Fall or Spring terms may serve if elected and willing. 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 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 No. 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 syllabus and other teaching materials, and a written report.
- i) A **candidate for reappointment must use the DRTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.
- j) A **candidate for tenure or promotion may choose between the criteria** in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

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

## **SECTION II – PROCEDURES**

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

### **II.2. DEPARTMENT RTP PROCEDURES**

**2.1.** The chair of the department will always be a member of the DRTPC. The rest of the DRTPC will consist of full-time, tenured, and FERP faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The membership size shall be consistent with 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).

#### **2.2. Election**

**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.** 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, and the number of individuals on the DRTPC will also be voted upon by the department faculty.

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

## **2.3. Duties**

- 2.3.1.** The DRTPC discusses, evaluates, and interprets all personnel policies for tenured and tenure track Sociology faculty related to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. 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.
- 2.3.2.** The number of members on the DRTPC may vary depending on the election outcomes.
- 2.3.3.** 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.

## **2.4. The Chair and Vice Chair**

### **2.4.1. Duties**

- 2.4.1.1.** The DRTPC Chair is elected by the DRTPC, and develops the department calendar of RTP activities, receives materials from the candidates, students, and appropriate faculty members and agencies, and organizes these materials for the DRTPC.
- 2.4.1.2.** As required, the DRTPC Chair drafts proposed changes to DRTP policies and procedures, for submission to Sociology faculty for approval in accordance with university policies.
- 2.4.1.3.** The Vice Chair, also elected by the DRTPC, fulfills the duties of the Chair if the Chair becomes unable to complete the above duties.
- 2.4.1.4.** 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.

### **2.4.2. Composition, Election, and Responsibilities**

- 2.4.2.1.** The DRTPC Chair and Vice Chair are elected by the DRTPC.
- 2.4.2.2.**
- 2.4.2.3.** The Chair of the DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that all applicable University, College, and DRTP directives, policies, and procedures are complied with. The

Chair or Vice Chair may serve as advisors to candidates seeking RTP action. The DRTPC Chair is responsible to be sure that each candidate has a current copy of the DRTP document at the beginning of the RTP cycle.

**2.4.2.4.** The Vice Chair of the DRTPC is responsible for acting as Chair in the absence of the regular Chair, and for the compilation of proposed RTP document changes during the year.

#### **2.4.3. DRTPC Terms of Office**

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

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

#### **2.4.4. Responsibilities**

**2.4.4.1.** The Chair of the DRTPC is available as an adviser to candidates preparing packages. The Chair and Vice 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.

**2.4.4.2.** 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.

#### **2.4.5. RTP Procedures**

**2.4.5.1.** Faculty members eligible for RTP actions are so informed by the DRTPC, and given a time-table for RTP package submission deadlines and action dates. Included should be 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.

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

**2.4.5.3.** All RTP requests are initiated by the candidate. Requests are initiated by completing a self-evaluation on pages 1–4 of the Faculty Performance Review 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.

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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 2.4.5.7.** A differential weighting matrix will be used by the DRTPC in arriving at the final basis for recommendation. Following a complete review of all materials submitted, each committee member will complete a matrix form for each candidate. These preliminary signed matrices will be shared among the committee members and discussed prior to the preparation of a final consensus matrix. The committee will meet in extended sessions as needed to allow time to prepare the consensus matrix. The concluding recommendation for the DRTPC will be guided by the numeric value of the total score from the matrix.
- 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 such new material as the candidate may have submitted. 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.

**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 evaluations 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**

- 3.1.** The Department faculty shall review and adopt a single standard form for student evaluation of instruction. This form shall be developed and administered in accordance with Policy Nos. 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual.
- 3.2.** The university requires that all courses (except independent study types of courses) receive a Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI).
- 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 at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal. Any rebuttal provided by the faculty members shall be attached to the original letter/petition and placed in the faculty member's Personnel

Action File (PAF). Letters/petitions received as the result of appropriate solicitations by the evaluation committee (Section 3.2 of Policy 1328 of the University Manual) may be collected and presented as a group to the faculty member.

