

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

College of Science

**Department of Computer Science**

**Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

*AY 2023/24 through AY 2027/28*

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

	Page
1. Statement of Purpose .....	1
2. Department RTP Committee .....	3
3. Departmental RTP and Periodic Evaluation Procedures .....	5
4. Candidate's Responsibilities .....	6
5. Departmental Evaluation of Candidate .....	8
6. Criteria for Reappointment .....	12
7. Criteria for Tenure .....	13
8. Criteria for Early Tenure .....	14
9. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor .....	14
10. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor .....	15
11. Criteria for Promotion to Professor .....	15
12. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor .....	16
13. Evaluation of Faculty in an Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave .....	16
14. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review) .....	18
15. Evaluation of First Year Faculty (Pre-RTP Review) .....	18
Appendix 1—In-Class Student Evaluations .....	19
Appendix 2—In-Class Peer Evaluations .....	20

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

### 1. Statement of Purpose

- 1.1 This document fulfills all requirements for directing candidates seeking reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as periodic evaluation in the Department. It incorporates Policy No. 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual, and the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, and documents incorporated therein. No other documents and criteria are applicable. In cases where the Department RTP document does not conform to the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or University Manual (including Policy No. 1328 and Policy No. 1329), those documents take precedence.
- 1.2 Candidates will be evaluated for teaching performance, professional development and scholarly activity, and service at any level within the University and the community. In evaluating a candidate for periodic evaluation, reappointment, tenure or promotion, the review groups will consider these evaluation areas in light of the candidate's reappointment level, past performance, and improvement. A candidate lacking in any one area will not receive a positive recommendation.

In addition to teaching, accomplishments in the area of scholarly and creative activity, and service to the University and profession, the criteria also address the following circumstances: consideration of performance in the area of student advising/mentoring; peer evaluation of teaching performance; provision for the evaluation of faculty serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties; provision for evaluation of faculty serving in academic governance, and consideration of the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution.

- 1.3 Reappointment means that the candidate is re-applying for the next one or two probationary years. Reappointment, beyond the second year, is not automatic and must be requested. Candidates successful in obtaining reappointment will be re-appointed to the next one or two probationary years. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their first or second probationary year will be granted termination effective at the end of the current academic year. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their third, fourth, or fifth year will be granted reappointment for a terminal year.
- 1.4 Periodic evaluation is a non-actionable abbreviated review process defined by Policy No. 1328, section 7.3 as "an intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the DRTPC, Department Chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and Dean," which "does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions." With a successful reappointment for the next two probationary years, probationary faculty will typically undergo periodic evaluation in the interim year.

Additional performance reviews may be required at the interim year. According to Policy No. 1328, section 7.4, "Based on review of the RTP package and evaluation of progress towards tenure and promotion, evaluators at any level of review may recommend that a probationary faculty member undergo another performance review rather than a periodic evaluation in the following year. This recommendation is not subject to appeal although the probationary faculty member can submit a rebuttal."

- 1.5 Tenure is the status conferred on the candidate by the University that grants continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Tenure is requested at the beginning of the sixth probationary year or earlier if the candidate seeks early tenure. Candidates successful in obtaining tenure will be re-appointed with tenure. Failure to obtain tenure at the end of the sixth probationary year results in the granting of reappointment for a terminal year.

## **Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- 1.6 Promotion means the candidate seeks a change in rank commensurate with accomplishments deserving merit and recognition. A probationary faculty member shall not normally be promoted during probation. A probationary faculty member shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time he/she is considered for tenure. The promotion of a tenured faculty member shall normally be effective the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current academic rank, that is, a tenured faculty member may normally apply for promotion at the beginning of the fifth year after appointment to their current academic rank. Candidates successful in obtaining a promotion will receive the new rank at the beginning of the next academic year.
- 1.7 Candidates are required to assemble a RTP package that documents accomplishments and makes a positive case for the requested action. Before submittal, the candidate is invited to seek counsel from the Department RTP Committee regarding the preparation of the RTP package.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

### 2. Department RTP Committee

- 2.1 The Department RTP Committee (DRTP committee) is responsible for ensuring the integrity of the RTP and periodic evaluation process within the Department. The committee structure and function shall conform to Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual.
- 2.2 The committee shall consist of full time, tenured faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The minimum size of the committee shall be three if the Department has seven or fewer full time faculty eligible to serve, five if the Department has eight to seventeen full time faculty eligible to serve, and seven if the Department has eighteen or more full time faculty eligible to serve. The committee may be larger than these minima at the discretion of the faculty, but should always have an odd number of members.

