

✓

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	PHILOSOPHY
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018/19
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	5 years

DEPARTMENT

"This Department RTP Document has been approved by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in this department."

Dept. Chair: Dale Turner [Signature] 3/29/18
Printed Name Signature Date

DRTPC Chair: Michael Chubb [Signature] 3/29/18
Printed Name Signature Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

"The CRTPC has reviewed this Department RTP Document and makes the following recommendation."

1. Recommend Approval
 2. Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.
 3. Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

CRTPC Chair: DANIEL LEWIS [Signature] 5/15/18
Printed Name Signature Date

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN

"I have reviewed this Department RTP Document and make the following recommendation."

1. Recommend Approval
 2. Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.
 3. Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

Dean/Director: IRIS LEVINE [Signature] 6/16/18
Printed Name Signature Date

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. Approved for the following years 5
 2. Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs: Martin Sancho-Madriz [Signature] 08/10/18
Printed Name Signature Date

In cases where the Department RTP Document does not conform to the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or University Policy 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) or Policy 1329 (formerly Appendix 10), those documents take precedence.

DATE: May 15, 2018

TO: Dr. Iris Levine, Dean
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

FROM: Dr. Daniel Lewis, Chair
College RTP Committee

RE: Review of Philosophy RTP Document Updates

The CRTPC has reviewed the RTP revisions that the conversion to a semester-based system of operations requires. We make the following suggestions:

The document refers to a "Winter semester" on pages 3 and 4. Please revise.

The references to appendix 10 and 16 need to instead cite policies 1329 and 1328.

Please make these corrections to the document and return the revised document to the college dean's office at your earliest convenience. Assuming these changes are made in the document going forward, the CRTPC approves the revised document.

Philosophy Department
College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Document
2018-2023

Section I – Introduction

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (hereafter “RTP”) 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 Appendices 10 and 16 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 precedence and University and Departmental policies are superseded by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of his or her 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 so that the candidates are able to plan their activities in order to meet them. Department criteria should be consistent with Department and College mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards.

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

I.1. Definitions: University Manual, policy 1328, provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the most pertinent definitions are provided here.

- a) **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- b) **RTP Committee** members must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) for only one semester during a particular RTP cycle may serve

if elected and willing; a faculty member who is on leave for two semesters or more during a particular RTP cycle may not be elected. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may participate on reappointment cases *only*—and may *not* participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. In any case, Committee members must be senior in rank to candidates for RTP action. (See also policy 1328, sections 1.17 and 3.1.)

- c) **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in policy 1328, section 2.0. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the Dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the President or his/her designee.
- d) A **probationary year** of service is defined in terms of the traditional academic year; that is, fall, and spring semesters. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.
- e) A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.
- f) A faculty member is **eligible to apply for the first promotion** at the time he or she applies for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible for a subsequent promotion** after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**.
- g) **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and university service.
- h) **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- i) **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee. Peer evaluation activities include classroom visits and reviews of course syllabus and other teaching materials, as well as written reports of candidates' teaching performance.
- j) A **candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. *Current procedures and policies apply. By "procedures and policies" are meant matters covered by Section II of this document, by contrast with criteria which are matters covered by Section III of this document.*
- k) A **candidate for 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* procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions. *By "procedures and policies" are meant matters covered by Section II of this document, by contrast with criteria which are matters covered by Section III of this document.*

I.2 Department Philosophy: From here to its conclusion this document represents the position of the Philosophy Department of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona in compliance with University Policy/Procedures and the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Policy 1328 and this document are unequivocally and absolutely binding on all RTP actions, procedures, and recommendations undertaken within the Department. No vote, decision, or Department practice or custom shall be taken to override, amend, or permit exceptions to either Policy 1328 or this document. Past failures to abide by the provisions of either policy 1328 or this document establish no presumption that such failures are permissible in future RTP cycles.

Section II – Procedures

II.1 What follows is in compliance with Policy 1328, which describes University-wide RTP procedures that Departmental procedures cannot violate.