#### **II.4. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

- 4.1. The Department faculty shall review and adopt guidelines for conducting peer evaluations of teaching in accordance with Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual and the CBA.
- 4.2. A minimum of two peer evaluations in different courses, and in different terms, in each academic year shall be conducted for each probationary faculty and for each tenured faculty member who may subsequently seek promotion. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. Peer evaluation of 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.
- 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.
- 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 action. 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:



- 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.
- b) The DRTPC shall consider relevant work done off-campus while the candidate was on professional leave from Cal Poly Pomona.
- 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 FOR RTP ACTION**

**DIFFERENTIAL WEIGHTING MATRIX**

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

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

**III.1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION**

**1.1. Area I—Instructional Competence**

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

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

**1.1.3.** Criteria and Illustrative Performance Indicators:

Major Criteria:

**1.1.3.1.** Classroom Performance

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

**1.1.3.1.2.** Faculty Peer Evaluations. Source: Class visitation records.

**1.1.3.2.** Pedagogical Approach and Methods

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

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

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

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

**1.1.3.2.5.** Faculty may present other evidence of accomplishment in this area such as development of new courses, service learning, preparation of teaching, integration of technology and other innovative approaches to teaching.

### **1.1.3.3. Administrative Responsibilities**

**1.1.3.3.1.** Meeting University deadlines, submitting grades in time, adds and drops, incompletes and withdrawals, etc. Source: Candidate's statement, department administrative files.

**1.1.3.3.2.** Meeting scheduled classes, including final examinations. Source: Student evaluations, peer evaluations, and department administrative files.

### **1.1.3.4. Faculty–Student Relations**

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

**1.1.3.4.2.** Student advisement. Source: Candidate's statement.

**1.1.3.4.3.** Supervision of student research. Source: Candidate's statement, department administrative files.

**1.1.3.4.4.** Student mentoring. Source: Candidate's statement.

### **1.1.3.5. Professional Behavior and Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**

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

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

### **1.1.3.6. Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

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

take into consideration the type of course and other related matters, and other evidence of the candidate's performance.

#### **1.1.3.7. Justification of Release Time**

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

### **1.2. Area II—Professional Productivity**

Major Criteria:

**1.2.1.** The Department will assess the overall quality of the candidate's work, while also taking account the quantity of publications. Three scholarly works in refereed social science journals, or their equivalents represents the minimum research profile typical of those successfully achieving tenure and promotion in the Department. The following equivalencies are relevant here:

- 1.2.1.1.** Authored or co-authored book based on original research = 3 scholarly works
- 1.2.1.2.** Authored or co-authored textbook = 2 scholarly works
- 1.2.1.3.** Authored or co-authored edited book = 2 scholarly works
- 1.2.1.4.** Authored or co-authored book chapter (in a social science book in a reputable non-vanity press) = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.5.** Authored chapter in a book co-edited or edited by yourself (in a non-vanity press) = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.6.** Two published pieces specific to discipline in encyclopedias, newspapers, academic blog posts, including book reviews = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.7.** Three professional reviews of manuscripts for refereed international, national, or regional journals = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.8.** Grant application submitted to external funder = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.9.** Two grant applications submitted for intra-mural funds = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.10.** Guest editor of a referred international, national, or regional journal = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.11.** Two submitted articles/chapters currently under review = 1 scholarly work
- 1.2.1.12.** Two submitted IRB protocols = 1 scholarly work.

**1.2.2.** Co-authorship: The department values both single-authored and co-authored publications, but recognizes that co-authorship introduces questions about the scholarly independence of the researcher. In evaluating co-authored publications, the Department will consider the specific contributions of the candidate. Given the

range of conventions for listing authors, it is important that a candidate detail his or her contributions to all co-authored works.

- 1.2.3.** Timing and Pace of Publication: The Department will assess the candidate's overall intellectual work and publishing trajectory. It is understood that the output of scholarly productivity may vary widely from year to year, which is why works in progress and currently under review can also count towards tenure and promotion. Overall, the candidate's record should represent a pattern indicative of a career of continual accomplishment and productivity
- 1.2.4.** Activity at a professional meeting including presentation of papers, symposium discussant, organizing or chairing symposia, chairing paper sessions, organizing professional conferences, serving as chair, co-chair, or active member on committees organizing professional conferences, serving as chair or co-chair of a program committee, serving on committees or being chair of committees of professional organizations, or being an office holder in professional organizations. Source: Copy of program, letters documenting committee or organization service, or other similar sources of evidence.

Additional Evidence:

- 1.2.5.** Such activities as consulting, survey research, policy analysis, etc., shall be considered under professional productivity. It is expected such activities shall result in a tangible product (survey research report, agency evaluation report, etc.) that reflects scholarly growth..
- 1.2.6.** Formal training and qualification for certification, licensing, or the maintenance thereof, such as licensure as a Clinical Social Worker. Source: Certification from granting agency.
- 1.2.7.** Additional professional training and development, such as NSF Short Courses, seminars in one's academic discipline, teacher training, or workshops. Source: Certification from granting agency.

