CalPolyPomona | College of Education and Integrative Studies

Education Department

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Document

2022-2027

Table of Contents

Introduction

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

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within fourteen (14) days of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona.

It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the department web page so that they are available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and in particular what they must achieve in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidates are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate a model of the department faculty colleague to which the candidate should aspire.

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

A. Definitions

Policy 1328 and Policy 1329 provide   a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures and student evaluation of teaching. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

1. Candidate refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.

2. The Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) will consist of an odd number of members with a minimum size of 3. RTP Committee members must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department   DRTPC   members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only participate on reappointment cases – may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. (See Policy 1328, 3.   1).

 3. Criteria are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or their designee. (See also Policy 1328, 2.1   )

4. A probationary year of service is an academic year. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.

5. A faculty member is eligible to apply for tenure at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for early tenure.

6. A faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is eligible for a subsequent promotion after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion that are submitted prior to completing these eligibility time requirements are applications for early promotion.

7. Criteria for early actions shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to teaching ability, scholarly and professional activities, and university service.

8. Policy 1329 of the University Manual governs student evaluation of teaching.

9. Peer evaluation of teaching is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit or a synchronous or asynchronous virtual visit; review of course syllabus & other teaching materials, and a written report.

10. A candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. (See Policy 1328, 7.1) Current procedures and policies apply.

11. A candidate for tenure or promotion (including early tenure or promotion) may choose between the criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current university procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

B. Department Philosophy

Our department vision and mission drive our department philosophy. Our vision is that we will be the model for developing socially just educators who provide quality instruction, embrace local and global challenges, inspire innovation, and work collaboratively to improve school and community outcomes.

Given this vision, our mission is to empower transformative educators who advocate for justice and equity for all learners.

Our values are equity; racial and social justice; academic excellence; student success; experiential learning; inclusiveness; and social and environmental responsibility.

The process of Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) is designed to support the professional development of each member of the faculty of the Department of Education. The Department recognizes that professional growth and development is a continuing responsibility throughout the duration of a professional career. The RTP process is a formative assessment conducted by the faculty member and the RTP Committee, composed of peers, which is designed to facilitate individual growth and self-assessment of professional growth. While recognizing and accommodating the professional and individual variations in areas of interest, assignment, and skill, the RTP process emphasizes the importance of high standards of performance in all categories of review.

The process is also intended to provide guidance and support to faculty members without restricting their academic freedom to pursue, develop, and present the findings of scholarly inquiry and educational activities in ways that are compatible with the mission of the

Department. It is expected that once a full-time, tenure-track faculty member's appointment begins, the department assumes an investment in that faculty member for the candidate's professional development in higher education.

Candidates are evaluated for teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activity, and service at any level in the University, community, and profession. In evaluating a candidate for re-appointment, tenure, or promotion, the review groups will consider these evaluation areas in light of the candidate's re-appointment level, past performance, and improvement.

The Department values a broadened "scope of scholarship," in which education faculty engage—scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching (p. 9). In addition, the Department views every aspect of a candidate's professional work as part of an ongoing process of professional growth (informed by the practices of intellectual inquiry and self-reflection) that will advance their teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to the university, community, and profession. The Department encourages and supports the candidate's development of a professional identity that is framed around a domain (or domains) of expertise within the field of education. The Department also encourages, supports, and values the impact of faculty service and creative activities in the field. In keeping with the polytechnic mission of the university and the professional service functions of a college of education, the contributions made by Department faculty that advance educational knowledge, skills, and practice in the field are considered to be important elements of a scholarly portfolio.

II. Procedures

A. Reference to Policy 1328

Policy 1328 describes RTP procedures in complete detail. It is the candidate's responsibility to consult Policy 1328. Candidates should be aware that changes to Policy 1328 occur more frequently than do changes to the Department RTP document.

B. Department RTP Procedures

Members of the committee, including the DRTPC chair, will be elected by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty via secret ballot. At the beginning of each annual RTPC cycle, the department chair will indicate whether they intend to be a member of the DRTPC or write a separate statement for each candidate.

The Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) and the DRTPC Chairperson will follow the procedures detailed in <u>Policy 1328</u>. It is the responsibility of the candidate to follow Policy 1328 procedures. When a faculty member undergoes a performance review, the faculty member shall submit an RTP package that is comprised to the following items:

- An updated curriculum vitae;
- A self-assessment narrative (no page limit) discussing the DRTP criteria regarding strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities and service from the current review period. The narrative will highlight, as applicable, how accomplishments support CPP's core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;
- All peer evaluations since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all peer evaluations since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);
- Statistical summaries of student survey scores since the previous performance review (in the case of reappointment) or all student survey scores since appointment or last promotion (in the case of tenure and/or promotion);
- The Faculty Performance Review Form (RTP Form);

- Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period per the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF).

