

[Amended 3/11/2022]

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) CRITERIA**  
2022-2027 Academic Years

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY .....	2
2. DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE .....	3
3. CAREFUL CONSIDERATION DEFINED .....	7
4. PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND RTP CALENDAR .....	7
5. PERFORMANCE REVIEW .....	12
6. CRITERIA FOR RETENTION (REAPPOINTMENT) .....	20
7. CRITERIA FOR TENURE.....	21
8. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION.....	22
9. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE/EARLY PROMOTION .....	23
10. EVALUATION OF FACULTY ON ADMINISTRATIVE TEMPORARY NON-TEACHING ASSIGNMENT (INCLUDING DEPARTMENT CHAIR).....	23
TABLE I WEIGHTED MODEL FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION.....	25
TABLE II SEVEN-POINT GRADUATED RATING SCALE .....	25
TABLE III MINIMUM REQUIRED COMPOSITE SCORES.....	26
TABLE IV INTERPRETATION OF GRADUATED RATING SCALE AND DEFINITIONS OF PERFORMANCE TERMS.....	26
EXHIBIT A “CAREFUL CONSIDERATION” DEFINED.....	27
EXHIBIT B POLICY ON FACULTY QUALIFICATION AND ENGAGEMENT.....	28

## **1.0 STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**

1.1 The faculty members of the Department of Accounting (“Department”) have prepared this document (“RTP Document”) to be a statement of the Department's policy on retention, tenure, and promotion. The retention, tenure, and promotion (“RTP”) criteria shall be included as part of the Department's personnel policy. The Department’s objective is to allow faculty members of the Department to bring their academic careers to fruition at California State Polytechnic University - Pomona (“University”). The Department's goal is to provide faculty members with an atmosphere conducive to the professional development of the individual leading to intellectual contributions.

1.2 A nurturing academic atmosphere requires mutual respect and individual freedom for each faculty member to pursue his or her interests to benefit the collective good. The Department's primary emphasis is on teaching excellence. The professional qualities required for retention, tenure, and promotion all emphasize qualities of excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Each individual shall possess these qualities to varying degrees. However, only collectively as a Department, do we expect to possess all of these qualities.

1.3 In conjunction with the qualities of a good teacher, faculty members are to teach by the "polytechnic" approach. Faculty members should incorporate their practical experiences into their teaching. Faculty members are also expected to continue developing their individual interests in their areas of specialization. Scholarly and creative activities are consistent with the polytechnic approach. Scholarly and creative activities are attained through contributions to business practice, learning and pedagogical research, and discipline-based scholarship.

1.4 In addition to teaching excellence and scholarly and creative activities, faculty members also must participate in professionally-related service to the Department, the College of Business Administration (College), the University, and the community. Faculty members are uniquely qualified to contribute to the mission of the University through service. Service includes the area of student development and relations, consulting activities, and academic governance.

1.5 This document establishes guidelines within which individual differences, interests, talents, and specialties can be nurtured and brought to fruition. The retention, tenure, and promotion criteria are not exhaustive, but rather are illustrative of the range of performance areas available for a faculty member of this University. Each faculty member has the obligation to carefully study the contents of this document, along with the University Manual and the Collective Bargaining Agreement of the California Faculty Association and The California State University.

1.6 The responsibility for furnishing documented evidence of performance lies with the candidate faculty member. The responsibility of evaluative judgment lies with the Department RTP Committee (DRTPC). The candidate faculty member and DRTPC shall work together in a professional manner so individual differences that contribute to the collective good shall be evaluated with tolerance, respect, encouragement, and equity.

1.7 All personnel procedures and decisions shall conform to the requirements prescribed in the appropriate sections of the University Manual and the Collective Bargaining Agreement of the California Faculty Association and The California State University.

1.8 For purposes of this RTP Document, "faculty members" refers to probationary and tenured

accounting faculty members. In addition, "administrative or other non-teaching assignments" refers to assignments not involving teaching at the University, such as service as a Dean or Associate Dean, performance of assigned administrative duties, or the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties serving as a visiting professor, another scholarly or research position, or on sabbatical or other leave.

## **2.0 DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE**

2.1 The Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) is responsible for insuring the integrity of the RTP process within the Department. The committee structure and function shall conform to Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual.

2.2 The DRTPC shall consist of full time, tenured and if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the Department and approved by the President, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The membership size for a DRTPC shall be: three (3) to seven (7) for departments with ten (10) or fewer full-time tenured faculty eligible to serve; five (5) to nine (9) for departments with eleven (11) to seventeen (17) full-time tenured faculty eligible to serve; seven (7) to fifteen (15) for departments with eighteen (18) or more full-time tenured faculty eligible to serve. The DRTPC may be larger than these minima at the discretion of the faculty members. If too few faculty members are available to form a DRTPC for all or some aspects of a DRTPC's work, faculty members from outside the Department shall be nominated and elected to supplement the DRTPC. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members.

2.3 The DRTPC shall be elected by secret ballot before the end of the winter quarter (spring semester) of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The DRTPC's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC's recommendations have been concluded. After the election of the DRTPC, the Department shall notify the Dean of the composition of the DRTPC.

2.4 The tenured and probationary faculty shall decide in this annual election whether the Department Chair shall be elected to the DRTPC. If the Department Chair is not elected as a member of the DRTPC, then the Department Chair shall prepare a separate evaluation or recommendation of the RTP candidates. This decision is made prior to the election of the remaining members of the DRTPC.

2.5 No DRTPC member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Also, in promotion considerations, the DRTPC members must have higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Tenured RTP candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any promotion or tenure actions considered by the DRTPC. However, tenured RTP candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the DRTPC.

2.6 Faculty on Professional Leave With Pay (sabbatical and difference in pay) may participate in DRTPC activities. Faculty, who know in advance that they shall, during one quarter (semester) or more, be unavailable or ineligible, should not be nominees for the DRTPC.

2.7 The DRTPC shall elect a chair who shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the Departmental RTP document and Policy Nos. 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual are carried out. The Department RTPC Chair shall perform the following duties:

- Schedule, in cooperation with the RTP candidates and other faculty, the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance; and
- Be the official custodian of the candidate's RTP package between the submission of the package to the DRTPC by the candidate and forwarding the package to the Dean. In this period, the DRTPC chair and only the DRTPC 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.

2.8 The DRTPC's duties include the following:

- Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to Department and University policy;
- Soliciting input from students by publicizing names of candidates for RTP action and names to whom signed statements may be submitted; and
- Evaluation of candidate's request for an RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.

2.9 The DRTPC shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions for each of the candidate's requests for action:

- Reappointment to next probationary year;
- Reappointment with tenure;
- Reappointment with Early Tenure;
- Promotion to requested rank;
- Early Promotion to requested rank;
- Termination (available for RTP candidates currently in their first or second probationary year);
- Reappointment with a terminal year (available for RTP candidates in either third, fourth, fifth, or sixth probationary year);
- Deny promotion;
- Deny Early Promotion; and
- Deny Early Tenure.

2.10 Decisions must be supported and shall address all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the DRTPC by the candidate or requested by the DRTPC from the candidate. No conditions or contingencies can be attached to the decision.

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

- Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations in accordance with Policy No. 1328 and Policy No. 1329 of the University Manual;
- Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance in accordance with Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual;
- Self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);
- Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);
- Material requested from the candidate by the DRTPC, which include requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package; and
- Other material in writing identified by the source submitted to the DRTPC before the closing date.

2.12 COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE

2.13 MEMBERSHIP

2.14 The size of the DRTPC shall be determined each Winter Quarter (Spring Semester) based on the minimum-size criteria set in paragraph 2.2 plus an alternate. The eligibility conditions exclude, among others, the following from membership: the Department Chair (if the Department decides that the Department Chair is to prepare separate evaluations of RTP candidates - see procedures below), a member of another RTP committee (see below), the president, vice presidents, deans, individuals on temporary administrative assignments of 0.5 or more, participants in FERP and, candidates for promotion considerations, a faculty member of the same or lower rank than a candidate being considered for promotion. The latter condition may, after the inclusion of the alternate, result in the composition of the DRTPC to vary according to the specific action that is being considered.

