

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

NUTRITION AND FOOD SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

2019/2020 – 2020/21 AY

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

Table of Contents

		PAGE
SECTION I – INTRODUCTION		
I.1	Definitions	4
I.2	Department Philosophy	5
SECTION II – PROCEDURES		
II.2	Department RTP Procedures	6
II.2.1	Election of RTP Committee	6
II.2.2	Election of RTP Committee Chair	7
II.2.3	Duties of RTP Committee	8
II.2.4	Duties of Department Chair	11
II.3	Student Evaluation of Teaching	11
II.4	Peer Observations of Teaching	11
II.5	Candidates and Future Candidates	12
II.6	Candidate’s Responsibilities	14
SECTION III – CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION		
III.1	Elements of Performance and Evaluation	15
III.2	Criteria for Reappointment	19
III.3	Criteria for Tenure and Promotion	21

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

APPENDICES	26
Appendix I: TABLE FOR SUMMARIZING SCORES FROM STUDENT EVALUATIONS	27
Appendix II: HNFS INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	28
Appendix III: HNFS PEER OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING	30

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

Human Nutrition & Food Science Department RTP Criteria Document

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

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

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. The document with the criteria is permanently posted online at a department web page available to tenure-track/tenured faculty. This document can be made available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and in particular what they must achieve in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidates are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate a model of the department faculty colleague to which the candidate should aspire.

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

- I.1. DEFINITIONS: Policy no. 1328 provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here; however, the most current version of Policy no. 1328 must be reviewed and followed by the DRTPC for any RTP action with the understanding that in case of disagreement Policy no. 1328 will supersede the DRTP criteria.
- 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 tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only participate on reappointment cases – may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

- c) Criteria are the expectations articulated in the DRTP criteria document and in Policy no. 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/ procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his/her designee (see also Policy no. 1328 section 2.1).
- d) A probationary year of service is any two semesters in a period of three consecutive semesters. The first probationary year begins with the first Fall term of appointment.
- e) A faculty member is eligible to apply for tenure at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for early tenure.
- f) A faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is eligible 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.
- g) 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 (see section 111.3.304).
- h) Student evaluation of teaching is governed by Policy no. 1329 of the University Manual.
- i) Peer evaluation of teaching is the responsibility of the DRTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of courses syllabi & other teaching materials, and a written report. The Department Chair and other department tenured faculty, as determined by the DRTP Committee may assist the DRTP Committee in conducting peer observations of teaching. Tenured faculty members will conduct all peer observations of teaching.

Policy no. 1328 prescribes the DRTP criteria document that a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion is entitled to use. Candidates are responsible for ensuring that they use the appropriate criteria documents.

I.2 DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY

I.2.1 This document fulfills all requirements for directing candidates seeking reappointment, tenure and promotion in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science. It incorporates Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual, and the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, and documents incorporated therein.

I.2.2 Candidates will be evaluated for teaching performance, scholarly and creative activity, service at any level within the university and service to the community and to professional organizations. In evaluating a candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion the review groups will consider these evaluation areas in light of the

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

candidate's reappointment level, past performance, and improvement. A candidate lacking in any one area will not receive a positive recommendation.

In addition to teaching, accomplishments in the area of scholarly and creative activity and service to the university and profession, the criteria also address performance in the area of student advising/mentoring. The criteria also address the performance of a faculty member whose regular assignment consists of a minimum teaching load of 50% (12 WTUs per year, with at least three lecture classes) and 50% assigned time as determined by the Department Chair, the faculty member and reviewed by the DRTP Committee and approved by the College Dean and the Provost. This assignment must be approved in advance.

Furthermore, the criteria also address the provision for the evaluation of faculty serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties; provision for evaluation of faculty serving in academic governance, and consideration of the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution.

SECTION II – PROCEDURES

- II.1 Policy no. 1328 describes RTP procedures in complete detail. A summary is provided here.
- II.2 DEPARTMENT RTP PROCEDURES
 - II.2.1 ELECTION OF RTP COMMITTEE
 - II.2.101 The DRTP Committee is responsible for insuring the integrity of the RTP process within the Department. The Committee structure and function shall conform to Policy no. 1328, Section 3.1 of the University Manual.
 - II.2.102 The Committee shall consist of three (3), five (5) or seven (7) full time, tenured faculty members elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. Faculty participating in FERP may participate following University policy (Section 1.17 of Policy 1328).
 - II.2.103 The Committee shall be elected by secret ballot before the end of the Spring semester of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The Committee's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the Committee's recommendations have been concluded. After the election of the Committee, the Department Chair will notify the Dean of the composition of the Committee. In the event that there is not a sufficient number of department faculty of appropriate rank, the department faculty will nominate candidates from other departments in related disciplines prior to the election. A biosketch is required for nomination.
 - II.2.104 No Committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Also, in promotion considerations, the Committee members must have higher rank than those being

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

considered for promotion. Tenured candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any promotion or tenure actions considered by the Committee. However, tenured candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the Committee.

II.2.105 Faculty on Professional Leave With Pay (sabbatical or difference in pay) may not participate in Committee activities unless approved by the Professional Leave Committee and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Faculty, who know in advance that they will, during one semester or more, be unavailable or ineligible, cannot be nominees for the Committee.

II.2.2 ELECTION OF RTP COMMITTEE CHAIR

II.2.201 The Committee shall elect a Chair who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the DRTP document and Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual are carried out.