Although the RTP package is the working PAF for the purposes of RTP evaluation and consists of the Faculty Performance Review Form and accompanying materials, the DRTPC should consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials. The procedures and number of peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted in accordance with Policy 1328 Section 3.3 and the DRTPC Chair will ensure that each candidate is evaluated twice each year. Student evaluations and solicitation of student comments will be conducted in accordance with Policy 1329.

Based on the 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. The Provost makes the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. In interim years when a probationary faculty member is not applying for reappointment, a periodic evaluation will be conducted. The probationary faculty member shall submit a "periodic evaluation report" comprised of five items:

- An updated curriculum vitae;
- A self-assessment narrative, not to exceed four pages, discussing strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities and service and other professional activities as applicable from the current review period. In your narrative, highlight, as applicable, how your accomplishments support CPP's core values, such as academic excellence, experiential learning, student learning and success, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;
- Two peer evaluations from the period of review
- Statistical summaries of student survey scores and reviews from the current review period;
- Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.

The DRTPC, the department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and the dean shall produce a report with constructive feedback and clear guidance for improvement in preparation of the next year's performance review. No recommendation for RTP actions will be permitted during a periodic evaluation. A copy of the report shall be placed in the candidate's PAF.

In most cases of RTP review, CPP faculty are well qualified to provide the requisite objective review. In other instances, colleagues or community partners outside the University may be needed to provide additional expertise not available within the CPP community. A written request for external review may be initiated at the DRTPC level by any party to the RTP review process to solicit external evaluators to provide local, regional, national, and/or international perspectives on a candidate's achievements and activities.

Such a request shall document:

> (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an outside reviewer, and

> (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer.

The request must be approved by the Dean or appropriate administrator, as President's designee, with concurrence of the candidate. In such cases, the candidate may be asked to submit the names of potential external evaluators. The Chair is responsible for soliciting letters of evaluation in a timely manner. An external evaluator shall be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of a candidate's achievements only in those areas where the evaluator has first-hand knowledge of the candidate's work or contributions. External evaluators shall not be asked to conduct evaluations of the candidate's RTP package based on RTP criteria.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

It is the candidate's responsibility to refer to the most recent version of Policy 1329, the University manual, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for specific procedures.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

It is the candidate's and the DRTPC's responsibility to refer to the most recent version of Policy 1328, Section 3.3. The DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and that a copy of each written evaluation is submitted to the faculty member within two weeks of the class visit. Policy 1328 3.3 E.

Positions Other Than Teaching

10

These positions refer to candidates and future candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, reassigned time, or on leave.1328

Professional Leave

Candidates on leave shall be evaluated using the criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service. Faculty may be on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships and grants, overseas teaching program coordination, administrative assignment for the University, reassigned time and visiting professor/scholar at another institution. Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for   action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence.

For such professional leave assignments, the candidate will agree to a memorandum of understanding with the Department Chair and DRTPC outlining the criteria for RTP, which may include a reduced teaching assignment with minimal course evaluation requirements, and/or reduced scholarship and service. The memorandum must be approved by the DRTPC to be sure all aspects of teaching, service, and scholarship are met.

Such individuals must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the Dean, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The memorandum will be placed in the PAF.

III. Criteria for RTP Action

A. Elements of Performance and Evaluation

The criterion areas include

>1) teaching and supervision of culminating experiences (clinical practice, project, thesis, comprehensive exam, and/or dissertation supervision)

>2) scholarly and creative activity

>3) service to department, college, university, community/profession, and advising. Criteria are designed to guide candidates in a manner that is flexible enough to allow the candidate to demonstrate effectiveness in a variety of ways. In all areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, candidates are expected to contribute significant and consistent work every year across all criterion areas, as appropriate to the candidate's rank and year of service in higher education.

The criteria contained in Section III are intended to guide both candidates and faculty Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (DRTPC) members. However, they are not intended to constrain the fair and reasoned professional judgments of the DRTPC. Candidates should provide a self-evaluation narrative that succinctly addresses teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service in all RTP packages (e.g. reappointment, tenure, and promotion). Candidates should articulate the significance of their work, as appropriate and should address each of the recommendations made in previous review cycle(s). There is no page limit on the narrative.

A narrative introduction before each section (teaching and supervision section, scholarly and creative activity section, and service section) should summarize one's overall achievements in each area (as set forth in section IIIA) and in the case of a request for early promotion, should explain how the candidate's performance in each section exceeds the standards required for regular promotion (as set forth in the sections describing the criteria for early action).