II.2 Department RTP Procedures: In this section the Department’s procedures for electing the DRTPC (before the end of the spring semester of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle) will be detailed, as well as the role of the RTP Chair.

II.2.a Selection of the DRTP Committee

The Philosophy Department RTP Committee shall consist of full-time tenured members of the Department elected by probationary and tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members who are candidates for promotion may sit on the DRTPC, participating in reappointment actions *only* (see I.1.b above). The constitution of the DRTPC will be identical for all candidates within a given RTP cycle, unless, as allowed by Policy 1328, a tenured faculty member who is a candidate for promotion participates in reappointment actions (see I.1.b above).

With respect to the size of the DRPTC, Policy 1328 notes that the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement “restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members and, if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). The RTP committees shall not be solely comprised of faculty participating in the FERP. “

The Department Chair may serve as a member of the RTP Committee if a simple majority of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty vote to allow him or her to serve. If the Department Chair does not serve as a member of the DRPTC, he/she will prepare a separate evaluation of the candidates.

Each year (before the end of the fall semester of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle), the Philosophy Department shall elect a Department RTP Committee, the number of members being sufficient to constitute a DRTPC in accordance with policy 1328. Only tenured members of the department may serve on the DRTPC. Nominations for election to the RTP Committee shall be taken during a Department Meeting before the end of the spring semester prior to the academic year during which the RTP Committee is to serve. Self-nominations are allowed. The voting shall be by secret ballot and each probationary and tenured faculty member in the Department shall vote for that number of members sufficient to constitute a DRTPC in accordance with policy 1328. The nominees receiving the highest number of votes shall constitute the Department RTP Committee.

The DRTPC Committee shall elect one of its members as Committee Chair.

Responsibility for assuring that RTP procedures are honored falls on the Department faculty as a whole, with special responsibility falling on the DRTPC chair to ensure that such procedures are honored. Candidates for RTP action bear no special responsibility to ensure that such procedures are honored. Faculty selected for the DRTPC shall consult policy 1328 and relevant sections of this document to verify their eligibility to serve on the DRTPC.

Once the DRTPC and its Chair are selected, the DRTPC Chair shall consult policy 1328 and other relevant sections of this document to verify (a) the eligibility of all DRTPC members to serve as members of the DRTPC, and (b) the Chair's own eligibility to serve as DRTPC Chair. If the Chair finds that one or more members of those selected for the DRTPC are ineligible, the Chair shall immediately notify all members of the DRTPC of this fact, as well as notifying the Department Chair and the Dean. Members found ineligible shall resign from the DRTPC. The DRTPC Chair shall then make provisions for the immediate replacement of these individuals. Likewise, should the RTP Chair determine that he/she is ineligible to serve as Chair of the RTP committee, the he/she shall immediately notify all members of the DRTPC, the Department Chair, and the Dean, and resign as Chair. The DRTPC members, in consultation with the rest of the Department, shall then identify a new DRTPC Chair.

The DRTPC Chair's duties include the following:

- Fall semester:
 - Ensure that candidates have information they need— including information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests, department criteria;
 - Ensure that the provisions of the DRTPC document and Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual are carried out;
 - Assist candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages;
 - Inform Faculty Affairs of requests;

- Ensure that packages are complete;
 - Act as the official custodian of the RTP package for the period between the submission of the package to the DRTPC by the candidate and the forwarding of the package to the Dean's office in a timely manner;
 - Authorize any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package;
 - Notify the appropriate parties of any additions or changes;
 - Ensure all necessary signatures are obtained; and
 - Provide the Department's recommendation to the candidate.
- Throughout the year:
- Schedule peer evaluations (and ensure they are conducted) for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action in the future;
 - Ensure that reports are provided to candidates within two weeks of the classroom visit.