If too few faculty members are available to form a committee for all or some aspect of a committee's work, the committee shall consult with the College RTP committee and name faculty members from outside the Department to supplement the committee.

Candidates in a joint appointment with Computer Science as the home department, will use the same CS DRTP criteria. At least one representative from the other department will serve on the corresponding evaluation committee.

- 2.3 The committee shall be elected by secret ballot by Mar. 1 of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the Department. The committee's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the committee's recommendations have been concluded. After the election of the committee, the Department Chair will immediately notify the Dean of the composition of the committee.
- 2.4 The tenured and probationary faculty will decide annually whether the Department Chair will serve on the committee. If the Department Chair is not a member of the committee then the Department Chair shall have the option of writing a separate evaluation of the candidate.
- 2.5 No committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Also, in promotion considerations, the committee members and the department chair must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Tenured candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any promotion or tenure actions considered by the committee. However, tenured candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the committee.
- 2.6 Faculty on Professional Leave With Pay (sabbatical and difference in pay) may participate in committee activities. Faculty who know in advance that they will, during one semester or more, be unavailable or ineligible should not be nominees for the committee.
- 2.7 The committee shall elect a chair who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the Departmental RTP document and Policy No. 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual are carried out. The Department RTP Chair shall perform the following duties:
  - A. Give written notice to each candidate who is eligible for a regular RTP action or periodic evaluation;
  - B. Present, or direct, to the RTP candidates, all forms appropriate to the RTP or periodic evaluation process;

## **Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- C. Provide each RTP and periodic evaluation candidate a copy of the University RTP Calendar for the current academic year;
  - D. Provide a copy of the Department RTP Document to each RTP and periodic evaluation candidate and to new faculty who will need the document for preparation of their RTP package the following academic year;
  - E. Schedule, in cooperation with the RTP and periodic evaluation candidates and other faculty, the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance;
  - F. Be the official custodian of the candidate's RTP and periodic evaluation package between the submission of the package to the committee by the candidate and forwarding of the package to the Dean. In this period, the committee chair and only the committee chair shall be responsible for any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.
- 2.8 The committee's duties include the following:
- A. Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to Department and University policy;
  - B. Soliciting input from students by publicizing names of candidates for RTP action and names to whom signed statements may be submitted;
  - C. Evaluation of candidate's request for a RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.
  - D. Conducting the candidate's periodic evaluation by using the approved RTP criteria.
- 2.9 The committee shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions for each of the candidate's requests for action:
- A. Reappointment to next probationary year,
  - B. Reappointment with tenure,
  - C. Reappointment with early tenure,
  - D. Promotion to requested rank,
  - E. Early promotion to requested rank,
  - F. Termination (available for candidates currently in first or second probationary year),
  - G. Reappointment with terminal year (available for candidates in either third, fourth, fifth or sixth probationary year),
  - H. Deny promotion,
  - I. Deny early promotion,
  - J. Deny early tenure.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

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

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

- A. Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations in accordance with Policy No. 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual;
- B. Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluations of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual;
- C. Self evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate the candidate's statements);
- D. Signed material with printed name(s) and affiliation received from other faculty, administrators, students, and other sources before the closing date (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package) if applicable;
- E. Material requested from the candidate by the committee, which include requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package if applicable.

### 3. Departmental RTP and Periodic Evaluation Procedures

- 3.1 The Department Chair shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy of the current, approved RTP criteria, and shall post a copy of the current approved Department RTP document in the Department office. The Department Chair will also retain copies of past, approved RTP criteria for the purposes of evaluating candidates who choose to be evaluated by criteria which were current at the time of the candidate's initial appointment. Copies of these past RTP documents shall be made available to the committee and faculty.
- 3.2 The committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place(s) near the Department office, of the names of candidates requesting a RTP action, the type of request made, and the name of the individual to whom signed comments or recommendation can be given. This posting will take place within one week of notification of the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request a RTP action. The posting will specify a deadline for receipt of comments.
- 3.3 The committee will make its evaluation of the candidate's request in writing on University approved forms. The chair of the committee will review with the candidate the results of the committee's evaluation. The candidate will then be given the opportunity to either accept the committee's recommendation, or to submit within ten (10) calendar days either a response/rebuttal or request a reconsideration (Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual). If the candidate does not acknowledge the recommendations of the committee, the Department Chair shall forward the RTP package to the next level of review and document the fact that the candidate was told of the committee's evaluation and recommendation and refused to acknowledge them.