2.15 The Department faculty shall determine, through a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty, whether the Department Chair shall prepare separate evaluations or recommendations, or shall be elected to the DRTPC; in no case shall the Department Chair do both.

2.16 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).

2.17 If too few faculty members are available to properly constitute a DRTPC for all or some aspects

of a DRTPC's work, faculty members from outside the department shall be elected to supplement the DRTPC. Election of members outside the department members shall fully comply with all provisions under Policy No. 1328.

2.18 The provision for a standing alternate member of the DRTPC is provided below in 2.21 *et seq.*

2.19 The phrase "a member of another RTP Committee" shall be construed so that a member cannot serve on RTP committees at different levels but can serve on more than one Departmental level RTP Committee. In addition, a candidate for promotion cannot serve on any RTP Committee (at any level) during any academic year in which such Committee evaluates any member of the Department for tenure and/or promotion.

## 2.20 DRTPC ELECTION

2.21 DRTPC members shall be elected by secret ballot to one year term in the Winter Quarter (Spring Semester) for the next academic year. An alternate is also elected each year for a one-year term. All probationary and tenured faculty members are eligible to vote, regardless of the length of service.

2.22 The election procedure shall be as follows:

2.23 Each year a sufficient number of eligible faculty shall be elected to the DRTPC to meet the minimum-size criteria in 2.2 and 2.14.

2.24 A regular term on the DRTPC is one year, for both regular and alternate members.

2.25 If a faculty member is unable to complete her or his term and must be replaced, the vacant position shall be filled with the alternate elected in 2.21.

## 2.26 FUNCTIONS

2.27 The DRTPC shall conduct performance reviews at the Department level and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and promotion (Policy No. 1328).

## 2.28 DRTPC CHAIR

2.29 The chair of the DRTPC shall be elected by the full membership of the DRTPC prior to the end of the foregoing Winter Quarter (Spring Semester). The DRTPC chair shall be responsible for arranging DRTPC meetings, notifying DRTPC members of meeting times, observing the RTP calendar, communicating with the College RTP Committee, assigning colleagues to do classroom visitations, and administering all official business of the DRTPC in a timely manner.

## 2.30 AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP DOCUMENT

2.31 Tenured and probationary faculty members may, in any yearly cycle, as the need arises, amend the RTP document by simple majority vote.

2.32 The RTP document shall be systematically reviewed for possible amendment on a quinquennial

basis. In the year of such review, the Department shall select a Personnel Document Review Committee, which in turn shall elect its chair in the Fall Quarter (Fall Semester). The Committee shall have a 50/50 split between tenured and probationary faculty members, if possible.

2.33 The Personnel Document Review Committee is responsible for periodically evaluating all of the personnel documents of the Department of Accounting, including the Probationary and Temporary Faculty Appointment documents, the RTP Document, and the Post-Tenure Review Document.

2.34 By February 15, the Personnel Document Review Committee shall submit any proposed changes to the tenured and probationary faculty for consideration. The faculty members shall discuss the proposals in an open forum.

2.35 The eligible faculty members then shall vote by secret ballot on the proposals. Any approved revisions shall be submitted to the College RTP Committee and Dean of the College by April 1 of each year (Policy No. 1328).

### **3.0 “CAREFUL CONSIDERATION” DEFINED:**

3.1 Each RTP action shall be given “careful consideration” as defined in Exhibit A, which is an integral part of this document.

## **4.0 PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND RTP CALENDAR**

### **4.1 SELECTION OF RTP DOCUMENT BY CANDIDATE**

4.2 Each candidate for tenure (including Early Tenure) and/or promotion (including Early Promotion) may use either the Departmental RTP criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus or the Departmental RTP criteria in effect in the year the candidate requests action.

4.3 If a candidate requests simultaneous consideration for both promotion and tenure, the candidate must select a single set of criteria (Policy No. 1328).

### **4.4 SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED TO EVALUATE FACULTY**

4.5 Information from students, colleagues, and self-assessments is vital to any evaluative process designed to maintain high academic standards (*e.g.*, teaching effectiveness) and to provide constructive guidance to faculty members in achieving intellectual growth, professional development, and service. Each source of information (*e.g.*, students, colleagues, and self-assessments) offers important but limited insight.

4.6 Accordingly, the following sources of information, taken as a whole, shall be used:

- Information from students shall be used to assist in evaluating teaching effectiveness (*e.g.*, command of the subject, organization of instructional materials, clarity of presentation, dynamism, and enthusiasm) and academic advisement.
- Information from the candidate and other faculty members shall be used in appraising the

appropriateness of course and instructional objectives, reviewing teaching materials (e.g., assignments, handouts, tests, papers, and projects), mastery and currency of subject matter; displayed concern for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, service to the Department, College, University, and community, and marketability of the Department.

- The candidate is urged to use other relevant sources of information in support of teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

#### 4.7 INSTRUMENTS USED TO COLLECT INFORMATION

#### 4.8 Sources of Supporting Documentation in General

#### 4.9 Examples of sources of supporting documentation for teaching are:

Examinations, syllabi, course outlines, and teaching aids created and/or used by the candidate. Examples of sources of supporting documentation for scholarly and creative activities are: books, articles accepted for publication, contracts, grants, and other appropriate, professionally-generated materials and activities. Documentation supporting service to the Department, College, University, and community should come from colleagues, self-evaluation, committee members, personnel file, Personal Action File (PAF), engagement letters, and input from the community.

#### 4.10 Classroom Visitation Reports

4.11 Classroom visitation reports shall be prepared for all probationary faculty members and tenured faculty members requesting promotion. The following guidelines must be met:

- Classroom visitation reports shall be completed for at least two courses in two different quarters (semesters) each academic year, for second through sixth year probationary faculty members and faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion. First-year probationary faculty members (RTP candidates) shall be visited twice in different quarters (semesters) during their first year of appointment. Peer evaluations should reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. At the request of the candidate or DRTPC, additional visitations may take place. The course to be visited shall be selected by the DRTPC.
- The DRTPC chair shall request, from each RTP candidate requesting personnel action, a list of three preferred tenured faculty members who may perform his or her classroom visitation. The DRTPC chair shall appoint one of the three to perform the classroom visitation as requested. The visitor must be of a rank equal to or higher than that of the visatee (candidate). There shall be a mutual agreement between the visitor and the visatee (candidate) regarding dates for classroom visits.
- Classroom visitation forms shall be distributed by the DRTPC chair to the visitor and the visatee (candidate) prior to the pre-visit conference. Before the visit takes place, a pre-visit discussion shall take place between the visitor and the visatee (candidate). This discussion shall cover matters such as the course objectives, content and organization, approaches and methods used, and the relevance of the class to be visited to the overall course plan. The visitor shall arrange all meetings. The visatee shall furnish copies of syllabi, exams, and other instructional materials to the visitor.
- Within one week of the visit, a post-observation conference between visitor and visatee should be held. The discussion is to include a review of the visitation as well as the points that the visitor



proposes to include in the visitation report.

- Within one week of the post-observation conference, the visitor shall submit the visitation report to the visatee for review, along with a copy of the report to the DRTPC Chair. The visatee is to sign the report as verification of having seen the report (signature does not imply agreement). The visatee has the right to respond to the visitation report in writing within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the report. The signed report, and any response submitted by the visatee within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the visitation report, shall be forwarded to the DRTPC Chair.
- The visatee may request a second visitation at any time during the process. However, all visitation reports must be submitted to the DRTPC by the end of the ninth week of classes of the visatee's anniversary quarter (semester). The second visitor shall be selected by the DRTPC from the remaining two names originally submitted. Both the first and second reports shall become a part of the evaluation process.