The DRTPC will be responsible for posting notices that solicit written comments about any RTP candidates from students. For a two-week period during fall semester of the relevant RTP cycle, these notices will be prominently displayed outside the Philosophy Department Office and Philosophy classrooms, indicating the candidates under review, deadlines for submission of student comments and any other pertinent information. As well, the Philosophy majors will be emailed such notices with this information.

II.3 Student Evaluation of Teaching: See policy 1328, section 3.2, as well as policy 1329. (A copy of the Department form is attached as an appendix.)

The following statement will be provided to the person designated to administer the evaluation process:

Thank you for volunteering to help with this important task of academic evaluation. Your participation is truly appreciated. Please do the following:

1. If the instructor has not yet left the room, encourage him/ her to do so.
2. Instruct the class there are two things to do.

- a. Fill out anonymous bubbled form (Instructional Assessment Form) with a #2 pencil.
 - b. They MAY fill out voluntary SIGNED (including Bronco ID#) statements to be sealed in the envelopes provided. Then write the instructor's name and class number on the outside.
3. Pass out the assessment forms. Tell students where you want them returned once they are complete.
 4. Gather completed forms and envelopes containing signed statements. Put them in the envelope which contained the original materials. Please include any blank or unused forms. Deliver the packet to the Philosophy Department, located in Building 1, room 321 immediately following the class. If the office is closed, slide the envelope under the door, or return it to the Economics Department (1-340) or the Communications Department (1-313).

A copy of the summary of these evaluations (a computer print-out which instructors receive several weeks after evaluation) must be submitted in the candidate's RTP packet for each class evaluated. All classes that are evaluated must be included in the RTP packet. Analysis by the candidate and the DRTPC Committee must accompany descriptions of results.

II.4 Peer Evaluation of Teaching: See Policy 1328, section 3.3, outlined below.

For all candidates eligible for RTP actions, policy 1328 also requires two peer observations per year. Peer evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Policy 1328, section 3.3. At the beginning of the academic year, the DRTPC will make a copy of this section available to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. A minimum of one peer evaluation per semester shall be conducted in at least two different semesters in each academic year. Scheduled by the DRTPC, in consultation with candidates and reviewers, peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the diversity of courses taught. Each peer review shall be conducted by a colleague of academic rank higher than that of the candidate and shall include a classroom visit and a review of course syllabi and related material. Within two weeks of the classroom visit (see policy 1328, section 3.3), the report should be given to the candidate and filed with the DRTPC Chair. At the beginning of spring semester, the DRTPC will contact candidates to verify that they have had the requisite peer evaluations for that academic year and will help remedy the situation if they have not.

II.5 Leaves and Other Changes to Tenure Timetable: The following applies to candidates who are serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also policy 1328, sections 2.1 and 7.3):

II.5.a Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

II.5.b Candidates who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing, in light of the special circumstances, (a) an interpretation of the departmental criteria and (b) a statement that specifies expectations and outcomes. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the Dean and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

II.6 Candidates' Additional Responsibilities: Candidates are required to assemble an RTP package which makes the case for the requested action. To prepare the RTP package, candidates are encouraged to attend university-sponsored workshops and seek the counsel of the DRTPC.

II.6.1 .1 Self Evaluation: Candidates must include a self-evaluation which explicitly addresses the Philosophy Department's RTP criteria for the action/s requested. The following structure will help make such reference explicit:

- a) Discussion of teaching performance—includes analysis of student and peer evaluations, explanation of activities related to student advising and/or mentoring, and discussion of any outcomes-assessment measures to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.
- b) Discussion of research, scholarship, and creative activities--includes specific citation of all peer-reviewed publications, dates of attendance at professional meetings, and all duties/assignments in professional organizations; also includes an explanation of work in progress and ongoing activities.
- c) Discussion of service to the University, College, Department, and community-- includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc.; response to any problems/deficiencies pointed out in previous evaluations of service (steps taken, progress made).
- d) Discussion of short-term and long-term goals in all areas of evaluation--includes brief discussion of why goals are appropriate (i.e., candidates' goals are related not only to their own interests, strengths, responsibilities, and career aspirations but also to the Department's, College's, and University's goals and mission) and of how these goals will be met.
- e) Discussion of progress made on goals established in previous year's self-evaluation, with such progress connected clearly and reasonably to the current year's self-evaluation.

