

√	<b>Main areas that need to be addressed in the department's RTP criteria document</b>	<b>Referenced Material</b> <b>Policy #1328, Policy #1329, and/or</b> <b>Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) *</b>
<h2 style="color: #0056b3;">DRTPC Structure</h2>		
	<p>1) Specify structure and size of the DRTPC</p> <p>2) DRTPC members must be elected by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department <u>via secret ballot</u></p> <p>3) Specify procedure for the election of the DRTPC Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structure, size, and procedures of the DRTPC <b>shall</b> be determined by the probationary and tenured faculty in the department within limits stipulated in this document. (#1328, 3.1C)</li> <li>• Three (3) to seven (7) for departments with ten (10) or fewer faculty eligible to serve, five (5) to nine (9) for departments with eleven (11) to seventeen (17) faculty eligible to serve, seven (7) to fifteen (15) for departments with eighteen (18) or more faculty eligible to serve. The DRTPC <b>shall</b> always have an odd number of members. (#1328, 3.1A)</li> <li>• Annual elections by secret ballot <b>must</b> be conducted by <b>March 1</b> of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election <b>shall</b> be by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The DRTPC's term of service <b>shall</b> not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC's recommendations have been concluded. (#1328, 3.1D)</li> <li>• The DRTPC Chair <b>shall</b> be a full-time tenured faculty. (#1328, 3.1B)</li> </ul>
	<p>4) Specify the role of department chair</p> <p>[Note: a separate Chair review would need to be done concurrently and independently, without consulting with the DRTPC or reading their recommendation]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structure <b>shall</b> include whether the department chair will be a member of the DRTPC or write a separate statement. Non-tenured department chairs, or chairs who are candidates for a RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC or to write separate recommendations. (#1328, 3.1E)</li> </ul>
<h2 style="color: #0056b3;">RTP Procedures</h2>		
	<p>5) Define procedure for the DRTPC and Department Chair to consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RTP package is the working PAF for the purposes of RTP evaluation [ ]. However, evaluating committees and administrators should consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials. (#1328, 1.5)</li> </ul>

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS - CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF RTP CRITERIA DOCUMENTS

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, or promotion or any other personnel action <b>shall</b> be based on the Personnel Action File. (CBA 15.12c)</li> </ul>
	<p>6) Specify procedures to handle requests for external reviewers either by the faculty member under review or the DRTPC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A request for an 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 <b>shall</b> document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an external reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request <b>must</b> be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee. (CBA 15.12d)</li> </ul>
	<p>7) Specify procedures for peer observation of teaching, including how peers will be assigned for class observations</p> <p>8) Is the current peer observation form appropriate for hybrid and/or online courses or does the department need to develop different templates?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific procedures and forms for peer evaluation of teaching <b>shall</b> be included in the Department RTP Document. (#1328, 3.3A)</li> <li>A minimum of two peer evaluations <b>shall</b> be conducted each academic year. Peer evaluations <b>shall</b> reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught (#1328, 3.3C)</li> <li>The DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and that a copy of each written evaluation is submitted to the faculty member within two weeks of the class visit. (#1328, 3.3C)</li> <li>[ ] the individual faculty unit employee being evaluated <b>shall</b> be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. There <b>shall</b> be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (CBA 15.14)</li> </ul>
	<p>9) Review questionnaire for official student evaluations of teaching</p> <p>Is questionnaire appropriate for labs, studios, online courses, and other types of courses or does the department need to develop additional instruments?</p> <p>10) Specify minimum score requirements for teaching evaluations</p> <p>11) Specify procedures for student evaluation of teaching via official questionnaires</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The probationary and tenured faculty of each department or equivalent unit <b>shall</b> design the instruments for official student evaluation. Instruments appropriate to the content, method of instruction, and learning objectives of the course <b>shall</b> be designed by the department. Therefore, there can be more than one instrument used for official student evaluation in a department. Departments are encouraged to ensure that evaluation instruments are reliable and valid for the purpose of collecting data for summative evaluation of faculty. The Faculty Center for Professional Development can provide resources and consultation to this end and faculty are urged to contact the center when developing evaluation instruments. (#1329, 3.2.1)</li> <li>The instruments <b>shall not</b> provide for written student comments. (#1329, 3.2.3)</li> <li>Administration of student evaluations <b>shall</b> ensure anonymity of the students participating in the evaluation process. (#1329, E)</li> <li>Departmental procedures <b>shall</b> include safeguards which preclude tampering or other activities which may invalidate the results of the evaluation. (#1329, F)</li> </ul>

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS - CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF RTP CRITERIA DOCUMENTS