The request for reconsideration of the committee's recommendation must address only the issues raised by the committee. It is important for the candidate to realize that new evidence can be introduced at this state. The committee cannot refuse a request for reconsideration.

In the request for reconsideration, the candidate must clearly deal with each issue raised by the

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

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

If the committee does not act favorably upon the candidate's request for reconsideration, the candidate has ten (10) calendar days, from the receipt of notification, to appeal to the College RTP Committee. Appeal is not obligatory. The candidate is advised to consult Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual. In addition to, or in lieu of a formal appeal to the College RTP Committee, the candidate may submit a response or rebuttal statement to the committee's final recommendation to be included in the RTP package.

- 3.4 The Department Chair, if not a member of the committee, should make a separate recommendation which will be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. The candidate will receive a copy of the Department Chair's recommendation when the original is incorporated into the RTP package. An appeal of the chair's recommendation will follow the same procedure as an appeal of department recommendations.
- 3.5 The Department requires that student evaluations be obtained by all faculty in each non-supervisory class taught. The policy and the approved forms are in Appendix 1.
- 3.6 The Department has established a policy on the peer review of teaching performance and a copy of this policy along with approved forms is in Appendix 2 of this document. In summary, the peer evaluation of teaching performance shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught by the candidate. Also, the peer evaluation shall include classroom visits and a review of course syllabus and relevant course materials. A minimum of two peer reviews per year, in different semesters, is required. A written report of the classroom visit shall be placed in the candidate's PAF within one month of the class visit. A copy of the written report will also be given to the candidate.

Only peer evaluations conducted during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. Exceptions may be allowed if the candidate does not have the minimum number of evaluations.

- 3.7 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 shall 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 must be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee. (CBA 15.12d)

#### 4. Candidate's Responsibilities

- 4.1 If the candidate is eligible for a RTP action or periodic evaluation then the candidate will receive written notification from the committee Chair. The candidate must respond in writing that either there will or will not be a RTP request. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then the candidate must notify the committee chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action.
- 4.2 At all times the candidate will be informed of the progress of the request through the various review groups.



## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

- 4.3 The candidate is required to assemble an RTP package, which makes the case for the requested action, or, in years of periodic evaluation, a periodic evaluation package. Packages will require candidates to submit an up-to-date curriculum vitae. To prepare RTP packages or periodic evaluation reports, the candidate is encouraged to attend university-sponsored workshops and seek the counsel of the DRTPC.

### 4.3.1 Self-Evaluation in the RTP Package

In the self-evaluation of the RTP package, the candidate must explicitly indicate what activities in Sections 5.5.1, 5.5.2 and 5.5.3 have been accomplished and explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested in Section 6–12. There must be solid evidence showing the quality as well as the quantity of accomplishments. In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document the importance of their work and their active involvement in all three areas. Furthermore, the evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:

- A. Discussion of teaching performance. This includes a detailed evaluation of the student and peer evaluation questions (such as identifying areas to be improved and methods to improve), activities relating to student advising and/or mentoring, and a teaching philosophy. The candidate shall provide evidence of development of materials for courses taught. The Department encourages the candidate to apply appropriate, available technology to classroom situations, and to develop and use various methodologies to present course content and assess teaching effectiveness. All deficiencies noted in the student and peer evaluation shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- B. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities. This includes a general description of your area of research, accomplishments during the period of review, and work in progress. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- C. Discussion of service to the University, College, Department and community. This includes specific accomplishments of that service (for example, proposals or problems solved by the committee), and the candidate's role in those accomplishments. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- D. The candidate shall clearly state attainable short and long term goals in all areas being evaluated, and discuss how these goals will be met. In the next RTP cycle, the candidate shall clearly state whether or not the short term goals have been met, the progress made on the long term goals, and whether or not goals need to be altered. The candidate is expected to seek advice from other faculty, administrators, etc. in generating these goals.

### 4.3.2 Self-Evaluation Report in the Periodic Evaluation Package

The candidate who needs to undergo periodic evaluation needs to submit a self-evaluation report. According to Policy No. 1328, section 7.4, in years when candidates undergo the more abbreviated periodic evaluation process, they must include a shorter self-assessment narrative, not to exceed four pages. This self-assessment narrative need not address the specific department RTP criteria but should broadly discuss the candidates "strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service and other professional activities," from the relevant period of review.