#### 4.12 Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

4.13 Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness for all faculty members shall be obtained as specified in 4.17 and 4.18 below. The following guidelines shall be met in administering student evaluations:

- Department-authorized forms shall be used.
- The faculty member teaching the course shall not be present when the student evaluation is conducted.
- The results of student evaluation shall be included in the visatee's PAF.

#### 4.14 Candidate's Self-Evaluation

4.15 All RTP candidates shall provide the DRTPC with a self-evaluation describing the RTP candidate's achievements in the performance review criteria. The self-evaluation must include a synopsis of the RTP candidate's plans for teaching, scholarly, and service activities for the next two years.

4.16 The RTP candidate shall identify all materials to be considered and 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 the material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The RTP candidate should consider an appendix to the evaluation package which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, artwork, *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.

4.17 Policy No. 1329 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on student evaluations of teaching performance. The Accounting Department has decided to require that

student evaluations be administered in all classes taught each quarter (semester). The RTP candidate is to ensure that the required number of classes have completed student evaluations.

4.18 The only professional means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in a faculty performance review is to reach students collectively, not individually. Any solicitation by the RTP candidate on his/her own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is unprofessional and is prohibited. This does not mean that the RTP candidate cannot use other forms of evaluation. It just means that student evaluation forms other than Department approved student evaluation forms and the results from the use of these forms cannot be included in the RTP package.

4.19 A RTP candidate needs to work closely with the DRTPC in order to schedule the minimum number of peer reviews of teaching performance. As noted in 4.11, the minimum number of peer reviews is two per year in different quarters (semesters). An RTP candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those initiated by the DRTPC. Such requests are to be directed to the committee chair. All original, Department-approved peer review forms must be included in the RTP package. The RTP candidate shall provide during the peer review session (or at some other prearranged time) a course syllabus and other relevant teaching materials. Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on peer review of teaching performance.

4.20 Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave.

4.21 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, administrative assignment for the University, and 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.

4.22 Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment:

A. For promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses equivalent to 36 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 4 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the RTP candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

B. For reappointment or tenure, the RTP candidate serving an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 12 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department. At least 8 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the RTP candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

C. 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 RTP candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion in the Department.

D. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty serving an

administrative assignment without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

#### 4.23 FACULTY SERVING IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE:

A. For promotion, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught Department courses equivalent to 36 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 4 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the RTP candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

B. For reappointment or tenure, the RTP candidate serving in academic governance who has assigned time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 12 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department. At least 8 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the RTP candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

C. 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 RTP candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion in the Department.

D. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

#### 4.24 Faculty on approved leave

A. Faculty members 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 RTP candidate is inactive ("the clock has stopped") and the next several paragraphs do not apply.

B. For promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at this University, Department courses equivalent to 36 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 4 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the RTP candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the RTP candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.

C. For reappointment or tenure, the RTP candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 12 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department at this University. At least 8 of the WTUs must

be for courses for which the RTP candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the RTP candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.

D. 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 the same standard as any other RTP candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion in the Department. Research and scholarly activity conducted at another institution, whether alone or in collaboration with others, can be examined by the committee for the purposes of fulfilling the Department's criteria in the area of scholarly or creative activity.

E. Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirement specified in the Departmental criteria for the requested RTP action. Visitation to another institution does not relieve the RTP candidate of the service requirement at this University.

F. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving on approved leave without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean, and the University RTP Committee.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

#### 4.25 RTP CALENDAR

Within the first two weeks of Fall Quarter (Fall Semester), the DRTPC chair shall:

- Post on the Department's bulletin board a calendar of RTP deadlines and procedures for students to submit to the DRTPC chair their signed, written evaluations of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and
- Prepare the classroom visitation schedule and insure that all classroom visitation procedures have been completed two weeks prior to the due date for submission of the candidate's RTP package.

#### 4.26 AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENT

The RTP Document shall be made available to the Department tenure-track faculty on the faculty shared folder.

### 5.0 PERFORMANCE REVIEW

#### 5.1 College of Business Assessment Plan for Faculty Development Activities

5.2 Department Faculty are expected to be Scholarly Academics (SA) as specified in Standard 15 of the Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation promulgated by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Scholarly Academic is determined by academic preparation (completion of degree) followed by scholarly and creative activities evidenced by peer-reviewed journals publications (PRJs) and/or other intellectual

contributions (OICs) that have been defined by the College's Policy on Faculty Qualification and Engagement: 2016.

### 5.3 PERFORMANCE REVIEW CRITERIA

5.4 One of the hallmarks of University excellence is the sound academic balance of its instructional faculty members. This balance results from a blend of excellent teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service to the Department, College, University, and community. These criteria shall be applied to all probationary accounting faculty members seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion (See below for the Performance Rating System and the weighted model.)

#### 5.5 Teaching (Weight: 12 = 50%)

5.6 The primary function of California State Polytechnic University is teaching. Direct objective evidence of teaching effectiveness is crucial to the overall evaluation process. Teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated for the quality of performance of the RTP candidate in varied aspects of instruction. These may include but are not limited to: classroom instruction, studio instruction, laboratory instruction, supervision of individual projects, and supervision of field work.

5.7 The tenured faculty member(s) involved in the evaluation process shall recognize the existence of differences in teaching styles. While no single style or manner of teaching can be established as best for all faculty members or for all students, faculty members are expected to work effectively with students individually and in groups. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based upon the particular methods used by the probationary faculty member.

5.8 Primary sources of evidence concerning the quality of teaching shall be classroom visitation reports with appended materials gathered during the pre- and post-visit conferences, and student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. Items appended to classroom visitation reports may include but are not limited to: course syllabi, examinations and quizzes, hand-out materials, and other appropriately demonstrative materials.

5.9 Teaching effectiveness shall be demonstrated in the following areas:

a. Command of Subject

Credentials presented by the RTP candidate upon appointment attest initially to the candidate's command of the subject matter. However, refinement and change are inherent in any area of knowledge. Candidates must be familiar with current knowledge within their specific area of accounting expertise (*e.g.*, financial accounting, auditing, taxation, cost, managerial, not-for-profit accounting, and computerization) and incorporate relevant changes into courses taught.

b. Organization of Instructional Materials

Candidates must organize instructional materials in a manner appropriate to individual classes and instructional modes. Organizing materials for a course as a whole is equally important.

c. Effectiveness of Instruction

Candidates must use their organized materials to deliver instruction of high quality. Communicating this material effectively using teaching techniques appropriate to both the type and size of the class or instructional mode is basic to competence in teaching.

Successful teaching may include experimentation with innovative or different teaching methods to match the best interest of students. Adapting to the needs of a changing curriculum is indicative of not only subject matter command and organizational ability but also quality instruction.

d. Academic Assessment of Students

A fair and thorough assessment of student achievement is an important aspect of effective instruction. Methods of assessment include, but are not limited to, examinations; homework; term papers; computer laboratory assignments; special assignments; seminar presentations; and other means appropriate to the type of class or instructional mode involved. Items such as out-of-classroom instructional contacts between faculty members and students during office hours and special appointments; and other out-of-class instructional contacts are also included. A faculty member's methods of assessing student achievement shall be documented by sample copies of items used, as appended to the visitation report.