The DRTP Chair shall perform the following duties:

A. Fall semester:

1. Ensures that candidates have information they need: including information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests.
2. Assists candidates in understanding expectations for preparing packages.
3. Informs Faculty Affairs of requests.
4. Ensures that packages are complete.
5. Be the official custodian of the candidate's RTP package between the submission of the package to the Committee by the candidate and forwarding of the package to the Dean. See Policy no. 1328 for appropriate policies governing the RTP package. In this period, the Committee Chair and only the Committee Chair shall be responsible for any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.
6. Provide the department recommendation to the candidate.

B. Throughout the year:

1. Ensure that peer observations are conducted in two different courses preferably in two different semesters according to Department and University policy for all faculty members who will be a candidate for RTP action in the future. Ensure that reports are provided to candidates in a timely manner.
2. Schedule, in cooperation with the RTP candidates and other faculty, the minimum number of peer observations of teaching performance.
3. The DRTP Committee Chair will identify faculty for whom peer observations are required and days of times of their classes. The DRTPC Chair in consultation with the other members of the committee will assign faculty members to conduct the peer observations.

II.2.202 The Department Chair shall:
Ensure that each faculty member has access to the approved RTP criteria. A copy of the current approved DRTP document shall be maintained in the Department

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

office and available online. The Department Chair will also retain copies of past, approved RTP criteria for the purposes of evaluating candidates who choose to be evaluated by criteria which were current at the time of the candidate's initial appointment. An archive of these past RTP documents shall be made available to the Committee and faculty online. The Department Chair will distribute the summary scores from course evaluations to the faculty member that taught the corresponding course.

- II.2.203 The Committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place(s) near the Department office, of the names of candidates requesting a RTP action, the type of request made, and the name of the individual to whom signed comments or recommendation can be given. This posting will take place within ten (10) calendar days of notification of the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request a RTP action. Signed comments will be accepted up to the due date of the RTP package. Signed comments by students must also include the student's Bronco ID number. The candidate will have ten (10) calendar days to provide a response, if desired, to these comments. The RTP Committee will meet after all responses are received.

II.2.3 DUTIES OF RTP COMMITTEE

- II.2.301 The Committee's duties include the following:

A. Student Evaluations

1. Evaluations shall be conducted during the 13th through 15th weeks of the semester or during finals week. Following University Policy #1329 there are two exceptions: One, when multiple instructors teach a class, the evaluation for each individual instructor shall take place during the last two weeks of the instructional period of each individual instructor. Two, when the duration of a course spans fewer than 15 weeks the evaluation shall take place during the last two weeks of the instructional period.
 1. Class evaluations will be distributed by Tenured and Tenure Track faculty members, staff or student assistant as requested by the Department Chair, after giving notice to the faculty as to the date and time this will occur. A sign up sheet will be made available in week 13th of the semester.
 2. Students will be asked to independently complete the evaluation by the person administering the surveys. Forms will be placed in an envelope provided by the Department for that purpose. After evaluation the envelope will be sealed and immediately returned to the Department office.

B. Announcing Candidates Requesting RTP Action

1. A notice soliciting input from students, faculty and staff shall be posted in public areas. The notice shall include names of candidates and their requested RTP action and DRTPC Chair contact information for submission of any signed statements. and will be included in the faculty's Working Personnel Action File (15.7(b)).

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

2. Approved RTP criteria is to be used to evaluate candidate's performance.

C. Peer Observations

1. A member of the DRTP Committee or a designated tenured faculty member will contact the faculty, and arrange for a mutually acceptable time(s) for the peer observations. A faculty member of a higher rank than the candidate must conduct peer observations.
2. DRTP Committee members will submit, to the DRTP Committee Chair, a narrative description of observations during the classroom visit, using the Department Peer Observation Form.

II.2.302 The Committee shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions for each of the candidate's request for action:

- A. Reappointment to next probationary year,
- B. Reappointment with tenure,
- C. Reappointment with early tenure,
- D. Promotion to requested rank,
- E. Early promotion to requested rank,
- F. Termination (available for candidates currently in first or second probationary year),
- G. Reappointment with terminal year (available for candidates in either third, fourth, fifth or sixth probationary year),
- H. Deny promotion,
- I. Deny early promotion,
- J. Deny early tenure.

II.2.303 Decisions must be supported and shall address all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the Committee by the candidate or requested by the Committee from the candidate.

The Committee, in their evaluation of the candidate's request, shall take into account information from the following sources:

- A. Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations in accordance with Appendix 1328,1329 and Section 305 of the University Manual;
- B. Summaries and interpretations of peer observations of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy no. 1328, Section and 305 of the University Manual;

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

- C. Self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);
- D. Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);
- E. Material requested from the candidate by the Committee that includes requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package;
- F. Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the Committee before the closing date.