## **Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- 4.4 The period of time covered by the self-evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; tenure on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position. For periodic evaluations, the period of review shall be the period since the last performance review.
- 4.5 The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and will make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personal Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the committee and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should consider an Appendix to the evaluation package that contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, art work, etc.). These supplemental materials can be located in the department office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the RTP or periodic evaluation package.
- 4.6 The candidate is responsible for making sure that student evaluations have been completed and that the results of all evaluations are included in the RTP or periodic evaluation package. The policy and the approved forms are in Appendix 1.

The only professional means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in faculty performance review is to reach students collectively, not individually. Any solicitation by the candidate on their own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is unprofessional and is prohibited.

- 4.7 The candidate needs to work closely with the Department in order to schedule the minimum number of peer reviews of teaching performance. The minimum number of peer reviews is two in different semesters. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those initiated by the committee and 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 candidate should have ready 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.

### **5. Departmental Evaluation of Candidate**

- 5.1 Candidates selecting these Departmental RTP criteria (see Section 5.2) shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless stated in writing, with agreement of the candidate, the committee, the University RTP Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- 5.2 Criteria for reappointment decisions or periodic evaluations shall be the criteria that were in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus. Candidates for tenure or 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. If a candidate requests simultaneous consideration for both promotion and tenure, the candidate must select a single set of criteria. Once the evaluation process has started, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the candidate.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

- 5.3 In promotion considerations, committee members and the department chair must have a higher academic rank than the candidate. Tenured candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any promotion or tenure actions considered by the committee. However, they are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the committee.
- 5.4 Each committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a two thirds majority (rounding to the nearest integer) vote of the entire membership of the committee, with abstentions counting as a negative vote. In most cases, the voting results should be consistent with the minimum DRTPC ratings for positive recommendation in each of criteria as described in the criteria for the action requested (Sections 6–12). If not, the committee must explain this disagreement in the Department RTP Committee evaluation of the candidate’s performance. The deliberations of the committee shall remain confidential. The committee shall not assign any of its duties to any other group or individual.
- 5.5 The candidate is evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Teaching is considered the most important component of a candidate’s performance. Scholarship is expected to enhance the candidate’s teaching. The candidate is expected to show meaningful committee activity at the Department, and College or University level.

### 5.5.1 Evaluation of teaching

A. Evaluation of teaching includes the following items.

#### 1. *Student evaluations:*

- *Candidates are required to examine the results of the student evaluations and comment upon them in the RTP package. Likewise, the committee in their recommendation, shall examine the candidate’s student evaluations and document their findings.*
- *In general, the Department will refer to the “class average” of each student evaluation summary sheet to evaluate the performance. However, scores of individual categories may also be examined.*
- *Scores on the student evaluation form (see Appendix 1) range over 1 – excellent, 2 – good, 3 – satisfactory, 4 – poor, 5 – unacceptable.*

#### 2. *Peer evaluations:*

- *Peer evaluations should address the following issues:*
  - a. *Candidate’s knowledge of subject matter and clarity of presentation.*
  - b. *Appropriateness and organization of the material presented in class.*
  - c. *Effective use of various teaching methods*
  - d. *Use of various methods of evaluating student achievement.*
  - e. *Candidate’s attitude and helpfulness to students.*

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

- *Marks on the peer evaluation form (see Appendix 2) are mapped to numerical scores range over 1 – excellent, 2 – good, 3 – satisfactory, 4 – poor, 5 – unacceptable.*

### 3. Candidate's involvement in the activities below:

- *Working towards teaching an appropriate range of CS courses (lower and upper division undergraduate and graduate-level lecture courses).*
- *Improving lecture, laboratory or course materials.*
- *Curriculum development involving the creation of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses.*
- *Directing students in senior projects.*
- *Directing students in graduate theses or projects.*
- *Participating in professional development activities as a teacher, such as faculty center workshops and CS/STEM related pedagogical workshops.*

## B. Criteria of Teaching Evaluation

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the quality of teaching of the Candidate.

**Excellent:** The candidate should have an overall average student evaluation score 1.5 or better. The candidate should receive an overall average peer evaluation score 1.5 or better. The candidate should demonstrate involvement in all the activities listed in above item 3. The candidate should have at least one exceptional achievement, such as teaching award in the college/university level, recognition at reputable pedagogical conferences (such as SIGCSE) on significant teaching innovation or other similar significant achievement as judged by the committee.