In areas of teaching and supervision, scholarly and creative activity, and service, candidates should articulate the significance of their work, as appropriate. They should organize each section according to the following headings:

- *DRTPC's recommendations*: Include the DRTPC's recommendations from the previous year, and respond to these recommendations in both the narrative at the beginning of each section of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service and the appendices.
- *Goals*: Articulate the philosophy and aims of one's work.
- *Activities and Results*: Describe the activities taken to achieve one's goals and the results.

Reflective critique: Write a critical self-evaluation of one's work, including specific strengths and areas of growth, and a professional development plan that discusses in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that the candidate expects to accomplish prior to requesting tenure. The DRTPC will make recommendations based on accomplishment of this plan (which will include a consideration of the candidate's reflective analysis of the factors that either advanced or inhibited their accomplishment of the plan and its component goals). The DRTPC will weigh these factors against the department's expectations for tenure and/or promotion. The narrative should include a summary or citation of supplementary material when appropriate and an appendix of supplementary materials (e.g. publications, grant proposals, course materials, commendations, art work, etc.) uploaded to the CPP Interfolio platform.

University Policy 1328 states, "The "period of review" is the period of performance under review or evaluation. If a candidate is applying:

- for reappointment for the first time, the period of review shall be the period since the candidate's original appointment.
- f   or subsequent reappointment   and periodic evaluations the period of review shall be the period since the last performance review.   For application for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure, the period of review shall be the period since the original appointment.   For promotion to Full Professor, the period of review   shall be the period since the previous application for promotion to Associate, or, if the candidate was hired at the Associate rank, the period since the original appointment.

Given the integrated nature of work in education, the Department recognizes that some activities might be included in more than one category. The candidate has discretion to determine where to place these types of activities and to explain the reason for this placement.

While the DRTPC expects that the candidate will demonstrate strong performance in all areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, the DRTPC may consider extenuating circumstances and/or the strength of one's overall work across teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service in decisions regarding tenure and/or promotion. In addition, the candidate may explain how relevant prior experience (apart from service credit experience) prepared him or her for the current appointment.

1) Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences

Teaching is effective when it results in student learning and is closely aligned with course and program learning goals and expected outcomes. Candidates should have freedom to employ a variety of strategies and assessments that they believe will promote student learning and achieve course outcomes. In addition, the department highly values efforts by faculty members to work collaboratively to improve teaching and learning. Evidence of quality teaching may include teaching philosophy, syllabi, course materials, instructional methods, assignments, assessments, and student work.

Supervision of culminating experiences including fieldwork and clinical practice in the credential programs, masters' theses, projects and comprehensive exams in the MA program, and dissertations in the EdD program is considered of equal value to teaching courses. As set forth in Commission on Teacher Credentialing's (2015) Common Standards, candidates whose primary teaching load resides in the credential programs are required to do some supervision of field-based activities and/or clinical practice during the probationary period. Evidence of quality supervision might include supervisor evaluations, peer review of supervision, supervision materials and methods, assignments, student work and documentation of candidates' performance). The work of master's thesis and project committee chairs, supervising comprehensive examinations, and of <u>all</u> members of doctoral dissertations committees is considered teaching; membership on a master's committee will be viewed as service.

2) Scholarly & Creative Activity

At Cal Poly Pomona, scholarship of teaching, scholarship of engagement, and applied research are considered of equal value to basic research. The department encourages and supports faculty who pursue scholarship that relates to the candidate's field of interest in order to establish a

record of focused scholarly and creative activities in the candidate's area(s) of expertise. The DRTPC will assess the quality of these activities in terms of:

- *Scope*—the development, application, and refinement of expertise in the field
- *Originality*—the extent in which the work advances knowledge, practice, and the profession
- *Rigor*—the difficulty, intensity, and complexity of the work
- *Audience*—public sharing in local, regional, state, national, and international arenas
- *Value*—the recognition of expertise and impact

The trajectory of a candidate's scholarly and creative endeavors is expected to increase and become higher in quality in the aforementioned areas over time as the candidate approaches tenure and/or promotion. A candidate who produces significant scholarly work early in the probationary period should still show evidence of ongoing achievement of short-term goals and of continuous progress toward long-term goals.

The DRTPC recognizes that legitimate scholarship comes in many forms and is expressed through multiple venues. Within the profession of higher education, the forms and venues of scholarship are commonly accorded different values as a consequence of their methodological rigor, quality, and contributions to the domains of theory and/or practice. Following are examples of valued scholarship organized hierarchically by scope, originality, rigor, audience, and value to the field (i.e., most highly valued, highly valued, and valued). This taxonomy is provided as an illustration only, does not preclude the consideration of other forms of legitimate scholarship (since overall performance must be appraised) and is meant to offer guidance to both candidates and the DRTPC. Refer to Section III for further detail regarding the criteria used to guide decisions for promotion and tenure.