### **1.3. Area III—Service**

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

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

### **1.3.1. Service to the Department**

- 1.3.1.1.** Regular attendance at scheduled department meetings.
- 1.3.1.2.** Teaching courses as needed, consistent with department goals, including times, days, frequency.
- 1.3.1.3.** Meeting department emergencies.
- 1.3.1.4.** Consistently displaying professional demeanor and ethical behavior in interactions with students, colleagues, staff, and other university personnel. Actively supporting department goals. Both candidates and senior faculty should be aware that evaluation of candidates in this area requires significant interaction. Both candidates and senior faculty are therefore encouraged to find opportunities for such interaction both in scheduled meetings and more informally.
- 1.3.1.5.** Active support of department goals and objectives by implementation, cooperative effort, and program enhancement or development.
- 1.3.1.6.** Serving on department committees, including regular attendance, participation, and constructive contribution.
- 1.3.1.7.** Development of new courses, options, or other programs, or revision of outdated course outlines, consistent with department goals when needed.
- 1.3.1.8.** Participation in events and activities as a member or representative of the department.
- 1.3.1.9.** Willingness to be of service to peers and administration beyond mandated activities, such as conducting peer evaluations.

### **1.3.2. Service to the University or College**

- 1.3.2.1.** Chair, vice-chair, or active member of University or College committees.
- 1.3.2.2.** Consultation with or representing the University, College, or Department to intramural or extramural organizations, to other University organizations, or to other schools.
- 1.3.2.3.** Academic program development at the University or College level. Additional source: Office of Student Development records.

1.3.2.4. Academic governance.

### 1.3.3. Service to the Profession

1.3.3.1. Office holder in local, state, regional, or national professional organization.

1.3.3.2. Membership in professional organizations, such as APA, ASA, Western Psychological Association, California Psychological Association, Pacific Sociological Association, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, etc.

1.3.3.3. Other memberships in scientific, honorary, or community organizations of a professional nature, e.g., AKD Sociology Honor Society, , Sigma Xi Scientific Research Society, Western Social Science Association, etc. Source: Candidate's statement, organizational documents.

### 1.3.4. Service to Community Projects or Organizations

## III.2. Criteria for Reappointment

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

**2.1. Instructional Competence.** The candidate must perform satisfactorily on each of the teaching criteria listed in III.1.1. The SEIs and the Peer Evaluations will constitute the major part of the Department's assessment of instructional competence. The peer evaluations will consist of both classroom visits to view direct instruction and also examinations of syllabi, tests, and other classroom material that constitute instructional mechanics. From these criteria, the faculty members of the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the Department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 4. Thus, a candidate's score can range from 0 to 20 in instructional competence. The candidate must obtain a minimum average score of 10.7 across all eligible DRTPC members.

**2.2. Professional Productivity.** The candidate must demonstrate activity in one or more of the major areas of the professional productivity criteria listed as III.1.2.1 through III.1.2.4. Evidence in the additional criteria listed as III.1.2.5–III.1.2.7 will also be taken into account, but activity in these areas will not substitute for activity in the major criteria areas. From all criteria in this category, the faculty members of the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the Department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate's score can range from 0 to 15 in professional productivity.

**2.3. Service.** The candidate must demonstrate activity in service to the department and at least one other area (college, university, profession, and community). Again, service goes

beyond mere membership in a committee or organization but entails active involvement with these entities. From all criteria in this category, the faculty members of the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the Department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 15 in service.

### III.3. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

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

- 3.1. Instructional Competence.** The candidate must perform satisfactorily on each of the teaching criteria listed in III.1.1. The SEIs and the peer evaluations will constitute the major part of the Department’s assessment of instructional competence. The peer evaluations will consist of both classroom visits to view direct instruction and also examinations of syllabi, tests, and other classroom material that constitute instructional mechanics. From these criteria, the members of the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the Department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 4. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 20 in instructional competence. The candidate must obtain a minimum average score of 10.7 across all eligible DRTPC members. These criteria will be applied across the candidate’s probationary period in order to come to an assessment of overall instructional competence across this period. It is expected that candidates will maintain acceptable scores across this period or show steady improvement. In other words, candidates receiving high marks in this area early in the period should continue to show high marks and not perform poorly the last few years before the tenure decision. Candidates receiving relatively poor marks at the beginning should show steady improvement in addressing problem areas and not wait until the very last year before the tenure decision is to be rendered.
- 3.2. Professional Productivity.** The candidate must be successful in the two major areas of the professional productivity criteria listed as III.1.2.1 and III.1.2.4. In other words, actual publications and activities in professional meetings must be completed by the time of tenure assessment (a publication “in press” will be considered completed). Evidence in the additional criteria listed as III.1.2.5–III.1.2.7 will also be taken into account, but activity in these areas will not substitute for success in the major criteria areas. From all criteria in this category, the faculty members of the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the Department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 15 in professional productivity. This assessment will be for the entire probationary period.
- 3.3. Service.** The candidate must demonstrate activity in service to the department and at least one other area (college, university, profession, and community). Again, service goes beyond mere membership in a committee or organization but entails active involvement with these entities. From all criteria in this category, the faculty members of the DRTPC will assess the candidate on a 0–5 scale in accordance with the Department matrix. This score will be multiplied by 3. Thus, a candidate’s score can range from 0 to 15 in service.