Section III -- Criteria for RTP Action

III.1 Elements of Performance and Evaluation: The areas of evaluation are: 1) Teaching Performance, 2) Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, 3) Service to the Department (including general advising), College, University, or to the Community. Candidates for any personnel action, except for administrators for whom there is no evidence of teaching performance, must be evaluated in all three areas. Of the three areas of faculty performance evaluated for RTP purposes, the Department considers teaching the most fundamental. It is unlikely that candidates for RTP action whose teaching performance is not judged proficient will be evaluated positively, regardless of their contributions in the areas of research or service.

Contributions in all three areas are expected in any RTP action but the granting of tenure and/or promotion requires proficient teaching performance **and excellence in at least one of research or service.**

The Department conceives of faculty as teacher-scholars who seek to integrate pedagogy and research by bringing their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way, thereby promoting a community of inquiry, encouraging rigorous scholarship, and facilitating faculty/student collaboration.

"Proficient" teaching performance is demonstrated in part by overall scores on student assessments that are at or near the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC. The criterion used by the Department as an indication of "proficient" teaching for the purposes of award of tenure and promotion, as judged by students, is an average score of 2.0 or lower on the student assessment summaries. The criterion used by the Department as an indication of "proficient" teaching for the purposes of reappointment to a subsequent probationary year, as judged by students, is an average score of 2.5 or lower on the student assessment summaries. Student evaluations, however, are only one measure of teaching performance and are best interpreted alongside other methods of evaluation such as peer review. Accordingly, "proficient" teaching is also demonstrated in part by peer evaluations which indicate, in the DRTPC's judgment, a consistent record of competent and conscientious teaching. Further, evidence from student and peer evaluations, and other evidence of teaching performance should indicate to the DRTPC that the candidate has performed satisfactorily with respect to all or nearly all of the criteria listed in **III.3.a , section A.**, below ("Behaviors") and to have performed satisfactorily with respect to at least half of the ten criteria listed in areas B ("Outcomes") and C ("Range and Reflection").

III.1.a Expectations for Documentation of Performance: In its evaluation of the candidate, the DRTPC shall take into account information from the following sources:

- a) Data summaries of students' numerical evaluations
- b) Originals of peer evaluations of teaching performance
- c) Self-evaluation provided by candidate
- d) Signed material (to be added to candidate's RTP package) received from other faculty, referees/editors for academic journals and presses, administrators, and students
- e) Material requested from candidate by committee (e.g., requests for clarification of, corrections to, augmentations of any aspect of RTP package)
- f) Other written material, identified by source, submitted to the committee before the closing date

III.2 Criteria for Reappointment: To be reappointed, a candidate must provide evidence (see III.1.a, above) of making steady progress toward meeting the criteria for *Tenure* (III.3, below) and *Promotion to Associate Professor* (III.4, below) or if hired at the Associate Professor level, for *Tenure* (III.3, below) and *promotion to Professor* (III.5, below). "Steady progress" can be demonstrated by evidence of student and peer evaluations, submission of scholarly work (including referees' reports), conference and other professional activity, participation on committees and in student-involvement areas, and criteria-referenced plans that are also responsive to the recommendations made by the DRTPC, the Dean and the Provost in prior reappointments. A candidate's initial request for reappointment should include a plan outlining how he or she plans to satisfy the Department's criteria for tenure. In each subsequent request

for reappointment, the candidate must summarize his or her progress to date in fulfilling that plan.

Policy 1328, section 7.3, defines the period of review as: “ the time period that has passed since the last application was made for the same or a similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations are based on the period since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment; and tenure evaluations are based on the period since original appointment to the probationary position. The candidate may discuss achievements outside of the period of review, but only for the purpose of demonstrating consistency of performance. Thus, this discussion should be brief.