Most Highly Valued

Scholarship that makes a significant contribution to the candidate's area of expertise and is based on original empirical research, grounded in research or empirical literature, and/or bridges theory and practice, such as

Publications
- Scholarly books and monographs
- Articles in refereed national and international journals
- Editor of an edited book

- Chapters in an edited work

- State, national, or international educational documents

Presentations
- Refereed presentations at national or international conferences

Grants and other sponsored activity
- Funded competitive grant proposals external to Cal Poly Pomona

- Government or private foundation sponsored research projects and/or reports

Other scholarly and creative activity
- Lead role in creative projects, media, scholarship, and/or major reports for the university, county offices of education, regional education laboratories, public schools, school districts or other education agencies with evidence of positive impact on practice and/or student learning outcomes

- International, national, or state educational policy document (e.g., legislative initiatives, proposals, regulations, programs, standards, curriculum or assessments)

Highly Valued

Scholarship that makes an important contribution to the candidate's area of expertise and draws from research or empirical literature and/or bridges theory and practice, such as

Publications
- Published trade journal articles, book reviews, or educational pieces in popular and other media

- Contributor to reports or policy documents by federal, state, and local agencies and private foundations

Presentations
- Refereed presentations in state professional associations, agencies, or groups

Grants and other sponsored activity
- Funded internal CPP grants

- Unfunded grant proposals external to Cal Poly Pomona

- Significant contributions to funded grants and educational projects supported by internal or external funding

Other scholarly and creative activity

- Significant contributions to creative projects, media, scholarship, and/or major reports for the university, county offices of education, regional education laboratories, public schools, school districts or other education agencies with evidence of positive impact on practice and/or student learning outcomes

Valued

Scholarship that contributes to the candidate's area of expertise, such as

Publications
- Any professional contributions, online or otherwise, that are not peer-reviewed

Presentations
- Non-refereed scholarly presentations or roundtables

Grant activity
- Contributions to grants and educational projects supported by internal or external funding

Other scholarly and creative activity
- Contributions to creative projects, media, scholarship, and/or major reports for the university, county offices of education, regional education laboratories, public schools, school districts or other education agencies with evidence of positive impact on practice and/or student learning outcomes

3) Service

The Department expects service with the department, college, university, education agencies, community, and/or the profession at large during the probationary period of employment and as the faculty member progresses through one's career. The DRTPC will determine the value of one's service using the following general criteria:

> *Service Venue*, such as department, college, university, education agencies at the international, national, state, and local levels, community, and/or profession);
>
> *Time Investment*, such as amount per semester and the total number of semesters;
>
> *Rigor*, such as difficulty, intensity, and complexity of the work; and
>
> *Value of Contribution*, such as role (e.g., leader versus participant).

Program Advising

Faculty members are expected to serve student needs through advising as required by their respective divisions.

Graduate Advising

Teaching in the graduate program includes serving as a committee chair for a Master's thesis or project, or supervising the comprehensive examination. Other work on graduate committees is treated as Advising , as described in III.A.1.

B. Criteria for Reappointment

The DRTPC will consider the candidate's contributions in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, in reference to the Elements of Performance and Evaluation described above, as appropriate to the candidate's assignment, rank, and year of service.

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences: The DRTPC will review student course evaluation scores and peer observations. A cumulative average of more than 2.5 on any item in student course evaluations for all courses taught in the period of review may disqualify a candidate from reappointment. A cumulative average of below 2.5 in any of the three rubric areas may disqualify a candidate from reappointment. .

Scholarly & Creative Activities: In review of the candidate's scholarly and creative activity, the DRTPC will consider evidence that the candidate will have a record of scholarly and creative activity in the candidate's field of expertise as outlined in section III.A.2 by the time the candidate requests action for promotion and/or tenure.

Service: Candidates must demonstrate activity in a variety of areas (department, college, university, education agencies, community, and profession). The DRTPC is looking for evidence of sustained and increasing levels of contributions, eventually taking on leadership roles by the time the candidate requests action for promotion and/or tenure. The DRTPC will also consider the candidate's contributions in areas related to effective supervision and graduate advising, as appropriate.

C. Criteria for Tenure

A request for tenure occurs when a probationary faculty member has begun the 6th year of service, at which time the request is obligatory. Teaching ability and scholarly activities are the primary considerations for granting tenure. Service to the department, college, university, education agencies, community, and/or profession is also expected and will be taken into consideration in decisions regarding tenure.

The DRTPC will consider the candidate's contributions as appropriate to the candidate's assignment . The candidate should articulate what was accomplished and the significance of

those accomplishments. The DRTPC will determine whether the accomplishments are significant enough to warrant a recommendation for tenure.