5.10 Direct objective evidence of teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (1) Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness on the standard Departmental questionnaire filled out by students enrolled in the candidate's classes
- (2) Peer evaluation of classroom teaching, including knowledge of the subject, preparedness, verbal articulation, writing-board techniques, and the use of lecture demonstrations and instructional aids
- (3) Peer evaluation of academic standards, as evidenced by syllabus material, written examinations and other evaluation tools, and by grading policy
- (4) Signed, written comments by students submitted directly to the chair of the DRTPC, Department Chair, Dean of the College of Business Administration, or RTP candidate being evaluated
- (5) The development of new courses or the upgrading of existing ones
- (6) The preparation of materials for classroom use
- (7) Teaching upper-division accounting courses
- (8) Teaching graduate courses

- (9) Directing student research
- (10) Successful coverage of syllabus material in the candidate's classes, particularly in those that are prerequisites for other courses
- (11) Innovative teaching methods including new technologies
- (12) Demonstrated ability to communicate orally and in writing with students and fellow faculty members

#### 5.11 Scholarly and Creative Activities (Weight: 8= 33.3%)

5.12 A certain level of scholarly and creative activities, known here as Intellectual Contributions, supports the primary mission of the Department, College, and University, and is consistent with the "polytechnic concept". The "polytechnic concept" provides a means whereby excellent, up-to-date, and enriched teaching benefits the University as a whole. Scholarly and creative activities are intellectual contributions that focus on outputs. Candidates should be aware that exceptional professional development (e.g., attending academic and professional accounting conferences such as the AAA or completing the required CPE for maintaining the CPA, CMA, CIA, or other professional licenses) cannot be used to override deficiencies in the area of intellectual contributions.

- a. Each RTP candidate is responsible for providing documented evidence of scholarly and creative activities.
- b. The DRTPC must evaluate each item in the area of scholarly and creative activities for relevance and quality. If the Committee finds any deficiencies in the RTP candidate's description of scholarly and creative activities or has difficulty commenting on any items in the report, the DRTPC Chair shall consult with the RTP candidate before the DRTPC prepares its written report.

The following categories of scholarly and creative activities should be regarded as illustrative in nature and are not meant to be limiting, definitive, or prescriptive. Also, as previously noted, professional development activities cannot be used to override deficiencies in intellectual contribution activities.

#### (1) Intellectual Contributions

Intellectual contributions are: discipline based scholarship, contributions to practice, and learning and pedagogical research. Discipline-based scholarship adds to the theory or knowledge base of accounting and its related discipline (e.g., finance, operations research, management, marketing, economics, information technology, and international business). Contributions to practice influence professional practice in accounting and its related field. Learning and pedagogical research influences teaching and student learning in accounting.

These contributions fall into two categories: publications in peer-reviewed journals and other intellectual contributions. Specific contributions include, but are not necessarily limited to, those listed below.

- (a) Peer-Reviewed Journal Publications:
- (1) Recognized peer-reviewed journals in the field of business and economics in general, accounting, taxation, and finance in particular. The Peer Reviewed Publication should be indexed in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities or the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality List at the time of submission.
- (b) Other Intellectual Contributions (OICs) are defined as (in no rank order):
- (1) Publication in international/ national non-refereed journals.
  - (2) Publication in local/regional non-refereed journals.
  - (3) Publication of a scholarly, tradebook, textbook, or monograph.
  - (4) Published workbook.
  - (5) Published practice set.
  - (6) Funded grant proposal.
  - (7) Presentations of refereed papers or non-refereed papers at academic or professional meetings
  - (8) Presentations at academic or professional meetings that do not require a paper, e.g., conference panel discussion.
  - (9) Published cases other than the peer-reviewed case meeting the criteria under 15.12(1)(a)
  - (10) Development of instructional software
  - (11) Publication of a chapter in a book
  - (12) Publication of a book review in an academic or professional journal
  - (13) Review of a paper for an academic or professional conference.
  - (14) Discussant of paper(s) at an academic or professional conference.
  - (15) Service as an editor, associate editor, or member of an editorial board of an academic or professional journal that involves reviewing manuscript submissions.
  - (16) Service on an advisory board or committee for a professional, academic, or government organization.
  - (17) Active participation in seminars, conferences, meetings, or other activities leading to intellectual contribution.
  - (18) Continuing education, retraining, and the development of new skills relevant to the Department curriculum or prospective changes in the Department curriculum. Evidence of these activities may be taking courses, earning advanced degrees, or participating in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or special programs that lead to systematic updating of knowledge.
  - (19) Receipt of a fellowship, grant, contract, award, prize, or other indication of professional recognition.
  - (20) Active leadership and/or service in recognized professional societies.

5.13 Service to the Department, College, University, and Community, Including Student Development and Relations (Weight: 4 = 16.7%)



5.14 In addition to demonstrated teaching effectiveness and scholarly and creative activities, the RTP candidate must participate in professionally related service to the Department, College, University, and Community. For tenure at all ranks, the RTP candidate must document service at all levels including serving in leadership positions.

5.15 RTP candidates are uniquely qualified to contribute to the mission of the University as a whole in a variety of ways, such as participating in institutional governance, advising students, and sponsoring student organizations.

5.16 Community service, as related to the mission of the University, brings recognition to not only the University but to the RTP candidate as well. Service should be consistent with the teaching abilities, expertise, rank, and leadership qualities of the candidate, and should foster an intellectual relationship with the off-campus community. The term "community" may refer to local, regional, state, national, or international entities.

5.17 The primary purpose of higher education is to provide a collegiate atmosphere where students develop academically, socially, and emotionally. Student/ faculty interaction creates a student/mentor environment where nurturing and learning can flourish. The candidate's activities should directly contribute to this collegiate environment.

5.18 The following two categories of service should be regarded as examples and are not meant to be limiting, definitive, or prescriptive. RTP candidates are encouraged to participate in a mix of service activities from both (a) and (b), indicated below.

a. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community. Examples:

- (1) Active participation in service to and/or governance of the Department, College, and University.
- (2) Active participation on committees at all levels, including Department, College, and University.
- (3) Authorship of documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University's mission.
- (4) Active participation in the Department or College Advisory Council.
- (5) Specialized service, either elected or appointed.
- (6) Service to the Department as Course Coordinator.
- (7) Lectures, speeches, talks, presentations made to schools, community groups, or the University community.
- (8) Professional consulting engagements for government, industry, or community organizations, whether paid or unpaid.
- (9) Service at the local, state, or Federal government levels.

- (10) Active participation and/or holding office in civic, educational, service, or humanitarian groups.
- (11) Media presentations such as interviews, articles, speeches, or other presentations in newspapers, magazines, radio, television, or film of a professional nature.
- (12) Professional activities such as involvement in the California Society of CPAs, Institute of Internal Auditors, or Institute of Management Accountants.
- (13) Recent, relevant work experience in business or industry of a professional nature. These activities may be treated as components of teaching and intellectual contributions if properly documented and are peer reviewable.
- (14) Other items as related to the Department, College, University, and/or community.

b. Student Development and Relations shall be demonstrated by evidence gathered from colleagues, self-evaluation, students, and DRTPC members. The following list provides examples of items that may be used.

- (1) Participates in department student advising activities, such as current curriculum, career track requirements, and non-academic matters.
- (2) Participates in related duties associated with student activities, such as department Scholarship Committee.
- (3) Acts as an advisor or sponsor to student groups on campus.
- (4) Is regularly available for more office hours than are required by either the teaching or administrative assignments.
- (5) Aids students in internships, job placement (lunch with recruiters, writing recommendations), and other related activities (other than Internship Director).
- (6) Is involved with professional/honorary fraternities and sororities.
- (7) Is involved with alumni development and relations.
- (8) Assists with academic and/or career advisement of students beyond course assistance.
- (9) Officiates at academic and sporting events or similar activities.
- (10) Participates in educational equity such as BEES activities.

## 5.19 PERFORMANCE RATING SYSTEM

## 5.20 Weighted Model for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

5.21 The weighted model for retention, tenure, and promotion is designed to assist the RTP candidate in preparing her or his RTP package, and to assist the individual DRTPC members in their evaluation of the candidate.

5.22 Table I [Tables are at the end of this document] contains the Department of Accounting's weighted model for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. It is based upon the three performance review areas: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, which are described above.

5.23 The model indicates the weights to be assigned in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. The weights in Table I may be modified in considering 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 (Policy No. 1328). Such modifications are to be arranged in writing with the DRTPC at least one year before any personnel action or at the time of assuming non-teaching duties which require modification, whichever is later. The aggregate weight for the three performance areas shall be twenty-four (24).