III.3 Criteria for Tenure: 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** (see I.1.e—emphasis in original).

The candidate for tenure must satisfy criteria III.3.a-c listed below.

III.3.a Teaching Performance: Of the three areas of faculty performance evaluated for RTP purposes, the Department considers teaching the most fundamental. It is unlikely that candidates for RTP action whose teaching fails to be proficient will receive an overall positive evaluation, regardless of their contributions in the areas of research or service. The candidate's self-evaluation should discuss the progress the candidate has made during the period of evaluation in meeting these criteria.

There are three principal sources of information used to evaluate teaching performance: student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, and candidate self-evaluations (submitted in conjunction with requests for RTP action). However, candidates may submit other evidence of teaching performance as well (signed letters from students, instructional diagnoses by personnel from the Faculty Center for Professional Development, etc.). With respect to student evaluations, candidates are required to administer evaluations in at least *one-half* of the academic courses taught in a given period of evaluation. Instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely not to be judged proficient in teaching performance. With respect to peer evaluations of teaching, candidates are required to have *two* evaluations administered per academic year. Student and peer evaluations should, to the degree possible, reflect the candidate's full range of teaching responsibilities (lower-division/upper-division, online or hybrid/traditional, etc.) Furthermore, with respect to both student and peer evaluations, candidates may not ‘cherry pick’ this information, putting forth for consideration only positive evaluations; that is, candidates must submit *all* student and peer evaluations gathered during the period of review.

When evaluating teaching performance, the DRTPC will consider the candidate's success in:

A. BEHAVIORS

- 1] Showing a willingness to consider divergent points of view
- 2] Offering well-organized in-class and online activities (lectures, discussions, etc.)
- 3] Clearly communicating goals and expectations to students
- 4] Fairly and consistently evaluating student work
- 5] Being accessible to students outside of class (via office hours, e-mail, etc.)
- 6] Using one's expertise in course content to enhance student learning
- 7] Providing timely and informative feedback on student work

B. OUTCOMES

- 8] Effectively facilitating student learning
- 9] Improving specific student skills such as writing, critical thinking, logical reasoning, etc.
- 10] Stimulating students' interest in further study in the discipline
- 11] Approaching teaching with enthusiasm and commitment

C. RANGE AND REFLECTION

- 12] Maintaining knowledge and mastery appropriate to course content
- 13] Developing new curricular initiatives
- 14] Incorporating relevant feedback, research, etc. into one's teaching efforts
- 15] Using appropriate technologies to enhance student learning
- 16] Participating in professional development activities related to teaching (workshops, conferences, etc.) and/or conducting teaching-related scholarship
- 17] Diversifying the range of courses taught

The Department recognizes that the main sources of information concerning teaching performance speak more saliently to some of these criteria than to others (e.g., student evaluations are irrelevant to 16] but very relevant to 5], etc.). While instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely to be judged not to be proficient in teaching performance, the DRTPC will make its determination of a candidate's teaching performance based on the totality of evidence presented. Consequently, the achievement (or non-achievement) of student evaluation scores that fall within a desired range shall not be the sole basis for the DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance. The Department furthermore recognizes and endorses recent recommendations issued by CLASS concerning student evaluations, namely:

1. Although student evaluations of teaching are generally reliable and valid, their results do not "speak for themselves" and must be interpreted with great care.
2. Small differences in scores should not be given great weight in the evaluation of instructors' teaching performance.
3. Interpretation of student evaluations of teaching must be mindful that such evaluations can only measure student perceptions of the outcomes of candidate's teaching efforts and cannot account for many factors that influence student learning and perceptions thereof that are beyond instructor's control (composition of the student population, academic difficulty of the course, student background and preparation, etc.).

In any event, candidates' self-evaluations must contain discussion and analysis of the candidates' student evaluations that indicate how the evidence they present supports the candidate's claim to proficient teaching performance

III.3.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities: Candidates must satisfy the criteria for the first two tiers, as well as show activity in the remaining tier.