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences: The DRTPC will review student course evaluation scores, average peer observations of teaching, and the candidate's self-evaluation when determining a candidate's teaching ability in relation to tenure. A cumulative average of more than 2.0 on any item in student course evaluations from the review period or below 3.0 on any of the three rubric areas for peer evaluations may disqualify a candidate from receiving a recommendation for tenure.

Scholarly & Creative Activity: In review of the candidate's scholarly and creative activity, the DRTPC will consider evidence that the candidate has an established record of scholarly and creative activity in the candidate's field of expertise as outlined in section III.A.2. It is expected that candidates under consideration for tenure will provide evidence of scholarly and creativity activity, including at least three publications and/or externally funded grants, falling within the level of "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued." Evidence of additional scholarship in the "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued" levels will strengthen the candidate's case for tenure.

Service: In review of the candidate's service contributions, the DRTPC will consider evidence of activity in a variety of areas (department, college, university, education agencies, community, and/or profession). The DRTPC looks for evidence of leadership and/or time-intensive responsibilities through committee work in these areas for recommendation for tenure.

D. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

A request for promotion to associate professor is never obligatory, but shall typically be considered for promotion at the same time a candidate is considered for tenure in the sixth year of service. Teaching ability and scholarly activities are the primary considerations for granting promotion to associate professor. Service to the department, college, university, education agencies, community, and/or profession is expected and will also be taken into consideration. The DRTPC will consider the candidate's contributions as appropriate to the candidate's assignment and the standards for promotion to associate professor. The candidate should articulate what was accomplished and the significance of those accomplishments. The DRTPC will determine whether the accomplishments are significant enough to warrant promotion to associate professor.

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences: In review of student course evaluation scores, peer-observations of teaching, and the candidate's self-evaluation, the DRTPC will consider the candidate's contributions in areas related to effective teaching and supervision, when determining a candidate's teaching ability in relation to promotion to associate professor. A cumulative average of more than 2.0 on any item in student course evaluations from the review period or below 3.0 on any of the three rubric areas for peer evaluations may disqualify a candidate from receiving a recommendation for tenure.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity: In review of the candidate's scholarly and creative activity, the DRTPC will consider evidence that the candidate has an established record of scholarly and creative activity in the candidate's field of expertise as outlined in Policy 1328, 2.1   . It is expected that candidates under consideration for promotion will provide evidence of scholarly and creativity activity, including at least three publications and/or externally funded grants, within the levels of "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued." Evidence of additional scholarship in the "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued" levels will strengthen the candidate's case for promotion   .

Service: In review of the candidate's contributions in the area of service, the DRTPC will consider evidence of activity in a variety of areas (department, college, university, education agencies, community, and profession). The DRTPC is looking for evidence of leadership, time-intensive responsibilities through committee work, and/or sustained contributions to program development in these areas for recommendation for promotion. The DRTPC will also consider the candidate's contributions in areas related to effective supervision and graduate advising, as appropriate.

E. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

A request for promotion to professor is never obligatory, but will be considered only if the candidate has served at least four years of service in the rank of associate professor. Furthermore, promotion to professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion. Consistently strong teaching ability, scholarly and creative activities, and service are the considerations for granting promotion to professor.

The DRTPC will consider the candidate's contributions as appropriate to the candidate's assignment and the standards for promotion to professor. The candidate should articulate what was accomplished and the significance of those accomplishments. The DRTPC will determine whether the accomplishments are significant enough to warrant promotion to professor.

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences: In review of student course evaluation scores, peer-observations of teaching, and the candidate's self-evaluation, the DRTPC will consider the candidate's contributions in areas related to effective teaching and supervision when determining a candidate's teaching ability in relation to promotion to professor. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate his/her knowledge or expertise and changes based on years of reflection. A cumulative average of more than 2.0 on any item in student course evaluations from the review period or below 3.0 on any of the three rubric areas for peer evaluations may disqualify a candidate from receiving a recommendation for tenure.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity: In review of the candidate's scholarly and creative activity, the DRTPC will consider evidence that the candidate has an established record of scholarly and/or creative activity in the candidate's field of expertise as outlined in Policy 1328, 2.1   . The candidate should show documentation of systematic, sustained activity related to their areas of research and creative work. Documentation should also demonstrate the candidate's expertise and leadership in the field, and processes of change based on the candidate's continual reflection. It is expected that candidates under consideration for promotion will provide evidence of scholarly and creativity activity, including at least three additional publications and/or externally funded grants falling within the levels of "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued" since the previous action of promotion or tenure. Evidence of additional scholarship in the "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued" levels will strengthen the candidate's case for tenure.

Service: In review of the candidate's contributions in the area of service, the DRTPC will consider a consistent record of activity in a variety of areas (department, college, university, education agencies, community, and profession). The DRTPC is looking for consistent and

effective leadership, time-intensive responsibilities through committee work, and/or sustained contributions to program development in these areas. The DRTPC will also consider the candidate's contributions in areas related to effective supervision and graduate advising, as appropriate.