II.2.304 The Committee will make its evaluation of the candidate's request in writing on University approved forms. The chair of the Committee will review with the candidate the results of the Committee's evaluation. The candidate will then be given the opportunity to either accept the Committee's recommendation, or to submit within ten (10) working days either a response/rebuttal or request reconsideration (Section 7.4E, Policy no. 1328 of the University Manual). If the candidate does not acknowledge the recommendations of the Committee, the Department Chair shall forward the RTP package to the next level of review and document the fact that the candidate was told of the Committee's evaluation and recommendation and refused to acknowledge them. Policy no. 1328 states:

"Before forwarding its recommendations, the DRTPC shall notify each candidate of its recommendation in his/her case. Such notification shall consist of a copy of the DRTPC's written statements that the candidate shall be asked to sign. If the candidate is off campus, notification must be made by registered mail, return receipt requested. If the candidate refuses to sign, the DRTPC chair shall document the fact that the candidate was apprised of the DRTPC's evaluation and recommendation and refused to sign. When the candidate is notified, he/she shall indicate his/her reaction to the DRTPC's evaluation and recommendations by checking the appropriate box, and by signing on the appropriate page of the Faculty Performance Review Form. The candidate has ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the DRTPC's recommendation to appeal the DRTPC action to the CRTPC in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.1 of this policy. In addition to, or in lieu of a formal appeal to the CRTPC, the candidate may submit, within ten (10) calendar days, a response or rebuttal statement to the DRTPC's recommendation to be included in his/her RTP package."

In the request for reconsideration, the candidate must clearly deal with each issue raised by the Committee and show how the facts clearly show that the original opinion of the candidate must be sustained, and where the Committee was in error when it examined the same or related facts. Brevity and clarity are encouraged since this request for reconsideration will become part of the RTP package and be examined by the Committee and other review groups.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

The candidate has ten (10) calendar days, from the receipt of notification, to appeal to the College RTP Committee final recommendation. Appeal is not obligatory. The candidate is advised to consult Policy no. 1328, Sections 7.4E and 8.1 of the University Manual. In addition to, or in lieu of a formal appeal to the College RTP Committee, the candidate may submit a response or rebuttal statement to the Committee's final recommendation to be included in the RTP package.

II.2.4 DEPARTMENT CHAIR DUTIES

II.2.401 Non-tenured department chairs, or chairs who are candidates for an RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC or to write separate recommendations (Policy no. 1328 3.1.E).

II.2.402 The Department Chair may elect to conduct his/her separate evaluation only if the Department Chair is not elected to the DRTP Committee. Any Chair's evaluation will be based on the DRTP Criteria (i.e. class visitation, evaluation of class material, etc.). The chair cannot write a separate evaluation for candidates at the same or higher rank.

II.2.403 If the Department Chair makes a separate recommendation that recommendation will be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. The candidate will receive a copy of the Department Chair's recommendation.

II.3 STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING – in this section the specific procedures called for in policy no. 1328 and 1329 must be followed. These procedures should include the method of administering the department standard evaluation form in classes as well as the method of soliciting input on RTP candidates. The department form should be included in this section or as an appendix (see Appendix II) .

II.3.301 All tenured faculty members (even when no personnel action is involved) are student- evaluated following the minimum of student evaluations established by the university. All student evaluations must be included in the evaluation. Non-tenured tenure track faculty and all lecturers are student evaluated in all courses taught and results must be included in the evaluation package submitted by the candidate. Summaries of all student evaluations conducted will be forwarded along with the RTP package.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty and/or designated staff approved by the Department Chair will distribute and collect the evaluation forms. This shall be done using the official student evaluation form approved by the Department.

The candidate must submit all student evaluation summaries completed since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment. A discussion of how the release time from teaching was used is required.

II.4 PEER OBSERVATIONS OF TEACHING - in this section the specific procedures called for in Policy no. 1328 should be outlined (see also Policy no. 1329, sections 3.2 and 3.3).

II.4.401 The DRTP Committee shall delegate tenured faculty the responsibility of visiting classes taught by the candidate in order to observe teaching performance. Preferably two different classes taught in preferably different semesters will be

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

observed. If a candidate requests more than two class visitations, all peer observations must be included in the evaluation.

All class visits must be documented in writing using the Peer Observation Form approved by the Department and included in this document as an appendix (see Appendix III). This information will be shared with the entire Committee.

Furthermore, the person planning to conduct such visit at least one week in advance should inform the candidate within five working days of the upcoming visit. A written report of the classroom visit should be given to the candidate within ten calendar days of the visit.

Peer observations of teaching performance shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught by the candidate. In addition to classroom visits, peer observations shall include a review of course syllabus and relevant course materials.

Only peer observations conducted either prior to or during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. Exceptions may be allowed by the DRTPC if the candidate does not have the minimum number of peer observations.

- II.5. CANDIDATES AND FUTURE CANDIDATES serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also Policy no. 1328, section 305).
- a) Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by fax or email, and must provide fax numbers or addresses to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.
 - b) Individuals who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The department may articulate expectations for these exceptional situations in the DRTP Criteria document. If these exceptions are not addressed in the department criteria, then the candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing an interpretation of the department criteria in light of the special circumstances. The Dean, URTPC chair, and Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Faculty Affairs shall approve this memorandum of understanding.
- II.5.501 Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave:
- A. The Committee must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching and administrative assignment for the University, or visiting professor/scholar at another institution. Faculty on leave shall be evaluated using the above stated criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity and service with suitable modifications listed below.
- II.5.502 Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment:

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

- A. For promotion and tenure, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses equivalent to an average of 18 WTUs per year since the last RTP action. At least 4 WTU's shall be during the Fall semester when the candidate requests action. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- B. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- C. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving an administrative assignment without the written consent of DRTPC, the Department Chair and the College Dean. The Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

II.5.503 Faculty Serving in Academic Governance:

- A. For promotion and tenure, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught Department courses equivalent to an average of 18 WTUs since the last RTP action. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- B. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- C. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of DRTPC, the Department Chair and the College Dean. The Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

II.5.504 Faculty On Approved Leave:

- A. Faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President of the University are on approved leave. Normally, this is with pay from this University and thus, for tenure track candidates, the probationary status is still active and the next several paragraphs apply. If the approved leave is without pay from the University then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate are inactive ("the clock has stopped") and the next several paragraphs do not apply.
- B. For promotion and tenure, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at this University, Department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.
- C. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department. The Committee, whether alone or in collaboration with others, can examine research and scholarly activity done at another institution, for the purposes of fulfilling the Department's criteria in the area of scholarly or creative activity.