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of Policy #1329 for additional information on student evaluations</li> </ul>
	<p>12) Specify procedures for student evaluation of teaching via comments/ letters</p> <p>13) Define deadline for comments to be included in an evaluation cycle. This needs to be at least 10 days before the deadline for RTP packet submission so that the faculty member has time to produce a response that can be added to the RTP package.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The probationary and tenured members of the department <b>shall</b> develop specific procedures and forms for the DRTPC to receive signed evaluative material, commentary, and substantiating documentation. (#1328, 3.2 B1)</li> <li>• The plan <b>shall</b> include methods for publicizing (on department bulletin boards and other relevant locations, newsletters, etc.), names of DRTPC members to whom material is to be submitted, submission procedures, and, during a RTP cycle, the names of candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. If a DRTPC is divided into subcommittees, that information <b>shall</b> be available.(#1328, 3.2 B2)</li> <li>• The only professional manner to solicit student opinion on teaching performance for the purpose of peer review is by posting a public announcement, or by publication of such, or by some other means designed to reach students collectively, not individually. (#1329, 1.1)</li> <li>• Any solicitation by a faculty member 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. (#1329, 1.2)</li> <li>• A department chair or dean/director may, in response to an unsolicited oral comment from a student, advise the student that any formal consideration of the comment requires that it be reduced to a written, signed statement. (#1329, 1.4)</li> <li>• <u>At any time</u> a student may submit a letter/petition expressing his/ her opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter/petition <b>must</b> 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 <b>must</b> include the Bronco Identification Number of all student signators. The department chair/chair of the appropriate department evaluation committee <b>must</b> provide the faculty member with copies of such letters/petitions. The faculty member <b>shall</b> be allowed at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal. (#1329, 2.0)</li> <li>• Note: Comments received after an RTP cycle deadline would be taken into consideration in the next evaluation cycle; however, they still need to be given to the faculty member right away and provide the opportunity for rebuttal. Both documents would go to the PAF and considered in the next cycle</li> </ul>

## Criteria for RTP Evaluation

<p>Criteria must address all three main areas of evaluation</p> <p>14) Criteria expectations, and requirements must be clearly specified in each area for each action, leaving no room for confusion or need for interpretation by review committees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department RTP criteria must be consistent with university-wide RTP criteria; specifically, they <b>must</b> recognize the primary importance of teaching and the maintenance of appropriate academic standards, <b>must</b> address accomplishments in the area of scholarly and creative activities, and <b>must</b> address accomplishments in the area of service to the university, the profession, and the community. (#1328, 2.1)</li> <li>• Explicit criteria <b>must</b> be elaborated for the following actions: reappointment, tenure, early tenure, promotion (by academic rank), and early promotion (by academic rank). (#1328, 2.1)</li> </ul>
<p>15) Criteria also must address faculty performing other duties or on leave during the period covered by the review</p>	<p><b>Shall</b> address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance in the area of student advising/mentoring (#1328, 2.1)</li> <li>• Evaluation of teaching performance (#1328, 2.1)</li> <li>• Faculty serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties (#1328, 2.1)</li> <li>• Faculty serving in positions of academic governance (#1328, 2.1)</li> <li>• Consideration of activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties. Examples: sabbaticals and difference-in-pay leaves, fellowships, teaching abroad and administrative assignment for the university, visiting professor/scholar at another institution (#1328, 2.1)</li> <li>• The DRTPC <b>shall</b> consider relevant work done off-campus while the candidate was on professional leave of absence from Cal Poly Pomona. (#1328, 7.3)</li> </ul>
<p>16) Define explicit criteria for <b>Reappointment</b>. Keep in mind that those hired as Associate Professors without tenure will also have to go through the process of requesting reappointments until tenured</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reappointment criteria should clearly address the necessity of progress toward satisfying the criteria for tenure; that is, they should establish a progressively more rigorous set of expectations during the probationary period. (#1328, 2.1)</li> </ul>
<p>17) Define explicit criteria for <b>Tenure</b>. Keep in mind that requests for tenure will include consideration for promotion. A combined "tenure and promotion to [rank]" criteria may be used</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A probationary faculty unit employee <b>shall</b> normally be considered for promotion at the same time s/he is considered for tenure. (CBA 14.2)</li> </ul>
<p>18) Define explicit criteria for <b>Early tenure</b>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for early actions <b>shall</b> place emphasis on teaching and <b>shall</b> require exceptional performance or extraordinary</li> </ul>

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS - CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF RTP CRITERIA DOCUMENTS

		qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. (#1328, 2.6)
	19) Define explicit criteria for <b>Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A probationary faculty unit employee <b>shall</b> not normally be promoted during probation (CBA 14.2)</li> <li>• A probationary faculty unit employee <b>shall</b> normally be considered for promotion at the same time s/he is considered for tenure. (CBA 14.2)</li> </ul>
	20) Define explicit criteria for <b>Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for early actions <b>shall</b> place emphasis on teaching and <b>shall</b> require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. (#1328, 2.6)</li> </ul>
	21) Define explicit criteria for <b>Promotion to Professor</b> (w/tenure if probationary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probationary Associate Professors are also covered by provisions in CBA 14.2 quoted above for tenure and promotion.</li> </ul>
	22) Define explicit criteria for <b>Early Promotion to Professor</b> (w/early tenure if probationary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for early actions <b>shall</b> place emphasis on teaching and <b>shall</b> require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. (#1328, 2.6)</li> </ul>

**\*Note:** Shall or must in the CBA or University policies equals a mandatory requirement

### Important reminders to departments:

- All RTP criteria expectations must be clearly explained in the document, keeping in mind that faculty from other disciplines in higher level committees, CRTPC and URTPC, would be able to understand the criteria. Spell out any acronyms.
- **All candidates must** discuss progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle (#1328, 7.4C). This would include recommendations at all levels of review.
- **The DRTPC must** also include a discussion of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle (#1328, 7.4D). This would include recommendations at all levels of review.
- Current RTP criteria documents for all departments are posted online through the Faculty Affairs web page. This should be a resource for departments reviewing their own criteria.  
Go to: <https://www.cpp.edu/~faculty-affairs/rtp.shtml>