F. Criteria for Early Tenure

The department expects every candidate will follow the normal cycle of six years for obtaining tenure. A request for early tenure is never obligatory, requires that a recipient has completed two years of full-time service at Cal Poly Pomona, and will be recommended for candidates who have not completed a full six years of academic experience only in exceptional cases. Therefore, it is recommended that the candidate consult with the DRTPC chairperson and Dean before pursuing an early action request.

Early tenure is reserved for special circumstances where a candidate is so exceptional and exemplary that early tenure benefits the university (reputation, public persona, etc.) and profession as well as the candidate. The DRTPC will assess the exceptionality of the totality of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to determine a candidate's recommendation for early tenure.

For the purposes of this section, the following criteria are examples of exceptional and exemplary performance. However, these criteria are not intended to be all inclusive and the DTRPC may consider additional information that is relevant and important to the candidate's professional qualifications:

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences:

- The cumulative average of each item on student course evaluations is 1.5 or below; the cumulative average on each category of the peer evaluation rubric is 3.5 or above

-

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity:

- At least five publications and/or externally funded grants, within the levels of "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued"
- A clearly defined and focused line of scholarly inquiry that advances the candidate's field of expertise that includes extensive scholarly and creative activities that fall under the "most highly valued" category

- Special contributions, recognitions, and awards from state, national, and/or international professional organizations (e.g., scholarship, teaching, or service)

Service:

- An ongoing and balanced distribution of group leadership and/or time-intensive work in department, college, and university service activities/programs/committees
- Leadership in standing college and/or university committees
- Leadership in professional organizations
- Special contributions to the university that advance the university's core goals and mission

G. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor

The department expects every candidate will follow the normal cycle of six years for obtaining promotion to associate professor. A request for early tenure is never obligatory, requires that a recipient has completed two years of full-time service at Cal Poly Pomona, and will be recommended for candidates who have not completed a full six years of academic experience only in exceptional cases. Therefore, it is recommended that the candidate consult with the DRTPC chairperson and Dean before pursuing an early action request. (Policy 1328, 2.6) Teaching ability and scholarly activities are the primary considerations for granting early promotion to associate professor. Service to the department, college, university, education agencies, community, and/or profession is expected and will also be taken into consideration.

Early promotion is reserved for special circumstances where a candidate is so exceptional and exemplary that early promotion benefits the university (reputation, public persona, etc.) and profession as well as the candidate. The DRTPC will assess the exceptionality of the totality of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to determine a candidate's recommendation for early tenure.

For the purposes of this section, the following criteria are examples of exceptional and exemplary performance. However, these criteria are not intended to be all inclusive and the DTRPC may consider additional information that is relevant and important to the candidate's professional qualifications:

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences:

- The cumulative average of each item on student course evaluations is 1.5 or below; the cumulative average on each category of the peer evaluation rubric is 3.5 or above
- .

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity:

- At least five publications and/or externally funded grants, within the levels of "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued"
- A clearly defined and focused line of scholarly inquiry that advances the candidate's field of expertise that includes extensive scholarly and creative activities that fall under the "most highly valued" category
- Special contributions, recognitions, and awards from state, national, and/or international professional organizations (e.g., scholarship, teaching, or service   )

Service:

- An ongoing and balanced distribution of group leadership and/or time-intensive work in department, college, and university service activities/programs/committees.
- Leadership in standing college and/or university committees
- Leadership in professional organizations
  Special contributions to the university that advance the university's core goals and mission

H. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor

A request for early promotion to professor is never obligatory. Teaching ability and scholarly activities are the primary considerations for granting early promotion to professor. Service to the department, college, university, education agencies, community, and/or profession is expected and will also be taken into consideration.

The department expects every candidate will follow the normal cycle for obtaining promotion to associate professor. A request for early promotion to professor is never obligatory, requires that a recipient has completed two years of full-time service at Cal Poly Pomona, and will be recommended for candidates who have not completed a full six years of academic experience only in exceptional cases. Therefore, it is recommended that the candidate consult with the DRTPC chairperson and Dean before pursuing early action request. (Policy 1328, 2.6)

Early promotion is reserved for those special circumstances where a candidate is so exceptional and exemplary that early promotion benefits the university (reputation, public persona, etc.) and profession as well as the candidate. The DRTPC will assess the exceptionality of the totality of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service to determine a candidate's recommendation for early tenure.