- D. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving on approved leave without the written consent of DRTPC, the Department Chair and the College Dean. The Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

II. 6 CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

II.6.1 The candidate initiates all RTP requests. The candidate must inform the DRTPC Chair in writing that either there will or will not be a request for consideration. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then the candidate must notify the Committee Chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action.

II.6.2 At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups. The candidate can withdraw the request, without prejudice, at any level of review.

II.6.3 In the self-evaluation, the candidate must be clear, concise and relevant when addressing the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The candidate must submit evidence to the DRTP Committee that he/she has fulfilled the RTP criteria. Furthermore, the evaluation shall unequivocally contain the following items:

A. Discussion of teaching performance. This includes a discussion of the student evaluations and peer observations. A summary table for all courses evaluated including the average scores for all questions per course and the averages per questions throughout all the courses evaluated must be included in the packet by the candidate (see sample table in Appendix 1 of this document). All deficiencies noted in the student evaluations and peer observations shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made towards rectifying them must be addressed. In this section the candidate may address other activities related to teaching including adopting new teaching techniques, innovations in courses, developing and teaching a new course, substantial reviews of existing courses, using new technology, etc. . The faculty member shall be responsible for identification of materials for review consideration "as well as materials required by campus policy"; states evaluating committees and administrators are responsible for identifying and providing materials relating to evaluation required by campus policy but not accessible to the employee (CBA 15.12a), and copies of added material shall be provided to the faculty member (CBA15.12(b)).

1. Faculty members teaching online are subject to all the rights and conditions set out in CBA Article 15 and applicable campus evaluative policies. The collection and use of online course quantitative data for evaluation purposes shall only occur when required in campus evaluation policies and procedures (15.3)."
2. The faculty member shall be given at least 5 days notice that an "online observation, and/or review of online content" is to take place; additional consultation shall occur regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits.

A. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities. This includes specific citation of all peer reviewed publications, dates of attendance of all professional meetings, and explicit reference to all activities listed. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.

- B. Discussion of service to the University, College, Department, professional societies and Community. This includes specific citation of Committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.

- II.6.4 The period of time covered by the self-evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; promotion and tenure evaluations on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position.
- II.6.5 The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and to make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personal Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the Committee and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. Additional support documents need to be included in a separate binder as an Appendix to the evaluation package, which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, art work, etc.). These supplemental materials can be located in the faculty member's office, Department office, or dean's/director's office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the RTP package.

SECTION III - CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION

III.1 ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION

In this section, the department should provide an overview of the criteria areas and how accomplishments in each of these areas shall be assessed. The criteria areas must include teaching/advising, professional and scholarly activity, and service to department/ college/university/community and professional societies.

III.1.101 Departmental Evaluation of Candidate

The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless stated in writing, to the agreement of the candidate, the Committee, the University RTP Committee, and the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Academic Affairs.

- III.1.102 Policy no. 1328 prescribes the departmental RTP criteria document that a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion is entitled to use. The Office of Faculty Affairs informs the candidate, in September, of the criteria documents available to him/her. Candidates are responsible for ensuring that they use the appropriate criteria documents.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

- III.1.103 In promotion and tenure considerations, Committee members must have a higher academic rank than the candidate. Naturally, candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion and tenure review peer review Committees. A tenured associate professor may serve on an RTP Committee to consider requests for tenure by untenured Associate Professors.
- III.1.104 The deliberations of the Committee shall remain confidential. Each Committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the Committee. The Committee shall not assign any of its duties to any other group or individual.
- III.1.105 The candidate is evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Success in teaching performance will be the primary basis for evaluation. Scholarly and creative activity is also considered very important and is given more weight in proportion to the amount of release time the candidate had for this activities over the length of her/his probationary period. The candidate is expected to show meaningful Committee activity at the Department, College and University level as well as participation in professional societies and/or the community external to the University. Candidates need to address each one of the items described below.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

1. Student evaluations and Peer Observations

1.1 Student evaluations- Examination and discussion of student evaluation is required. Candidates are required to examine in detail the results of the student evaluations and comment upon them in the RTP package. Candidates will summarize the information by averaging the scores for each question across courses evaluated and presenting this information in a table (see Appendix I). Average scores of all questions for a course or average scores of each question across the courses evaluated where student evaluations were lower than 2.75 (on a 1 to 4 scale where 4 is best), should be explained and if appropriate, a plan of action should be addressed with the expectation that the candidate shows evidence of striving for excellence. Likewise, the Committee in their recommendation shall examine the candidate's student evaluations in detail and document their findings.