**Very Good:** The candidate should have an overall average student evaluation score 2.0 or better. The candidate should receive an overall average peer evaluation score 2.0 or better. The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least five activities listed in above item 3.

**Good:** The candidate should have an overall average student evaluation score 2.5 or better. The candidate should receive an overall average peer evaluation score 2.5 or better. The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least four different activities listed in above item 3. The candidate should demonstrate efforts working towards improvement in teaching.

**Satisfactory:** The candidate should have an overall average student evaluation score 3.0 or better. The candidate should receive an overall average peer evaluation score 3.0 or better. The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least three different activities listed in above item 3. The candidate should demonstrate efforts working towards improvement in teaching.

**Unsatisfactory:** The candidate does not meet the criteria set for Satisfactory in this category.

### 5.5.2 Evaluation of scholarly activities

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

A. Evaluation of scholarly and creative activity is based on candidate's involvement in the activities listed below under three different categories:

### Category I:

- *The candidate, as PI or co-PI, has successfully obtained major external grant to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate, as PI or co-PI, has successfully obtained major external contract/donations to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate, as a PI, has successfully obtained internal funding to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate has published in peer-reviewed journals related to their specialty area.*
- *The candidate has published peer-reviewed books/book chapters in computer science.*
- *The candidate has published in peer-reviewed conference/workshop proceedings related to their specialty area.*

### Category II:

- *The candidate, as co-PI, has successfully obtained internal funding to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate, as PI or co-PI, has applied for external grants to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate, as PI or co-PI, has applied for external contracts/donations to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate, as PI, has applied for internal funding to be used for scholarly activities, educational activities or infrastructure improvement.*
- *The candidate has made scholarly presentations at professional meetings.*
- *The candidate has completed additional course work related to their area of specialty.*
- *The candidate has served as a program committee chair or session chair for a professional conference or workshop related to their area of specialty.*

### Category III:

- *The candidate serves as a reviewer or abstractor for papers and manuscripts in recognized peer reviewed journals or publications.*
- *The candidate works as a consultant in their specialty area.*

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

- *The candidate has attended conferences, workshops and seminars directly related to their area of specialty.*
- *The candidate is an active member of a professional organization, conference or workshop as demonstrated by service on committees or service as an officer; related to their area of specialty.*
- *The candidate has presented at this University, at other institutions or professional organizations.*
- *The candidate has submitted articles for publication in peer reviewed journals and conferences.*
- *The candidate has submitted peer reviewed books/book chapters for publication.*

### B. Criteria of Scholarship Evaluation

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the quality of scholarship of the Candidate.

**Excellent:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least eight different activities (with at least three from Category I and three from Category II) listed in above part A. The candidate should have accomplished at least two items of the following activities: PI or Co-PI of major external grant, PI or Co-PI of major contract arranged through university that benefit the department and its students, publication in top tier peer reviewed journals and conferences, recognition of scholarly work by significant external organizations, publication of computer science books that made important contribution to the field, university or higher level award in scholarly achievements, or other significant activities as judged by the committee.

**Very Good:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least six different activities (with at least two from Category I and two from Category II) listed in above part A.

**Good:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least five different activities (with at least one from Category I and one from Category II or with at least two from Category II) listed in above part A.

**Satisfactory:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least four different activities (with at least one from Category I or with at least two from Category II) listed in above part A.

**Unsatisfactory:** The candidate does not meet the criteria set for Satisfactory in this category.

**Note:** Exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, a faculty invited to make a keynote speech at a related conference can be considered as a category I activity. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given, such as when one or more activities may be of such high quality that they should be given additional weight. These exceptions will be judged by the committee.