For the purposes of this section, the following criteria are examples of exceptional and exemplary performance. However, these criteria are not intended to be all inclusive and the DTRPC may consider additional information that is relevant and important to the candidate's professional qualifications:

Teaching and Supervision of Culminating Experiences:

- The cumulative average of each item on student course evaluations is 1.5 or below; the cumulative average on each category of the peer evaluation rubric is 3.5 or above
- .

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity:

- At least five publications and/or externally funded grants, within the levels of "most highly valued" and/or "highly valued" since the previous action of promotion or tenure
- A clearly defined and focused line of scholarly inquiry that advances the candidate's field of expertise that includes extensive scholarly and creative activities that fall under the "most highly valued" category
- Special contributions, recognitions, and awards from state, national, and/or international professional organizations (e.g., scholarship, teaching, or service)

Service:

- An ongoing and balanced distribution of group leadership and/or time-intensive work in department, college, and university service activities/programs/committees
- Leadership in standing college and/or university committees
- Leadership in professional organizations
  Special contributions to the university that advance the university's core goals and mission

Appendix A: Peer Observation of Teaching Criteria

1. Planning & Instruction: Understanding & Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning
   - Exhibits in-depth working knowledge of subject matter and course goals.
   - Organizes curriculum to facilitate student understanding of the subject matter.
   - Utilizes lesson elements that are appropriate to the subject matter and adult learners.
   - Monitors student learning and provides clarification

2. Equity & Engagement: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning
   - Connects learning to student backgrounds and prior knowledge, and to meaningful, real-life educational contexts.
   - Uses a variety of instructional strategies and resources, including technology, to meet the diverse learning needs of students.
   - Promotes critical thinking through inquiry, problem solving, and reflection.

3. Environment: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
   - Promotes a caring community where all students are treated fairly and respectfully.
   - Creates a physical and/or or virtual learning environment that respects diverse perspectives and encourages constructive interactions.
   - Develops, communicates, and maintains high standards for professional individual and group conduct.

Appendix B: Peer Observation of Teaching Form

RETENTION/TENURE/PROMOTION
SUMMARY OBSERVATION REPORT

Name: **Position:**

Date(s) of Pre-Observation Conference:

Date(s) of Observation:

Commendations for [course, term]

1. Planning & Instruction: Understanding & Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

Commendation	Evidence

2. Equity & Engagement: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

Commendation	Evidence

3. Environment: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

Commendation	Evidence

Recommendations

1. Planning & Instruction: Understanding & Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

Recommendation	Evidence

2. Equity & Engagement: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

Recommendation	Evidence

3. Environment: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

Recommendation	Evidence

Date/Time of Post-Observation Conference:

Instructor's Signature   **Observer's Signature**

1. Planning & Instruction: Understanding & Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	4-Highly Effective	3-Effective	2-Needs Improvement	1-Does Not Meet Standard
Exhibits in-depth working knowledge of subject matter and course goals.	Demonstrates expert knowledge of the subject.	Demonstrates strong knowledge of the subject.	Is familiar with the subject.	Has little familiarity with the subject.
Organizes curriculum to facilitate student understanding of the subject matter.	Has a clear, detailed plan for course instruction tightly aligned to course outline, program curricular goals, and departmental values to facilitate deep student understanding.	Plans instruction generally aligned with the course outline, program's goals, and departmental values to facilitate student understanding.	Demonstrates some thinking about how to address curricular goals and facilitate student understanding.	Plans lesson by lesson and has little familiarity with curricular goals, and does little to prepare students for learning.
Utilizes lesson elements that are appropriate to the subject matter and adult learners.	Teaches using theory to practice, big ideas, essential questions, knowledge, skills, and learning transfer appropriate to the subject and adult learners.	Teaches using theory to practice, big ideas, essential questions, knowledge, and/or skills appropriate to the subject and adult learners.	Teaches with some thought to larger goals and objectives, theory to practice, and/or skills appropriate to the subject and adult learners.	Teaches on an *ad hoc* basis with little consideration for long-range curricular goals appropriate to the subject and adult learners.
Monitors student learning and provides clarification.	Uses a variety of effective methods to check for understanding; immediately addresses confusion and clarifies.	Frequently and/or appropriately checks for understanding and gives students helpful information if they seem confused.	Rarely checks for understanding during instruction or uses inappropriate strategies.	Does not check for understanding.