## 5.24 Performance Rating Scale

5.25 The performance of an RTP candidate shall be evaluated in each performance area on a Seven-Point Graduated Rating Scale from "Unacceptable" to "Superior".

5.26 The scale is a continuous scale from "Unacceptable" to "Superior". The Seven-Point, Graduated Rating Scale is depicted in Table II [Tables are at the end of this document].

5.27 The interpretation of the Graduated Rating Scale and the definitions of the related performance terms is in Table III [Tables are at the end of this document.]

## 5.28 Application of the Performance Evaluation Model

5.29 The DRTPC shall apply the Performance Review Criteria, the Weighted Model, and the Seven-Point, Graduated Rating Scale to the performance of an RTP candidate relative to that candidate's academic rank in the area of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. The composite score shall be determined by using the following seven-step process:

- a. Step One: Each member of the DRTPC, after reviewing all pertinent materials and full participation in all discussions, shall make a preliminary rating of the candidate's performance in each performance area using the Seven-Point Graduated Rating Scale.
- b. Step Two: The DRTPC shall review the ratings assigned to the RTP candidate by the DRTPC.
- c. Step Three: After reviewing and discussing the preliminary ratings, including justifications, the DRTPC shall make a second rating.
- d. Step Four: Re-iteration of Steps Two and Three continues until a majority of the DRTPC is satisfied. This process is consistent with Policy No. 1328, which requires

that RTP recommendations shall be by a simple majority vote of the DRTPC.

- e. Step Five: The mean of the final ratings received from DRTPC members in each performance area shall be computed by the DRTPC Chair. The mean score is interpreted as a point on a continuum. Therefore, the score awarded may be a fraction, e.g., 5.3. If the score is a fraction it is to be rounded to one decimal place using the general mathematical rules for rounding, e.g., 5.34 becomes 5.3 and 5.35 becomes 5.4 and 5.45 becomes 5.5.
- f. Step Six: The final rating determined by the DRTPC in each performance area shall be multiplied by the weight in the Weighted Model. The resulting product shall be the score received for that performance area.
- g. Step Seven: A composite score shall be computed by adding the scores received for the three performance areas.

### 5.30 Application of the Weighted Model and Rating Scale

#### a. General Provisions

The DRTPC shall not recommend an RTP candidate for a requested personnel action unless the RTP candidate receives the appropriate composite score as set forth in Table III and meets the applicable criteria described below for the various personnel actions. Also, a majority of the DRTPC must be satisfied with the composite score (Policy No. 1328). The minimum required composite scores for the various personnel actions are depicted in Table IV [Tables are at the end of this document.].

#### b. Notification

The DRTPC report on the RTP candidate shall include the composite total score and composite scores for each of the three areas: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. In the report, the DRTPC shall explain the scores awarded in each of the three criterion areas (*i.e.*, teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service). For reappointment candidates, the DRTPC report shall include a discussion of the necessity for progress toward satisfying criteria for tenure.

## 6.0 CRITERIA FOR RETENTION (REAPPOINTMENT)

6.1 Reappointment means that the RTP candidate is re-applying for the next probationary year. Reappointment, beyond the second year, is not automatic and must be requested. 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. RTP candidates successful in obtaining reappointment shall be reappointed to the next probationary year. RTP candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their first or second probationary year shall be granted termination effective at the end of the current academic year. RTP candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their third, fourth, or fifth year shall be granted reappointment with a terminal year. The primary concern for retention shall be evidence of performance in teaching

effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, and service to the Department, College, University, and community.

6.2 For all reappointments, the RTP candidate must receive a composite score of 96 and be judged at least "Satisfactory" (minimum 4.0) in each of the performance areas: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

6.3 Since a first doctorate is an entry-level requirement, there is no scholarly and creative activities credit given for such a doctoral dissertation.

6.4 In the sixth probationary year, the probationary faculty member must apply for tenure.

## **7.0 CRITERIA FOR TENURE**

7.1 Tenure is the status conferred on the RTP candidate by the University which grants continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Tenure is requested at the beginning of the sixth probationary year or earlier if the RTP candidate seeks Early Tenure. RTP candidates successful in obtaining tenure shall 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.

7.2 Tenure is a time-based process, which is earned with sustained, progressively more demanding, successful performance normally over the six-year probationary period.

7.3 In addition to evaluating performance based upon the performance rating system, the tenure criteria pertain to the granting of tenure in specific ranks. For tenure at all ranks, the RTP candidate must possess an appropriate doctoral or Juris Doctor (J.D.) degree with an LLM or a J.D. with a Master of Taxation. A judgment of the appropriateness of the doctoral or J.D. degree is based on the criteria in the Appointment Document for Probationary Faculty. For tenure at all ranks, the RTP candidate must document a minimum of three (3) peer-reviewed journal publications during the candidate's evaluation period, as illustrated in 5.12(1) (a), of which one peer-reviewed journal publication should be made in the previous two academic years. The Peer Reviewed Publication must be indexed in Cabell's Directory or the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality List at the time of submission. In addition, the RTP candidate must document a minimum of five (5) Other Intellectual Contributions during the candidate's evaluation period, as illustrated in 5.12 (1) (b), of which three (3) should be made in the previous three academic years. The DRTPC requires RTP candidates to achieve a mix of Other Intellectual Contributions as defined in 5.12 (1) (b).

For tenure as a Full Professor, the RTP candidate must complete all requirements outlined in the Appointment Document for Probationary Faculty.

7.4 The DRTPC expects the RTP candidate to demonstrate the attainment of more rigorous expectations as they progress through the probationary period.

7.5 To be awarded tenure, the RTP candidate must show clear evidence of scholarly and creative activities since appointment, receive a minimum composite score of 132 (see Table III), and be found "excellent" (minimum 6.0) in teaching. In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, and service, the RTP candidate must be rated "good" (minimum 5.0) on the Seven-Point Graduated Rating Scale.

7.6 In the sixth probationary year, the faculty member must apply for tenure.

## **8.0 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

8.1 Promotion means the RTP candidate seeks a change in rank commensurate with accomplishments deserving merit and recognition. The RTP candidate is eligible for Regular Promotion if he or she has four years in his or her current rank and may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. The RTP candidate is eligible for Early Promotion if he or she has less than four years in his or her current rank and may apply at the beginning of any RTP cycle. RTP candidates successful in obtaining a promotion shall be in the new rank beginning the next academic year.

8.2 The primary concern for promotion shall be evidence of the ability to discharge the obligations of the higher rank based upon demonstrated performance at the lower rank. The method of evaluating performance is covered in Section 5.19 of the Performance Rating System. The evidence to support performance is described in Section 5.3, Performance Review Criteria.

8.3. In addition to evaluating performance based upon the Performance Rating System, the promotion criteria are based upon specific ranks. From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the RTP candidate must possess an appropriate doctoral degree with a J.D. and an LLM or a J.D. with a Master of Taxation. Judgment of the appropriateness of the doctoral degree is based upon criteria in the Appointment Document for Probationary Faculty. From Associate Professor to Full Professor, the RTP candidate must complete all requirements outlined in the Appointment Document for Probationary Faculty. For promotion at all ranks, the RTP candidate must document a minimum of three (3) peer-reviewed journal publications during the candidate's evaluation period, as illustrated in 5.12(1) (a), of which one peer-reviewed journal publication should be made in the previous two academic years. The Peer Reviewed Publication must be indexed in Cabell's Directory or the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality List at the time of submission. In addition, the RTP candidate must document a minimum of five (5) Other Intellectual Contributions during the candidate's evaluation period, as illustrated in 5.12 (1) (b), of which three (3) should be made in the previous three academic years. The DRTPC encourages RTP candidates to achieve a mix of Other Intellectual Contributions as defined in 5.12 (1) (b).