### 5.5.3 Evaluation of service

- A. Evaluation of service is based on candidate's involvement in some (or all) of the activities listed below under two different categories:

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

### Category I:

- *The candidate has served as the chair of a standing committee in the department.*
- *The candidate has an administrative assignment such as the Department Chair.*
- *The candidate has served as the chair of a standing committee in the College or University.*
- *The candidate has served on University Committee (e.g., Senate committees or other University Committees that meet regularly/weekly).*
- *The candidate has been a major advisor to an ASI recognized student organization or departmental organization.*
- *The candidate has organized K-12 or industrial activities related to CS curriculum.*

### Category II:

- *The candidate has actively participated on a standing committee in the Department/College/University.*
- *The candidate is a member of a Department, College or University ad hoc committee with major assignments to accomplish.*
- *The candidate has served as a mentor to junior faculty.*
- *The candidate has actively participated in the recruitment of new faculty.*
- *The candidate is a course coordinator for multi-sectioned course.*
- *The candidate has made presentations to schools, civic groups, etc.*
- *The candidate promotes community involvement through service-learning coursework related to CS curriculum.*
- *The candidate is involved in teacher preparation programs related to CS curriculum.*
- *The candidate is involved in general student advising, including meeting with students, keeping up to date on academic policies, and attending student advising workshops.*
- *The candidate is involved in volunteer academic/service activities.*

### B. Criteria of Service Evaluation

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the quality of service of the Candidate.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

**Excellent:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least six different activities (with at least three from Category I) listed in above part A. The candidate should have accomplishments in two of the following activities: leadership role in department key committees, leadership role in senate or university key committees, university or higher level awards in community service, recognition for the successful direction of special projects or programs of substantial benefit to the Department or University (such as organization of a national level conference/workshop relevant to their area of specialty, or organization of externally funded K-12, teacher preparation or community outreach events), or other significant activities as judged by the committee.

**Very Good:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least five different activities (with at least two from Category I) listed in above part A. The candidate should take leadership role(s) in department level committees and make major contributions to college/university level committees.

**Good:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in at least four different activities (with at least one from Category I) listed in above part A. The candidate should take leadership role(s) in department level committees and actively serve committees at college or university level.

**Satisfactory:** The candidate should demonstrate active involvement in in at least three different activities listed in above part A. The candidate is expected to actively participate in committees at the department.

**Unsatisfactory:** The candidate does not meet the criteria set for Satisfactory in this category.

**Note:** Many alternative activities and exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, work by a faculty on accreditation that required major time commitment (5 to 10 hours every week) may deserve as much weight as a category I activity. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given. These exceptions will be judged by the committee.

### 6. Criteria for Reappointment

- 6.1 A probationary faculty member must apply for reappointment during a RTP cycle if the previous reappointment letter (or initial appointment letter) specifies that the term of (re)appointment expires at the end of the current academic year. The only exception is the case of a probationary faculty member in the sixth probationary year, who must apply for tenure.

The candidates who need to undergo periodic evaluation should perform their self-evaluation based on the same criteria for their next reappointment or promotion goal.

- 6.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5.

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criterion 6.3	Criterion 6.4	Criterion 6.5
Reappointment to 3rd Probationary Year	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Meet	Meet	Meet



### Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Reappointment to 4th Probationary Year	Good	Good	Satisfactory	Meet	Meet	Meet
Reappointment to 5th/6th Probationary Year	Very Good	Good	Good	Meet	Meet	Meet

- 6.3. The candidate keeps regular office hours and appointments, and attends meetings of the Department and committees in which the candidate is a member.
- 6.4. The candidate should perform peer evaluations and other assigned duties from the department,
- 6.5. The candidate should document their efforts of working towards tenure and/or promotion. The candidate should demonstrate the ability and willingness to work effectively with the other members of the Department.

#### 7. Criteria for Tenure

- 7.1 A request for tenure is possible only when a probationary faculty member has begun the last year of the probationary period. The request is obligatory in this case.
- 7.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 7.3, and 7.4.

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criterion 7.3	Criterion 7.4
Tenure	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Meet	Meet

- 7.3 The candidate must have demonstrated the ability and willingness to work effectively with the other members of the Department. This should be substantiated by the candidate's report on committee assignments, new course proposals, updated course outline proposals, curriculum change proposals, collaborative research proposals and any other Department work or activities which require effective interaction with other faculty.
- 7.4 The candidate must have documented continuing efforts to make a positive and needed contribution to the Department in the future. This should be substantiated by the candidate's report on current or proposed research or projects, ideas for grant proposals, or any other current or proposed activities that will be of direct benefit to the Computer Science program and its students.

#### 8. Criteria for Early Tenure

- 8.1 A request for early tenure is never obligatory. Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early tenure must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona before the effective date of early tenure. Thus, a faculty member's application for early tenure can occur no earlier than the second year on campus.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

8.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 7.3 and 7.4.