1.2 Candidates are required to examine in detail the peer observations and comment upon them in the RTP package. If deficiencies were noted or improvement was suggested, candidates need to provide a plan for improvement.

2. Syllabi, laboratory exercises and related activities should be well organized.
3. Appropriate and effective teaching strategies should be used to meet learning objectives and stimulate critical and creative thinking.
4. Assessment of student performance such as examinations, assignments, etc., should be in accordance with teaching objectives. Criteria for assessment should be clearly explained to students.
5. Evidence that the candidate is participating in the Department Outcomes Assessment plan should be provided.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

6. Participate in new course development, which may include service learning, Expanded Course Outline revisions, and general curriculum development, as appropriate.
7. Professional obligations should be met such as being on time for classes, meeting office hours, and returning exams and assignments promptly to provide continuous feedback to students.
8. It is required that the candidate discusses how release time from teaching was used.
9. See II.6.3 for online class requirements

B. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity (Professional Growth)

The DRTP Committee based on the following activities will evaluate scholarly and creative activities. Candidates should discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities should be noted, and should increase over the probationary period with increased participation in A activities over time.

A Activities

- 1) Publication of a peer-reviewed paper in a journal.
- 2) Publication of book, a chapter in a multi-authored book, or manual in their professional area excluding self-published materials.
- 3) External funding received from grants, contracts, or gifts
- 4) Achieving goals established for grants within the timeline approved for the grant with clarification of the contribution (publications cannot be counted twice). All goals for each grant count as one A activity.
- 5) Each year of service as an active member of the board of directors or executive committee of a professional organization or foundation.
- 6) Being the main organizer of a professional conference, workshop or short course.
- 7) Editor of a book, textbook in the area of expertise.
- 8) Each year of service as editor of a peer reviewed journal.
- 9) Speaking presentation at a conference with book of abstracts or proceedings.
- 10) Serving as a Chair of the graduate committee for each student pursuing the Thesis Master's degree.
- 11) Serving as a Chair or member of the graduate committee for each student pursuing a PhD degree.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

- 12) Earning a certification, license or credential in a field relevant to one's professional practice.

B Activities

- 1) Consultation with industrial, business or government agencies related to her/his area of expertise.
- 2) Speaking engagements related to her/his area of expertise.
- 3) Attendance at professional meetings at international, national, regional or local levels.
- 4) Development and submission of grant and contract proposals and manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals.
- 5) A poster or an oral presentation by a coauthor at a professional meeting with book of abstracts or proceedings.
- 6) Internally funded grants and contracts by University and/or College.
- 7) Each year serving as a reviewer of grants or manuscripts for each call for proposals or for each journal.
- 8) Serving as member of the graduate committee for a student pursuing the Thesis Master's degree.
- 9) Serving as Chair or member of the graduate committee for a student pursuing the non-thesis option of the Master's degree.
- 10) Serving as Chair of the graduate committee for a student pursuing a Thesis Baccalaureate degree.
- 11) Publications in newspapers or popular journals in the area of expertise.

C. Evaluation of University and Community Service

The DRTP Committee will evaluate Service activities provided to the university community's, at different levels. Candidates should discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities should be noted, and should increase over the probationary period with increased participation in A activities over time. A activities will be given higher weight by the Committee, but the DRTP Committee in their deliberations will consider substantial participation in B activities. C activities are considered mandatory.

A Activities

1. Academic advising of assigned students.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

2. Participation in college or university committees that require significant time commitments (e.g., meets once a week) and produce and contribute to the College and University (e.g., academic program revisions, strategic planning, curriculum development).
3. Serving as chair of a department, college or university committee and /or task force.
4. Serving as advisor of an active student club.
5. Development of student recruitment materials such as brochures, videos, computer presentations, web sites and displays that were adopted for use by the department.
6. Successful establishment of an ongoing multi-student undergraduate or graduate internship.
7. Organizing a regional student conference or competition.
8. Service in a leadership position in professional societies (e.g. President/Chair, Vice-President/Vice-Chair, Secretary and Treasurer of the board, Chair of a Committee).

B Activities

1. Speaking engagements to campus and/or community groups.
2. Judging for community events.
3. Active participation in community service organizations related to the area of expertise.
4. Recruitment activities such as speaking in high school or community college career days.
5. Serving on advisory committees for community colleges or other educational, professional and community institutions or organizations where contributions are made to curricular and program development.
6. Member of a professional society's committee or task force.
7. Writing letters of recommendation for students and alumni.
8. Mentoring/Advising or coaching a student group involved in extracurricular activity(ies) relevant to one's area of expertise.
9. Serving on department search committee with significant time commitment

C Activities

1. Membership and participation in professional organizations related to his/her area of expertise.
2. Participation in Department committees, task forces and/or activities.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