8.4 In a promotion decision, the RTP candidate must be judged at the level of the academic rank to which promotion is sought. To be promoted to Associate Professor, the RTP candidate must receive a minimum composite score of 132 (see Table III), and be found "excellent" (minimum 6.0) in teaching. In the areas of scholarly and creative activities, and service, the RTP candidate must be rated "good" (minimum 5.0) on the Seven-Point Graduated Rating Scale.

To be promoted to Full Professor, the RTP candidate must receive a minimum composite score of 140, comprising a minimum score of 6.0 ("Excellent") in teaching, a minimum score of 6.0 ("Excellent") in scholarly and creative activities, and a minimum score of 5.0 ("Good") in service.

8.5 As a faculty member progresses through the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor, the expectations for performance shall be increasingly higher *that is*, a level of activity that is acceptable for a lower rank might be considered inadequate for a higher rank. For example for promotion to the rank of full professor, there is a higher expectation for greater leadership in research and service by proving evidence of lead authorship, chairing committees at the Department, College, and University as well as evidence of the candidate's involvement with community and the professional organizations.

## **9.0 CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE/EARLY PROMOTION**

9.1 In some circumstances, an RTP candidate may, upon application and with a positive recommendation from his/her department or equivalent unit, be considered for Early Promotion and/or Early Tenure. Such requests must be initiated by the RTP candidate in accordance with the regular RTP procedures.

Requests for early actions shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective date of those actions.

Criteria for early actions shall place emphasis on teaching and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. DRTPC recommendations shall include material relating specifically to the approved department RTP criteria.

9.2 A RTP candidate requesting Early Tenure must be judged at the level at which he or she was appointed to the tenure track. To be awarded Early Tenure, the RTP candidate must receive a minimum composite score of 164 (see Tables) and be judged "exceptional" (minimum 7.0 on the Seven-Point Graduated Rating Scale) in each of teaching and scholarly and creative activities. Additionally, he or she must be rated "excellent" (minimum 6.0) in service.

9.3 To be awarded Early Promotion, the RTP candidate must be judged at the level of academic rank to which promotion is sought. The RTP candidate must receive a minimum composite score of 164 and be judged "exceptional" (minimum 7.0 on the Seven-Point Graduated Rating Scale) in each of teaching and scholarly and creative activities. Additionally, he or she must be rated "excellent" (minimum 6.0) in service. For Early Tenure or Early Promotion at all ranks, the RTP candidate must document a minimum of three (3) peer-reviewed journal publications during the candidate's evaluation period, as illustrated in 5.13(1) (a), of which two (2) peer-reviewed journal publications should be made in the previous two academic years. The Peer Reviewed Publication must be indexed in Cabell's Directory or the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality List at the time of submission. In addition, the RTP candidate must document a minimum of five (5) Other Intellectual Contributions during the candidate's evaluation period, as illustrated in 5.12 (1) (b), of which three (3) should be made in the previous three academic years. The DRTPC encourages RTP candidates to achieve a mix of Other Intellectual Contributions as defined in 5.12 (1) (b).

9.4 A RTP candidate shall not be recommended for Early Tenure or Early Promotion with less than two years of full-time teaching at the University prior to the requested personnel action.

9.5 For decisions on Early Tenure and Early Promotion, the DRTPC is expanded to include all tenured faculty members, except those excluded in Section 2.5 of this document.

## **10.0 EVALUATION OF FACULTY ON TEMPORARY NON-TEACHING ASSIGNMENT (INCLUDING CHAIR)**

10.1 It is the responsibility of the assigned RTP candidate faculty member to be sure that he or she teaches at least two classroom/lecture courses of four units each in the quarter system or three units each

in the semester system during an academic year. Otherwise, the DRTPC shall be unable to evaluate her or his teaching performance which is a critical element of evaluation.

10.2 RTP candidates on administrative or other non-teaching assignments are not excused from the retention, tenure, and promotion requirements of this document.



TABLE I  
WEIGHTED MODEL FOR  
RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

Performance Areas	Weights	Prop.
Teaching	12	50%
Scholarly and Creative Activities (Appropriate Level of Intellectual Contributions Required)	8	33.3%
Service	4	16.7%
Total Weight Required	24	100%

TABLE II  
SEVEN-POINT, GRADUATED RATING SCALE

	U N A C C E P T A B L E	M A R G I N A L	M I N I M U M	S A T I S F A C T O R Y	G O O D	E X C E L L E N T	E X C E P T I O N A L
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Teaching							
Scholarly and Creative Activities (Appropriate Level of Intellectual Contributions Required)							
Service							

TABLE III  
 INTERPRETATION OF GRADUATED RATING SCALE  
 AND  
 DEFINITIONS OF PERFORMANCE TERMS

- 7 Exceptional: Candidate's performance is exceptional and by far exceeds reasonable expectations in this performance area.
- 6 Excellent: Candidate exceeds all reasonable expectations in this performance area.
- 5 Good: Candidate's performance is above minimum expectations but does not exceed reasonable expectations in this performance area.
  
- 4 Satisfactory: Candidate's performance is acceptable in this performance area
- 3 Minimally Acceptable: Candidate's performance needs improvement in this performance area.
- 2 Marginal: Candidate needs substantial improvement in this performance area.
- 1 Unacceptable: Candidate's performance is very weak in this performance area.

TABLE IV  
 MINIMUM REQUIRED COMPOSITE SCORES

Personnel Actions	Minimum Composite Scores	Overall Weighted Average Scores
For All Reappointments	96	4.0
For Promotion to Associate Professor	132	5.5
For Promotion to Professor	140	5.83
For Tenure	132	5.5
For Early Tenure	164	6.83
For Early Promotion	164	6.83

## **Exhibit A**

### **"Careful Consideration Defined"**

The various personnel documents of the Department of Accounting make several references to the term: "careful consideration." The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) also makes reference to "careful consideration" regarding temporary faculty appointments. The underlying problem is that "careful consideration" is not defined in the CBA. However, there have been three arbitration cases in which a definition appears to evolve.

Arbitrator Phillip Tamoush (Bryant Creel, 1985) defined "careful consideration" as follows:

"Careful consideration means exactly that, cautious, accurate, thorough and concerned thought, attention and deliberation to the task at hand."

Arbitrator Kenneth Perea (Kenneth Lebeiko, 1985) and Arbitrator Adolph Koven (Betty Brooks, 1986) added to the definition that "careful consideration" includes evaluation and decision-making procedures that have been established must be followed.

These definitions are not inconsistent with the dictionary definitions of the two terms: "careful" and "consideration."

"Careful" means cautious, prudent, and attentiveness to details.

"Consideration" means thoughtful regard (for the evidence being evaluated) and the act of weighing (the evidence) carefully.

It is clear that "careful consideration" does not mean preference for any person or group of persons. It means that the established processes for evaluating and making decisions involving current and prospective faculty are to be followed and all the available evidence taken into account before making a decision concerning appointment, reappointment, or promotion of a faculty member. Each current and prospective faculty member subject to a personnel action is to be evaluated on her or his merits (including credentials), as compared with other applicants or candidates, and not on the basis of emotions, or personal preferences.

The above discussion reflects the Department of Accounting's intent in using the term "careful consideration" in its various personnel documents.

## Exhibit B

# College of Business Administration California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

## *Policy on Faculty Qualification and Engagement*

*Approved by the faculty of the College of Business Administration on TBD.*

### *1. Overview*

The College of Business Administration (CBA) at California State Polytechnic University (hereafter Cal Poly Pomona) is a diverse community of faculty engaged in a wide variety of innovative, impactful academic activities that support the mission of the College. The Cal Poly Pomona core values of polytechnic identity, academic quality, learn by doing, teacher-scholar, celebration of diversity, and student success are evident in the academic and professional activities of the faculty, which impact the theory and practice of business and education in Southern California and nationwide.

The applied nature of our business programs and the quality of our graduates and faculty resources are highly appreciated by firms in Southern California and the global business community. The College will support faculty development activities that encompass a wide range of scholarly and professional pursuits and contribute to the intellectual vitality of the College. The College recognizes that faculty will maintain their qualifications in a variety of ways and seeks to implement a policy that embraces that richness.