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criterion 7.3	Criterion 7.4
Early Tenure	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Meet	Meet

### 9. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

9.1 A request for regular promotion to Associate Professor is never obligatory. The request for promotion to Associate Professor by a probationary faculty member will be considered only if the candidate is simultaneously applying for tenure. The promotion of a tenured faculty member shall normally be effective the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current academic rank, that is, a tenured faculty member may normally apply for promotion at the beginning of the fifth year after appointment to their current academic rank.

9.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5.

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criterion 9.3	Criterion 9.4	Criterion 9.5
Promotion to Associate Professor	Very good	Very Good	Very Good	Meet	Meet	Meet

9.3 The candidate must have demonstrated substantial breadth in teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses in Computer Science, especially core courses and existing elective courses. Some exceptions can be made to the candidates with reassigned time due to administrative assignment such as department chair, academic governance or externally/internally funded scholarly activity such as assigned time for exceptional services to students, CBA article 20.37.

9.4 The candidate must have successfully directed at least two master's thesis/project and department required number of undergraduate senior project(s) in Computer Science, and be available to direct future theses/projects.

9.5 In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated a leadership role in at least two of the areas of evaluation. This should be substantiated in the candidate's report and could include, for example, the development of new course or laboratory materials, published research work, grant proposals, program development, or other activities where the candidate's own initiative was a determining factor for success.

### 10. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor

10.1 A request for early promotion to Associate Professor is never obligatory. Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early promotion must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona in the rank of Assistant Professor before the effective date of early promotion. Thus, a faculty member's application for early promotion to Associate Professor can occur no earlier than the second year on campus.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

10.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Criterion 9.3</b>	<b>Criterion 9.4</b>	<b>Criterion 9.5</b>
Early Promotion to Associate Professor	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Meet	Meet	Meet

### 11. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

11.1 A request for promotion to Professor is never obligatory. The request for promotion to Professor will be considered only if the candidate has served four years in rank of Associate Professor. The candidate may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. Furthermore, promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.

11.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 11.3, 11.4, and 11.5.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Criterion 11.3</b>	<b>Criterion 11.4</b>	<b>Criterion 11.5</b>
Promotion to Professor	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Meet	Meet	Meet

11.3 The candidate must have demonstrated substantial breadth in teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses in Computer Science, especially core courses and existing elective courses. Some exceptions can be made to the candidates with reassigned time due to administrative assignment such as department chair, academic governance or externally/internally funded scholarly activity such as assigned time for exceptional services to students, Appendix 20 article 20.37.

11.4 The candidate must have successfully directed at least two master's thesis/project and department required number of undergraduate senior project(s) in Computer Science, and be available to direct future theses/projects.

11.5 The candidate must have demonstrated a leadership role in each of the three areas of evaluation, as exemplified in Section 9.5 above.

### 12. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor

12.1 A request for early promotion to Professor is never obligatory. Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early promotion must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona before the effective date of early promotion. Thus, a faculty member's application for early promotion to Professor can occur no earlier than the second year on campus. Furthermore, early promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

12.2 A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings. This set of minima represent guidelines as described in Section 5.5 as well as satisfactory performance in the areas set by criteria 11.3, 11.4, and 11.5.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Criterion 11.3</b>	<b>Criterion 11.4</b>	<b>Criterion 11.5</b>
Early Promotion to Professor	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Meet	Meet	Meet

### 13. Evaluation of Faculty in an Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave

13.1 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.

#### 13.2 Faculty Serving in an Administrative Assignment:

- A. For promotion, faculty serving in an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses equivalent of 24 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 3 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 22 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- B. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 8 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 8 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department. At least 6 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the 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 in an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- D. Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.
- E. There can be no deviation of 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.

#### 13.3 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 of 24 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 3 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 22 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

### **Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- B. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in academic governance and having release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 8 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 8 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department. At least 6 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the 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 in academic governance shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- D. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their academic governance duties.
- E. There can be no deviation of 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.

#### 13.4 Faculty On Approved Leave

- A. Faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President of the University are on approved leave. Normally, this is with pay from this University and thus, for tenure-track candidates, the probationary status is still active and next several paragraphs apply. If the approved leave is without pay from the University then the probationary status of the tenure-track 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 of 24 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 3 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 22 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the 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 candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.
- C. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 8 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 8 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department at this University. At least 6 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the 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 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 candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department. Research and scholarly activity done 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 candidate of the service requirement at this University.