- III.2. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT – note that these must guide the candidate toward tenure, articulate clearly the expectation of growth during the probationary period.
- III.2.201 Reappointment means that the candidate is re-applying for the next probationary year. Reappointment, beyond the second year, is not automatic and must be requested according to established procedures. If the initial appointment allowed for one or two years credit, then reappointment must take place at the beginning of the last year of the initial appointment period. Candidates successful in obtaining reappointment will be reappointed to the next probationary year. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their first or second probationary year will be granted termination effective at the end of the current academic year. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their third, fourth, fifth year will be granted reappointment with terminal year.
- III.2.202 Candidate is responsible for making sure that classes have student evaluations completed as required. The only accepted means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in faculty performance review is to reach students collectively, not individually. Any solicitation by the candidate on his/her own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is considered unprofessional and is prohibited. This does not mean that the candidate cannot use other forms of evaluation. It just means that anything other than Department approved student evaluation forms and the results from the use of these forms cannot be included in the RTP package.
- III.2.203 Candidate needs to work closely with the DRTPC in order to schedule the minimum number of peer observations of teaching performance. A candidate may request additional peer observations beyond those initiated by the Committee and such requests are to be directed to the DRTPC Chair. All original, Department-approved peer observation forms must be included in the RTP package. The candidate must provide the course syllabus and other relevant teaching materials to the observer preferably before the class visitation.
- III.2.204 A probationary faculty member must apply for reappointment during an RTP cycle if the previous reappointment letter (or initial appointment letter) specifies that the term of (re) appointment expire at the end of the current academic year. The only exception is the case of a probationary faculty member in the sixth probationary year, who must apply for tenure. The DRTP Committee will evaluate candidates in the following areas. Below are the areas the DRTPC will consider for evaluating the candidate.
- A. Success in teaching performance will be the primary basis for evaluation. Such evaluation is the responsibility of the DRTP Committee and will utilize these evaluative tools:
1. Results from the peer observations using the peer observation form (Appendix II of this document) should be satisfactory or better (on a 6 point scale with “Not demonstrated” as the lowest score to “Excellent” as the highest). Areas that were marked as “needs improvement” or “not demonstrated” must be addressed.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

2. Results from student evaluations using the Department approved form.
 - a) Student evaluations should average 2.75 or better per course and for each question across all courses on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being best, with the expectation that the candidate shows evidence of striving for excellence.
 3. Satisfactory evaluation of teaching materials such as, syllabi, assignments, tests, term papers and other materials relevant to lecture and laboratory as reflected by peer observations and/or by additional review by the DRTPC of those materials.
- B. The DRTP Committee shall evaluate the quality of Scholarly and Creative Activity.
1. Candidate must regularly participate in both A and B activities described in this document (III.1.105.B) to be considered for reappointment. Candidate must regularly participate in both A and B activities commensurate with the academic rank and demonstrate progress for promotion and tenure based on the minimum requirements as shown on **Table 1**. Candidates should discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities should be noted, and should increase over the probationary period with increased participation in A activities over time. A activities will be given higher weight by the Committee. It is required that the candidate discusses how release time was used for Scholarly and Creative Activity/Activities.
- C. Involvement in University and Community Service (A, B and C activities)
1. Candidate must regularly participate in both A and B activities described in this document (III.1.105.C). Candidates should discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities should be noted (A + B), and should increase over the probationary period with increased participation in A activities over time. A activities will be given higher weight by the Committee, but the DRTP Committee in their deliberations will consider substantial participation in B activities. C activities are considered mandatory.

III.3 CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, OR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR, OR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR AND EARLY TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

III.3.301 There are separate criteria for tenure and promotion to various levels. Policy no. 1328, 2.1 states that: "Explicit criteria must be elaborated for the following actions: reappointment, tenure, early tenure, promotion (by academic rank), and early promotion (by academic rank)."

III.3.302 Reappointment (see requirements III.2.201)

According to Policy no. 1328, 7.3, "Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance." Policy no. 1328, 7.4.C, states, "In particular, candidates for reappointment must discuss their progress toward meeting department requirements for tenure.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment must provide evidence that the recommendations from the previous DRTPC review as well as any issues that needed correction or rectification were properly addressed. If the candidate does not provide evidence, or if after careful consideration the DRTPC determines that the candidate did not satisfactorily address recommendations or needed corrections or rectifications, the DRTPC will not recommend reappointment.

III.3.303 Tenure

Tenure is the status conferred on the candidate by the University that grants continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Tenure is requested at the beginning of the sixth probationary year or earlier if the candidate seeks early tenure. Candidates successful in obtaining tenure will be reappointed with tenure.

Failure to obtain tenure at the end of the sixth probationary year results in the granting of reappointment to terminal year. A request for tenure is possible only when a probationary faculty member has begun the last of the probationary period. The request is obligatory in this case.

According to Policy no. 1328, 7.3, “tenure evaluations are based on the period since original appointment to the probationary position.”

III.3.304. Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, or for Early Promotion to Professor

Candidates are required to assemble a RTP package that documents accomplishments and makes a positive case for the requested action. In preparation of this package and before submittal, the candidate is invited to seek counsel from the Department RTP Committee regarding the preparation of the RTP package.

- A. A request for early tenure and/or promotion is never obligatory. Policy no. 1328 of the University Manual requires that an applicant of early actions must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona before the effective date of early action. Thus, a faculty member’s application for early action can occur no earlier than the third year on campus.
- B. Criteria for early actions shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession.

1. Criteria for teaching: exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications will be demonstrated by: average scores of student evaluations must be 3.25 or better per course and for each question averaged across courses. In addition peer observations using the peer evaluation form should be “very good” or “excellent” (on a 6 point scale with “Not demonstrated” as the lowest score to “Excellent” as the highest). Any concerns provided through signed statements (Bronco ID number required for students) must be addressed by the candidate and reviewed by the DRTPC.