This policy shall be reviewed periodically to ensure compliance with the most recent AACSB accreditation standards. Changes to the policy shall require approval by a majority vote of tenured and tenure track faculty members of CBA.

The following pages outline 1) CBA policy guidelines for designating and maintaining faculty qualification status, 2) the point system and categories of intellectual and professional contributions, 3) reporting and exceptions, and 4) the relationship between the CBA policy of faculty qualification and university review policies and procedures.

### *2. Faculty Qualifications and Engagement*

The AACSB accreditation standards require that faculty collectively and individually demonstrate significant academic and/or professional engagement that supports the mission of the CBA. The four classifications of faculty members' status, based on the academic and professional experience and sustained level of engagement activities, and the criteria for maintaining a faculty member's status are provided below.

Sustained Engagement Activities		
<i>Initial Academic Preparation and Professional Experience</i>	<b>Academic</b> (Research/Scholarly)	<b>Applied/Practice</b>
Doctoral Degree/Specialized Degree	Scholarly Academics (SA)	Practice Academics (PA)
Professional Experience (Substantial in Duration and Level of Responsibility)	Scholarly Practitioners (SP)	Instructional Practitioners (IP)

*Table 1: Sustained Engagement Activities*

**Scholarly Academics (SA)** sustain currency and relevance through scholarship and related activities. Faculty who hold an All But Dissertation status (ABD) are granted automatic SA or PA status (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for a period of 3 years. Faculty with a recently earned doctorate are automatically considered SA for a period of 5 years from the official date of their doctoral degree.

**Practice Academics (PA)** sustain currency and relevance through both scholarship and professional engagement with relevant activities. Normally, PA status applies to faculty members who augment their initial preparation as academic scholars with engagement activities that involve substantive linkages to practice or other forms of professional engagement.

**Note:** All tenure and tenure track faculty members must achieve SA or PA status subject to minimum accreditation qualifications requirements. It is the goal of CBA that all tenure and tenure track faculty members achieve the SA status.

**Scholarly Practitioners (SP)** sustain currency and relevance through continued professional engagement and scholarship related to their professional background and experience. Normally, SP status applies to practitioner faculty members who augment their experience with substantive scholarly activities in their fields of teaching, such as lecturers with a master's degree who publish in peer-reviewed journals.

**Instructional Practitioners (IP)** sustain currency and relevance through continued professional engagement related to their professional backgrounds and experience. Normally, IP status is granted to newly hired faculty members with a master's degree who have significant and relevant professional experience.

**Note:** All full and part-time lecturers must fall under one of the four classifications subject to minimum accreditation qualifications requirements.

It is important for faculty to have an appropriate initial academic preparation and/or professional experience at the time of hire and to remain engaged in scholarship and/or practice throughout their employment with the CBA. In order to deliver quality business education to

our students, faculty must pursue continuous development in their specialty area and/or its application to the business world. A point system for intellectual and professional contributions and the required threshold to maintain SA, PA, SP, and IP status are given in section 6.0. We seek to align faculty's initial academic preparation or professional experience and their ongoing engagement activities with their primary teaching responsibilities and with the mission of the CBA.

Academic and professional engagement activities must be substantive and sustained at levels that support currency and relevance for the CBA's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Engagement can result from the work of a single faculty member, collaborations between and among faculty, or collaborations between faculty and other scholars and/or practitioners.

Faculty are responsible for working with their Department Chair to ensure that they have a feasible plan for maintaining their SA, PA, SP, or IP status. Faculty are also responsible for regularly reporting their intellectual contributions and other activities to indicate how they are maintaining their qualifications and engagement status. Department Chairs will work with the Dean to review the department's and college's progress toward meeting the minimum required thresholds for faculty qualification and ensure that the CBA accomplishes its mission and maintain the standards required by the AACSB.

### ***3. Minimum Faculty Qualifications Thresholds***

The following are the minimum faculty qualification thresholds as prescribed by AACSB:

$$\begin{aligned} SA &\geq 40\% \\ SA + PA + SP &\geq 60\% \\ SA + PA + SP + IP &\geq 90\% \end{aligned}$$

These thresholds apply to the College as a whole as well as to each department separately. All faculty contributing to the mission of the CBA are included in the calculations.

## **4. Guidelines for Scholarly Academics (SA) and Practice Academics (PA) Status**

### **4.1 Initial Designation to Scholarly Academics (SA) and Practice Academics (PA) Status**

Criteria for designation to SA and PA status include the following:

1. *Research degree.* Initial academic preparation for SA and PA status is normally required in the form of a discipline-based research doctorate. Such a doctorate is intended to produce scholars capable of creating original scholarly contributions through advances in research and who can contribute research knowledge to their areas of teaching. In cases where the research doctorate is in the business discipline but outside the teaching area, or where the

research doctorate is outside the business discipline but related to the teaching area, evidence of supplemental preparation to support relevance in the teaching field may be required. The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the greater the need for supplemental preparation. Individuals whose highest degree is not a doctorate may be considered for SA or PA status if they have completed coursework in a business doctoral program and are currently a student in a business doctoral program.

2. *Specialized graduate degree.* Individuals with specialized graduate degrees in law, taxation, or accounting will be considered SA or PA for teaching in their respective fields subject to ongoing and substantive academic and/or professional engagement activities. A faculty member with a graduate degree in law would be expected to teach courses in business law, legal environment of business, and related subjects. Individuals with a graduate degree in taxation or an appropriate combination of graduate degrees in law and accounting will be considered SA or PA to teach taxation.

## **4.2 Maintaining Scholarly Academics (SA) Status**

To maintain SA status, faculty members are expected to demonstrate currency in their field and support the mission of the CBA through relevant intellectual contributions. The intellectual contributions must indicate a sufficient quality, rigor, and value to meet AACSB and CBA standards. (See detailed list of accepted intellectual contributions in section 7.0.) Intellectual contributions are original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. As such, they are based on generally accepted research principles, are validated by peers, and disseminated to appropriate audiences.

Faculty whose terminal degrees were granted within the past five years are considered SA because of the currency of their degree. These faculty members must still engage in research activities to produce the required portfolio of contributions for future periods, and meet departmental Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) criteria. Other faculty with SA status are expected to produce intellectual contributions on a regular basis. As evidence of maintaining SA status, faculty must earn a minimum of seven (7) points over each five-year period. Points are earned based on the nature of the intellectual contribution as described below for categories A, B, and C. At least 4 points in each 5-year period must be earned from Category A.

Faculty returning to academic appointments after administrative appointments that do not include research-designated release time may be granted provisional SA status for a period equal to their absence for up to three years.

## **4.3 Maintaining Practice Academics (PA) Status**

To maintain PA status, faculty are expected to be engaged in contributions to practice or other forms of professional engagement. These may include practice-oriented intellectual contributions, consulting activities, service on boards of directors, etc. (See detailed list of

acceptable professional contributions in section 6) As evidence of maintaining PA status, faculty must earn a minimum of 7 points over each five-year period. Points are earned based on the nature of the intellectual contribution as described below for categories A, B, C, and D. At least 2-points in each 5-year period must be earned from Category A.

## ***5. Guidelines for Scholarly Practitioners (SP) and Instructional Practitioners (IP)***

The College seeks to hire faculty who have appropriate academic preparation for teaching as well as relevant practical experience that can provide valuable insights into the rapidly changing landscape of the Southern California region. Faculty who meet the following general criteria may be designated as IP or SP at the time of hiring:

1. A master's degree in a field related to the area of teaching assignment.
2. Professional experience relevant to the faculty member's teaching assignment, significant in duration and level of responsibility.

The less related the professional experience is to the field of teaching, or the longer the time since the relevant experience occurred, the greater the need for that faculty member to demonstrate sustained academic and/or professional engagement related to the teaching field.