The Department requires faculty to conduct the ongoing research and study necessary to (a) sustain breadth of understanding, for example, by remaining familiar with the philosophical research relevant to their typical teaching areas, and (b) develop the depth necessary for expertise in their area(s) of research specialization. As **Grid 1** below indicates, candidates meeting minimal numerical benchmarks for various RTP actions will thereby have demonstrated that they have a cogent and active program of philosophical research, but there are no exact requirements concerning the nature of the activities or accomplishments that candidates for various RTP actions must meet. (E.g., candidates are not required to publish in specific journals, present their works at specific scholarly venues, etc.)

GRID 1			
MINIMAL expectations of research, scholarship, and creative activities for RTP actions			
ACTIVITY LEVEL	RETENTION (probationary)	PROMOTION (Associate)/TENURE	PROMOTION (Full)
<u>Tier 1:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • peer reviewed articles or books (including scholarship of teaching and learning) 	Recommended, but not strictly necessary	Some contribution required (i.e., at least two items)	Additional contribution required (i.e., at least two items since previous RTP action).
<u>Tier 2*:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chapters in anthologies of phil. research and invited articles • conference or colloquia presentations, including commentaries or panels • scholarly book reviews • publication of textbooks, pedagogical materials, or pedagogical research • editing of professional journals or newsletters • translations • organization of conferences or scholarly events • grant proposals and/or awards • receipt of fellowships, awards, or other scholarly honors • publications or contributions to non-scholarly media • development of, and participation, in scholarly technology endeavors (weblogs, etc.) 	Strongly recommended, but not strictly necessary. Activities in this area should provide evidence of steady progress toward achievements in tier 1.	Substantial contribution required. (E.g., 3 or more items and/or items in multiple areas)	Additional substantial contribution required. (E.g., 3 or more items and/or items in multiple areas since previous RTP action)
<u>Tier 3:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation or leadership in professional organizations or involvement in informal research activities (e.g., work-in-progress groups, reading groups, study groups). • reviewing manuscripts for journals or academic presses • other service of value to the profession, e.g., organizing conferences in one's area of specialization 	Required	Required	Required

GRID 2			
Expectations for EXCELLENCE in research and professional activities for RTP actions			
ACTIVITY LEVEL	RETENTION (probationary)	PROMOTION (Associate)/TENURE	PROMOTION (Full)
<u>Tier 1:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • peer reviewed articles or books (including scholarship of teaching and learning) 	Recommended, but not strictly necessary	Substantial contribution required (i.e., at least four items)	Additional substantial contributions required (i.e., at least four items since previous RTP action).
<u>Tier 2*:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chapters in anthologies of phil. research and invited articles • conference or colloquia presentations, including commentaries or panels • scholarly book reviews • publication of textbooks, pedagogical materials, or pedagogical research • editing of professional journals or newsletters • translations • organization of conferences or scholarly events • grant proposals and/or awards • receipt of fellowships, awards, or other scholarly honors • publications or contributions to non-scholarly media • development of, and participation, in scholarly technology endeavors (weblogs, etc.) 	Strongly recommended, but not strictly necessary. Activities in this area should provide evidence of steady progress toward achievements in tier 1.	Substantial contribution required. (E.g., 5 or more items and/or items in multiple areas)	Additional substantial contribution required. (E.g., 5 or more items and/or items in multiple areas since previous RTP action)
<u>Tier 3:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation or leadership in professional organizations or involvement in informal research activities (e.g., work-in-progress groups, reading groups, study groups). • reviewing manuscripts for journals or academic presses • other service of value to the profession, , e.g., organizing conferences in one's area of specialization 	Required	Required	Required

*Note: activities from Tier 2 might be considered more appropriately counted under Tier 1 given certain circumstances depending, for example, upon prestige of a particular journal or publisher, the significance of an invited address or other professional presentation, or the importance of a fellowship or award. In all cases, the candidate shall bear the burden of showing that the activity in question should count under Tier 1 rather than under Tier 2.