2. Equity & Engagement: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	4-Highly Effective	3-Effective	2-Needs Improvement	1-Does Not Meet Standard
Connects learning to student backgrounds and prior knowledge, and to meaningful, real-life educational contexts.	Purposefully and frequently connects learning to student backgrounds, and/or prior knowledge, and/or to meaningful, real-life educational contexts.	Often connects learning to student backgrounds and/or prior knowledge, and/or to meaningful, real-life educational contexts.	Superficial or little effort to connect learning to student backgrounds and/or prior knowledge, and/or to meaningful, real-life educational contexts.	Does not connect learning to student backgrounds and/or prior knowledge, and/or to meaningful, real-life educational contexts.
Uses a variety of instructional strategies and resources, including technology, to meet the diverse learning needs of students.	Thoughtfully and appropriately uses a variety of instructional strategies and resources, including technology, to support equity and engagement for all students throughout the lesson.	Uses several instructional strategies and resources, including technology, to support equity and engagement for most students throughout the lesson.	Includes few strategies to support equity or engagement.	Does not include strategies to support student equity; students are disengaged.
Promotes critical thinking through inquiry, problem solving, and reflection.	Purposefully promotes critical thinking through problem solving, inquiry, and reflection to drive instruction.	Promotes problem solving, inquiry, and reflection.	Occasionally addresses problem-solving, inquiry, and reflection.	Provides little or no evidence of problem-solving, inquiry, or reflection.

3. Environment: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	4-Highly Effective	3-Effective	2-Needs Improvement	1-Does Not Meet Standard
Promotes a caring community where all students are treated fairly and respectfully. *Creates a physical and/or or virtual learning environment that respects diverse perspectives and encourages constructive interactions.* *Develops, communicates, and maintains high standards for professional individual and group conduct.*	Shows warmth, caring, respect, and fairness for all students and builds strong relationships. Creates a learning environment that routinely promotes diverse perspectives and constructive interactions. Directly, specifically, and consistently communicates, models, and enforces professional conduct.	Is fair and respectful toward students and builds positive relationships. Creates a learning environment that promotes some diverse perspectives and constructive interactions. Clearly communicates, models, and consistently enforces high standards for professional conduct.	Is fair and respectful toward most students and builds positive relationships with some. Does not consistently foster positive interactions. Does not consistently communicate, model, or enforce high standards for professional conduct.	Is sometimes harsh, unfair, and disrespectful with students and/or plays favorites. Does not foster interactions. Does not communicate, model, or enforce standards for professional conduct.

Appendix C: Student Evaluation of Courses

The instructor is knowledgeable about content areas specific to the course

The instructor utilizes appropriate instructional materials

The instructor designs and implements a variety of effective instructional strategies

The instructor provides clear criteria for evaluation and grading

The instructor addresses cultural, linguistic, and academic diversity

The instructor is available during scheduled office hours, by appointment, or via online communication

The instructor establishes a positive classroom learning environment

The instructor provides timely and constructive feedback

The instructor presents an organized syllabus with clear objectives, expectations, and assignments

On a scale of 1-5, 1 being VERY GOOD, how would you rate this instructor?

Appendix D: Evaluation of Culminating Field Experience

Q2 How many times did your University Supervisor visit your classroom? If applicable, count video-observations.

○ 1 time (1)

○ 2 times (2)

○ 3 times (3)

○ 4 times (4)

○ 5 times (5)

○ 6 times (6)

○ more than 6 times (7)

Q3 On average, what was the duration of the classroom observation(s)?

○ 15 minutes or less (1)

○ 16-30 minutes (2)

○ 31-45 minutes (3)

○ 46-60 minutes (4)

○ 60 minutes or more (5)

Page 3 of 13

7

Q4 Please rate the following statement according to your experience:

My supervisor consistently showed up for scheduled observations.

○ Strongly Agree (1)

○ Agree (2)

○ Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)

○ Disagree (4)

○ Strongly Disagree (5)

Q5 How many times did your University Supervisor formally collaborate with you on the progress of your professional growth regarding the TPEs (self-assessment and/or evaluation)?

○ 1 time (1)

○ 2 times (2)

○ 3 times (3)

○ 4 times (4)

○ 5 times (5)

○ 6 times (6)

○ more than 6 times (7)

Q6 If you were observed using video-based observations with Go-React, what do you think were some of the strengths and challenges you faced using this tool?

_____

_____

_____

Q7 To what extent do you agree with each statement? My Supervisor...

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
Observed me and facilitated collaborative post-observation conferences (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Collaboratively supported my ongoing reflection and assessment of my performance based on the TPEs (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Regularly facilitated a collaborative conversation around what is working, current challenges and next steps related to my practice (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Collaboratively supported me in assessing student work and determining student progress (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Collaboratively supporting me in making content accessible to meet the learning needs of all my	○	○	○	○	○

students including ELL, students with disabilities, etc. (5)					
Collaboratively supported me to routinely assess my students based on the goals of each lesson (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Collaborated with the school site personnel to support my teaching experience (7)	○	○	○	○	○
Used technology to provide communication and support (8)	○	○	○	○	○
Collaboratively supported me in creating and maintaining an effective environment (classroom management) for student learning (9)	○	○	○	○	○

Q8 Is there anything else you would like us to know about your experience with your University Supervisor?

_____

_____