2. Criteria for scholarly and creative activities: to demonstrate exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications for early actions, expectations for

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

productivity as reflected in Table 1 must be at least 20% higher than the minimum number of A and A+B activities as shown in **Table 2**.

3. Criteria for service to the university and profession: to demonstrate exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications for early actions: Candidates must have regularly participated in both A and B activities described in this document each probationary year to be considered for early action. Candidates should discuss his/her exceptional individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities should be noted, and should increase over the review period with increased contributions through A activities over time. A activities will be given higher weight by the Committee. Participation in B and C activities is considered mandatory.

III.3.305 Promotion

Promotion means the candidate seeks a change in rank commensurate with accomplishments deserving merit and recognition. The first request for promotion shall be made at the time that tenure is requested. A tenured faculty member applies for subsequent promotion after having served four years in rank.

A request for promotion to Professor is never obligatory. The request for promotion to Professor will be considered only if the candidate has served four years in rank of Associate Professor. The candidate may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. Furthermore, promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion. According to Policy no. 1328, 7.3, "Promotion evaluations are based on the period since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment".

III.3.306 Personnel action requests will be evaluated in the following areas using outcome measures as described. Candidates must demonstrate continued improvement in all areas.

- A. Success in teaching performance will be the primary basis for evaluation. Such evaluation is the responsibility of the DRTP Committee and will utilize these evaluative tools:
 - 1. Demonstration of continued improvement as reflected by peer observations.
 - 2. Results from student evaluations using the Department approved form. Student evaluations should average 2.75 or better on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being best, with the expectation that the candidate shows evidence of striving for excellence and demonstrates improvement over the evaluation period.
 - 3. Satisfactory evaluation of teaching materials such as, syllabi, assignments, tests, term papers and other materials relevant to lecture and laboratory as reflected by peer observations and/or by additional review by the DRTPC of those materials.
 - 4. Evaluation of unsolicited letters by students, if any (signed and with student ID number included).
- B. The DRTP Committee shall evaluate the quality of Scholarly and Creative Activity.
 - 1. Candidate must demonstrate minimum participation in both A and B activities as shown on Table 1 to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. Candidates

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

should discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities should be noted, and should increase over the probationary period with increased participation in A activities over time; however, there is no minimum number of B activities. A activities will be given higher weight by the Committee. The minimum expectations increase based on the total percentage of release time during the probationary period prior to the application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or tenure and promotion to Professor, or promotion to Professor as reflected in Table 1 (Table 1 and examples on how to use this table are provided on page 24):

C. Involvement in University and Community Service (A, B and C)

1. Candidates must have regularly participated in both A and B activities described in this document to be considered for personnel action. Candidates should discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A combination of A and B activities (A + B) should be noted, and should increase over the review period with increased participation in A activities over time. A activities will be given higher weight by the Committee, but the DRTP Committee in their deliberations will consider substantial participation in B activities. C activities are considered mandatory.

Table 1- Minimum number of required activities versus percent release from teaching load for scholarly and creative activities accounting for service credit

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Requirements	
	No service credit	1 year service credit	2 years service credit	A Activities	A+B Activities
Percent of release from teaching load for scholarly and creative activity	WTU out of 120 in 5 years of probationary period used for scholarly and creative activities	WTU out of 96 in 4 years of probationary period used for scholarly and creative activities	WTU out of 72 in 3 years of probationary period used for scholarly and creative activities	Minimum number of A activities for tenure and/or promotion (*)	Minimum number of A+B activities for tenure and/or promotion (*)
0%	0	0	0	10	30
10%	12	10	7	12	32
20%	24	19	14	14	36
30%	36	29	21	16	40
40%	48	38	28	18	44
50%	60	48	35	20	48

(*) No minimum number of B activities is required. A candidate is allowed to fulfill the minimum number of activities with only A activities instead of a combination of A and B activities. WTU refers to semester WTU.

Example that illustrates the use of Table 1:

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

If a candidate at the Assistant Professor rank received a one-year service credit, the probationary period is 4 years instead of 5 years and the total WTU for teaching would be 96 instead of 1 at the time of application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. If no release time was granted for scholarly and creative activity during those 4 years then the minimum number of A activities is 10 and the number of A and B activities combined is 30. A 10% release time for this candidate would be 10 WTU (rounded from 9.6). Therefore, if this candidate had 10 WTU of release time for scholarly and creative activity over the 4 years the minimum number of A activities would be 12 and the number of A and B activities combined would be 32.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

Table 2- Minimum number of required activities versus percent release from teaching load for scholarly and creative activities for early promotion

Percent of release from teaching load for scholarly and creative activity	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Requirements	
	1 year early promotion	2 years early promotion	A Activities	A+B Activities
	WTU out of 96 in 4 years of probationary period (*)	WTU out of 72 in 3 years of probationary period (*)	Minimum number of A activities for early tenure and/or promotion	Minimum number of A+B activities for early tenure and/or promotion
0%	0	0	12	36
10%	10	7	14	38
20%	19	14	17	43
30%	29	21	19	48
40%	38	28	22	53
50%	48	35	24	58

(*) No minimum number of B activities is required. A candidate is allowed to fulfill the minimum number of activities with only A activities instead of a combination of A and B activities. WTU refers to semester WTU.