### **III.4. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

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

### **III.5 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

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

- 5.1 Instructional Competence.** The candidate continues to present a record of satisfactory performance for each of the teaching criteria listed in III.1.1, which are expected of all faculty members, and shows consistency of performance throughout the period between promotion to Associate Professor and application for promotion to Professor. The candidate is also expected to demonstrate an ability to help provide departmental direction and guidance in the area of instruction and advising (e.g., assisting junior colleagues in effective teaching, active participation in the development and refinement of the department's curriculum, assisting the department in reaching university objectives related to pedagogy, and/or successfully taking on increased responsibilities for advising), consistent with the candidate's Professional Plan.
- 5.2 Professional Productivity.** The candidate remains actively engaged with the discipline and demonstrates clear accomplishments in scholarly and creative activities by fulfilling the requirements for reappointment (III.1.2) and by demonstrating success in the two major areas of the professional productivity criteria listed as III.1.2.1 and III.1.2.4. (professional publications and presentations) for the review period. In addition, the candidate has evidenced a firm commitment to continuing scholarly work and to advanced scholarly activities (e.g., collaboration with and/or assistance to junior colleagues conducting research, review of manuscripts for refereed journals and publishers, and/or service as an editorial board member of an academic publication), as identified in the candidate's Professional Plan.
- 5.3 Service.** The candidate has compiled a tangible record of achievement, demonstrating active participation and/or positions of leadership in the area of service for the period under review. Although the specific service activities will vary according to the candidate's Professional Plan, they may include activities such as department, college, and university committees, leadership positions in regional, state, or national professional organizations, and/or professional contributions to the wider community.

### **III.6. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE**

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

### **III.7. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

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

### **III.8. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

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

**APPENDIX**

**SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT**  
*Peer Evaluation Form*

<b>Professor Evaluated:</b>	<b>Class Evaluated:</b>	<b>CRN#:</b>
<b>Evaluator:</b>	<b>Date Class Evaluated:</b>	<b>SEMESTER:</b>

Instructions to Evaluator: Please elaborate on your judgments of the Professor's performance. Discuss his/her strengths and give suggestions, where possible, for enhancing teaching effectiveness.

The peer evaluator using this form should be senior to the instructor being evaluated. Evaluators are asked to provide their best professional judgment in, at least, the areas indicated below. It is expected that a class session taught by the instructor to be evaluated will be visited by the evaluator. In addition, the evaluator is requested to examine the course syllabus and any other appropriate materials and provide a professional judgment on the criteria below.

**N/A=Not Available, Not Applicable, Not Observed, No Basis for Judgment**  
Please comment wherever appropriate to ensure clarity

<b>1) Does the syllabus conform to the departmental course outline OR the current university catalog description of the course?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:
<b>2) Is the syllabus clear and unambiguous?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:
<b>3) Is the syllabus sufficiently thorough and detailed?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:
<b>4) Is the syllabus professionally presented?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:
<b>5) Does the syllabus content reflect the current state of the discipline?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:
<b>6) Are the exams/assignments appropriately constructed?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:
<b>7) Are the exams/assignments valid measures of learning?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comment:

**N/A=Not Available, Not Applicable, Not Observed, No Basis for Judgment**  
Please comment wherever appropriate to ensure clarity

<p><b>1) Is the instructor knowledgeable about the subject matter?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>2) Is the instructor abreast of current trends in the discipline?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>3) Does the instructor encourage diverse points of view?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>4) Do the students seem to understand ideas, concepts, examples, etc., presented during the class session?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>5) Does the instructor respond appropriately to student questions and comments?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>6) Does the instructor treat students with respect and dignity?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>7) Is the instructor organized in their presentation?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>8) Does the instructor provide a professional model to the students?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>9) Are students attentive to the task at hand?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>
<p><b>10) Does the instructor use class time effectively?</b></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Work    <input type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            Comment:         </p>