## **Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- 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.

### **14. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)**

- 14.1 Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty members not under consideration for promotion shall be conducted by a subcommittee of the DRTPC who are at Full Professor rank with minimum two members. If the DRTPC contains faculty with lower rank than the faculty member under review, the evaluating body will be expanded to include all tenured department faculty at the same or higher rank.
- 14.2 Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated at intervals of five years. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are not required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator.
- 14.3 Evaluations shall be conducted during the spring semester and reported on the appropriate pages of the university faculty performance review form (Policy No. 1330). For those with teaching responsibilities, consideration shall include student evaluations of teaching performance.

### **15. Evaluation of First Year Faculty (Pre-RTP Review)**

- 15.1 Please refer to the procedure and preparation mentioned in Section 305 of University Manual.
- 15.2 Candidates will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
- 15.3 Candidates will need to prepare a self-evaluation as stated in Section 4 of this DRTP document.
- 15.4 Criteria for reappointment to 3<sup>rd</sup> Probationary Year will be applied in the evaluation for candidates without any service credit. Candidates with service credits will use the appropriate probationary year criteria.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

### ***Appendix 1—In-Class Student Evaluations***

Faculty members must have student evaluations done for each section of each lecture/problem class that they teach using the Department approved form, Instructional Assessment. The evaluation criteria on this form are listed below. The faculty member shall follow the directions attached to the envelope containing the evaluation forms.

Under no circumstances shall the faculty member be present during the evaluation, or see the individual evaluations before grades have been submitted to the Records office and the evaluations have been reviewed and summarized.

A summary of the evaluations will be placed in the Department personnel folder for the faculty member.

The following qualities to be evaluated will appear on the Instructional Assessment form:

*Instructor preparedness, course well organized.*

*Instructor's knowledge of subject matter.*

*Effective communication of ideas and information.*

*Instructor's enthusiasm about the course.*

*Stimulation of student interest.*

*Instructor provides the student with challenge.*

*Exams fairly tested student's knowledge of subject.*

*Fairness in grading.*

*Sympathetic, courteous, helpful and concerned.*

*Instructor available during office hours or by appointment.*

*Students free to ask questions related to course.*

*Questions effectively answered.*

*Instructor effective as a teacher of Computer Science.*

*Scores on the student evaluation form range over 1 – excellent, 2 – good, 3 – satisfactory, 4 – poor, 5 – unacceptable.*

All summaries of student evaluations will become a part of the next RTP packet that is submitted by the faculty member.

## Computer Science Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

### ***Appendix 2—In-Class Peer Evaluations***

1. In-class peer evaluations of faculty shall be done at appropriate times using the department-approved form, Class Visitation Report, a sample of which appears on the next page. All evaluations shall be done by tenure-track faculty from the Computer Science Department.
2. The faculty member being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) working days that a class room visit is to take place.
3. The in-class peer evaluation report shall be written and sent to the Department within ten (10) calendar days after a classroom visit. A copy of each evaluation will be given to the faculty member and a copy will be placed in the Department personnel folder for the faculty member.
4. The faculty member being evaluated may append comments to the copy within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the evaluation. Both the peer evaluation and the faculty member's response will be kept in the Department personnel folder for the faculty member.

The DRTPC shall assign faculty to conduct in-class peer evaluations of all tenure-track faculty who teach during the academic year. A minimum of two (2) peer evaluations of teaching performance shall be conducted each academic year. The peer evaluations shall be conducted by two different faculty colleagues. Associate professors may evaluate assistant professors. Full professors may evaluate any other faculty member. No faculty member may evaluate themselves. The peer evaluation shall include a class visitation and a review of course syllabus and related materials (such as notes, assignments, exams). All evaluation reports will become part of the next RTP packet or post-tenure review that is submitted by the faculty member.



**California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Computer Science Department**

**Class Visitation Report**

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Visitor \_\_\_\_\_  
Course Number \_\_\_\_\_ Visitor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Course Title \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Semester and Year \_\_\_\_\_  
Visitation Date \_\_\_\_\_

	Excellent	Good	Satis- factory	Poor	Unac- ceptable
1. Instructor well prepared					
2. Session well organized					
3. Effective communication of ideas					
4. Enthusiasm about course					
5. Attitude toward students					
6. Stimulation of student interest					
7. Level of student participation					
8. Quality of answers to questions					

**Comments (attach additional pages as necessary):**

1. Comments for “excellent” or “unacceptable” marks:

2. General evaluation of course material—syllabus, projects, homework, handouts.

Instructor's Signature and Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please sign all subsequent pages if any.