Example that illustrates the use of Table 2:

If candidate applies one year early for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the probationary period is four years instead of five years and the total WTU would be 96 instead of 120 at the time of application for promotion and/or tenure. If no release time was granted for scholarly and creative activity during those four years then the minimum number of A activities is 12 and the number of A and B activities combined is 36 (accounting for the extra 20% expected for early actions). A 10% release time for this candidate would be 10 WTU (rounded from 9.6). Therefore, if this candidate had 10 WTU of release time for scholarly and creative activity over the four years the minimum number of A activities would be 14 and the number of A and B activities combined would be 38 (accounting for the extra 20% expected for early actions).

APPENDICES

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

APPENDIX I

Sample
Table for summarizing scores from student evaluations

Question	Course #1	Course #2	Course #3	Course #4	etc.	Average per question
1						
2						
3						
etc.						
Average per class						

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

APPENDIX II

HNFS INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. I understood the learning outcomes in this course.
2. To me, the course content seemed well organized.
3. To me, class sessions seemed well organized.
4. The time I spent in class sessions furthered my understanding of the course material.
5. Examples and illustrations provided in this course aided my understanding.
6. The course provided some general concepts that helped me see connections among specific topics.
7. The course was a valuable learning experience for me.
8. The assignments in this course aided my learning.
9. I was able to effectively use instructor feedback to increase my learning.
10. I learned ways of reasoning that I could apply to other disciplines.
11. My learning experience increased my appreciation for the subject covered.
12. I gained awareness of the relevance and importance of the course material.
13. The course made a relevant contribution to my overall education.
14. I felt I was evaluated fairly in this class.
15. I felt I was treated with respect in this class.
16. The class atmosphere supported my learning.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

17. I felt encouraged to contribute respectful dialogue to this class.

Answer the next three questions only if you have first-hand experience from making contact for help.

18. When I sought outside help from the instructor (such as by phone, e-mail or office visit),
I received it.

19. I felt welcome to seek help and advice from the instructor.

20. The help I received from the instructor was useful to my learning.

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

APPENDIX III

HNFS PEER OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

Form last reviewed: 04-17-13

Date of Peer Observation: _____

Instructor's name: _____

Course Prefix: _____ Name of course: _____

Topic covered during observation: _____

Materials to be provided for review (to assess quality of materials):

- Course syllabus
- Class handouts
- Copy of PPT slides used during observation if not included
- Example exam with summary of class performance with key if possible
- For writing or presentation assignments, include the rubric and outcome
- Provide access to Course Blackboard or equivalent platform

Write Y (yes) or N (no) for each one of the items shown below:

1. **Course Materials:**

- a. Syllabus includes:
- ___ Course title and number, time offered and class location
 - ___ Catalog description
 - ___ Unit hours
 - ___ Instructor name, office hours and office number
 - ___ Instructor office phone number and e-mail
 - ___ Course pre-requisites and co-requisites
 - ___ Course learning objectives (if DPD class these need to comply with ACEND 2012 standards as posted in ECO on blackboard)
 - ___ Outline of content (schedule or timetable) including assignments and exam
 - ___ Description of teaching methods
 - ___ Method of student evaluation/grading system
 - ___ Required and recommended readings
 - ___ Safety information
 - ___ Policy on make-up exams and assignment
 - ___ Policy on attendance
 - ___ Information on academic honesty
- b. PowerPoint slides: organization, clarity, sequence, use
- c. Handouts if applicable: content, follows lecture
- d. Blackboard/Other platform: organization, use by class
- e. Instructions for assignments
- f. Rubrics: posted with assessment assignments – exams, presentations, papers, team projects, etc.
- g. Sample exams

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

Course materials are comprehensive, organized and clearly communicated:

Not demonstrated	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments on materials submitted for review (see above- syllabus, exam, assignment rubric, etc.):

2. Knowledge, currency and command of course material

Instructor demonstrates command of course material and knowledge of current/future developments.

Not demonstrated	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

3. Clear and Effective Communication

Instructor interacts with students and stimulates student interest at the beginning of class- by a story, video clip, brief review of current material, asking for student response, etc. Online discussion boards, announcements and general communications in electronic form (if applicable) are clear and respectful. Instructor speaks audibly and clearly, presentation is understandable. Instructor responds to students in a clear, thoughtful, and respectful manner.

Not demonstrated	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

4. Educational Climate for Learning Experience

Instructor shows passion and enthusiasm about subject. Instructor is cognizant of and attentive to student behavior, encouraging all to participate, pace of the lecture appropriate for learning. Students show interest in the subject material and are active participants in the class discussion. Students respond to instructor questions, and ask pertinent questions. Students demonstrate a good rapport with instructor.

Not demonstrated	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

5. Instructional Methods and Use of Materials

Instructor includes activities to increase student participation and engage students such as use of group/team assignments, discussion assignments, sample materials from current news, lay publications or scientific publications, etc. Assignments are relevant to the course.

Not demonstrated	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

6. Classroom management

Instructor makes effective use of class time; lectures stay on schedule according to updated posted time table for the course. Instructor clearly states expectations, demonstrates preparation and organization. Instructor presents clearly the goals and learning objectives, manages classroom dynamics and controls class behavior.

Not demonstrated	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

HNFS DRTP CRITERIA

7. What are the instructor's strengths for teaching?

8. Suggestions and constructive recommendations to assist instructor?

Date of Discussion of Assessment with Instructor:

Instructor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Peer Observer: _____ Date: _____

Instructor comments (not required):