### **5.1 Maintaining Scholarly Practitioner (SP) Status**

To maintain SP status, faculty members are expected to be engaged in academic pursuits on a regular basis. As evidence of maintaining SP status, faculty must earn a minimum of 4 points over each five year period. Points are earned based on the nature of the intellectual contribution as described below for categories A, B, C, and D. At least 2-points in each 5-year period must be earned from Category A, B, or C.

### **5.2 Maintaining Instructional Practitioner (IP) Status**

To maintain IP status, faculty are expected to be engaged in contributions to practice or other forms of professional engagement on a regular basis. Faculty members should consult with their department chair if uncertain about whether an activity qualifies as a contribution for maintaining IP status. As evidence of maintaining IP status, faculty must earn a minimum of 2-points over each five-year period from the list of professional contributions in categories C or D.

## ***6. Point System for Intellectual and Professional Contributions***

The categories of intellectual contributions (A, B, C) and professional contributions (D) are listed below. The points earned for intellectual and professional contributions should be earned during the 5 years prior to the review date. The associated point system by faculty qualification is summarized here:



	<b>SA</b>	<b>PA</b>	<b>SP</b>	<b>IP</b>
<b>Relevant Contribution Categories</b>	A, B, C	A, B, C, D	A, B, C, D	C, D
<b>Points Required from Specific Categories</b>	At least 4 points from A	At least 2 points from A	At least 2 points from A, B, or C	
<b>Minimum Total Points Required</b>	7 points	7 points	4 points	2 points

*Table 2: Point System for Intellectual Contributions*

## 7. Intellectual Contributions

### Category A: Refereed Scholarly Publications (2 points each)

Peer-reviewed journal articles in the faculty member's discipline must be published in a journal that is listed in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality List, or is approved by the College's Research Committee.

### Category B: Books and Grant Awards (2 points each)

- Scholarly book that is published by a university press or academic publisher.
- Trade book on a topic relevant to the faculty member's discipline that is published by a university press or academic publisher.
- Textbook that synthesizes elements of a faculty member's discipline, and is published by a higher education commercial publisher.
- Awarded competitive grant or fellowship from a US national funding agency<sup>1</sup> (e.g., Fulbright, NSF, NIH, NASA, NIST...), foundation, or non-US equivalent.

### Category C: Service to the Profession (1 point each)

- Service<sup>2</sup> as an editor or associate editor for a professional or academic journal or book, or as a member of an editorial board of an academic or professional journal.
- Service<sup>3</sup> as an active reviewer for a professional or academic journal or conference.
- Service<sup>2</sup> as a program chair, track chair, or session chair, or discussant at an academic conference.
- Chapter in a scholarly book or a monograph that involves scholarly research and that is published by a university press or academic publisher.
- An article, paper, or case published in the proceedings of a conference in the faculty member's discipline.
- A case (accompanied by an instructor's manual) that is editorially reviewed but not peer-reviewed (e.g., accepted for publication by the author of a textbook).

- Technical report related to research projects in the faculty member's discipline that is published and distributed.
- Article on business practice or other areas relevant to the faculty member's discipline in newspapers with national or regional distribution or magazines/journals with a broad readership (or the online equivalent); includes an article that does not fall into Category A.
- Article in the faculty member's areas of expertise published in a journal that is not peer-reviewed.
- Presentation, lecture, paper discussant, or colloquium speaker in a faculty member's area of expertise at an academic/professional conference that includes written materials.
- Available consulting report, or testimony to a branch or agency of the government, in a faculty member's area of expertise.
- Published review of a book in the faculty member's area of expertise.
- Publicly available material describing the design and implementation of new curricula in the faculty member's area of expertise.
- Publicly available practice oriented website or web log in a faculty member's area of expertise that is updated regularly and linked at other significant sites.
- Instructional software or simulation in the faculty member's discipline that is widely used.
- Obtaining a new or completing the maintenance of appropriate academic/professional certifications (e.g., CPA, CMA, California Bar license, etc.)
- Awarded competitive research grant from a foundation, for-profit, or nonprofit organization including those internal to the CSU and Cal Poly Pomona (e.g., RSCA.)

*Category D: Professional Engagement or Contributions (1 point each)*

- Serving in an active role of significance or leadership position in a business, nonprofit or community-based organization, e.g. board of directors
- Consulting activities of significant level, substance, and duration
- Active service on a committee within a professional organization
- Creating and/or delivering high caliber executive education programs or their equivalent
- Obtaining a new and appropriate professional/technical certification (i.e., CPA, CMA, California Bar license, Oracle, SAP certifications, etc.)
- Continuing education – only one of the two required contributions for IP status may be of this type:
  - Maintenance of appropriate professional/technical certifications (i.e., CPA, CMA, California Bar license, Oracle, SAP certifications, etc.)
  - Attending professional development workshops.
- Faculty internships at a business, nonprofit or community-based organization
- Significant participation in business professional associations
- Participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business and management
- Participation in other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business and other organizational leaders

## ***8. Reporting and Exceptions***

**Intellectual Contributions:** Faculty members shall report annually via CBA established reporting system on their intellectual contributions. Such reporting shall include those listed below but may require additional information per system requirements in order to be considered complete.

- For refereed journal publications, complete citation including date of publication<sup>4</sup>.
- The nature of the intellectual contribution ( basic or discovery scholarship, applied or integration/application, teaching and learning).
- Suggested categorization of the intellectual contribution as category A, B, or C.
- A copy of the work, or a permanent link to the work.

**Professional Contributions:** Faculty members shall report, at least annually, on their professional contributions. Such reporting shall include:

- A description of the activity from Category D and the date(s), supported by written documentation.

### **Research Committee Review Process:**

Should a faculty member have questions or concerns about the nature of the intellectual contribution (i.e., that it may not fall within the items listed in Categories A, B, and C), or that a particular contribution warrants placement in a different category, such contribution and the rationale for its category placement shall be submitted to the CBA Research Committee for review. A majority vote of the Research Committee shall be final as to the category designation for the particular intellectual contribution.

A similar procedure is required when a journal is not listed in Cabell's or ABDC, but for which the candidate seeks an exception. For such considerations, the Committee will base its judgment on the rigor and relevance of the research, review of the quality of the editorial board of the journal, the journal's peer-review process, and the quality of past articles published by the journal.

For professional contributions, should a faculty member believe that an activity not listed in Category D should be considered equivalent to the listed items, a description of the activity and the rationale for its consideration shall be submitted to the Research Committee for review. A majority vote of this committee shall be final as to whether the activity is appropriate to include as a professional contribution.

The request for research committee review of a particular contribution and all supporting documents shall be initially forwarded to the appropriate Associate Dean, who is responsible for convening the Research Committee and for the completion of the review in a timely manner.

## ***9. Relationship of CBA Policy to University Review Policies***

All faculty members are subject to university review policies and procedures. For example, tenure-track faculty are subject to the university's retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) policy. These review procedures include regular peer evaluations and student evaluations. This policy on CBA faculty qualifications and engagement is intended to complement the existing university policies and procedures and not to replace them. Faculty members are required to follow both the university review policies and procedures and the CBA policy on faculty qualifications and engagement.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/applicant-resources/agencies-providing-grants.html>

<sup>2</sup> Documented by dates of service and counts as 1 point during any 5-year period in which such work is performed.

<sup>3</sup> Documented by three or more reviews, including revisions, from a range of journals and conferences, and counts as 1 point during any 5-year period.

<sup>4</sup> The publication date of a contribution is the copyright date for books and for other items that are issued for a particular date, such as a journal article or testimony, the stated date on that contribution. A faculty can elect using the actual publication date or the acceptance date if official proof of acceptance is available in written form. A contribution can only be counted by using one of these methods (acceptance or publication data), and cannot be recounted in a different review period using a different publication date.

### **Acknowledgments:**

We acknowledge the use of faculty qualification documents from other Business Schools within the Cal State University system as inspiration for this document, including the possible use of verbatim language in some places.