III.3.c Service to the Department, College, University or Community: During the *period of review*, it is expected that the candidate will perform service in some of the following areas. Adequate performance in service for all RTP actions is defined as involvement in the first three of the following areas.

1. Attendance at Department meetings
2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned

Excellent performance is defined as taking a leadership role in areas 1-3 above and some of following areas.

4. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
5. University Committee work
6. Program development
7. Student Club advising
8. Academic Senate
9. CSU System-wide work
10. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including the development and teaching of service learning courses)

All candidates must speak to the specific contributions of their service and document it in their RTP applications (such as letters from committee chairs, Deans, Senate chairs, etc.).

III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor: Because promotion to Associate Professor is tied to tenure (in the case when the candidate is hired as an Assistant Professor), see sections III.3 a-c for criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor: Promotion to Professor requires tenure or the simultaneous award of tenure.

III.5.a Teaching Performance: The candidate for promotion to Professor must meet the criteria described in III.3.a, above, for teaching performance.

III.5.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities: For promotion to Professor, expectations of research, scholarship and creative activities are given in **Grid 1** (above, III.3.b).

A general discussion of research and scholarship expectations is given in III.3.b. Also see **Grid 2** (above, III.3.b) for expectations for excellence in research and professional activities for promotion to Professor.

III.5.c Service to the Department, College, University or Community: During the *period of review*, it is expected that the candidate for promotion to Professor will have continued to perform service as in III.3.c. Additionally, the candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to have accepted the leadership opportunities provided to him or her in at least some of the following areas of service (note that this list does not include 1. Attendance at Department meetings):

2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
5. University Committee work
6. Program development
7. Student Club advising
8. Academic Senate
9. CSU System-wide work
10. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including the development and teaching of service learning courses)

III.6. and III.7 Criteria for Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor:

Policy 1328 section 2.6, states that requests "for early actions shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective date of those actions." Further, such consideration "shall place emphasis on teaching and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession."

It is therefore emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our three areas of performance and evaluation, *all* the specific criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The description of performance that exceeds our expectations in all three areas is as follows:

III.6.a and III.7.a Teaching Performance: Candidates for early tenure and early promotion shall demonstrate an exceptional level of accomplishment in a majority of the criteria in each of areas A-C given in III.3.a above. Exceptional accomplishment is demonstrated by overall scores on student assessments that are consistently above the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC, peer reviews that note exceptional achievement, teaching awards, success with innovative pedagogical approaches (e.g., service learning, new technologies, etc.), success in the creation of new courses and programs, recognition beyond the Department for contributions to academic programs on campus, effective use of course and program assessment to improve teaching, and evidence of inspiring a high level of achievement in our students (student awards and accomplishments).

When considering whether an exceptional level of accomplishment in teaching has been achieved, more than the student evaluations must be taken into account. As noted in III.3.a above, while instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely to be judged not to be proficient in teaching performance, the DRTPC will make its determination of a candidate's teaching performance based on the totality of evidence presented. Consequently, the

achievement (or non-achievement) of student evaluation scores that fall within a desired range shall not be the sole basis for the DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance.

III.6.b and III.7.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities: Excellent performance (which thereby exceeds criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) in the area of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities is described in **Grid 2** under III.3.b above.

III.6.c and III.7.c Service to the Department, College, University or Community: The candidate for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate exceptional performance in the area of service by performing service in at least five of the areas listed below and by having accepted leadership opportunities in at least two of them (note that this list does not include 1. Attendance at Department meetings):

2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
5. University Committee work
6. Program development
7. Student Club advising
8. Academic Senate
9. CSU System-wide work
10. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including the development and teaching of service learning courses)

III.8. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor: As with requests for early tenure, the consideration of such requests “shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and university service” (policy 1328, section 2.6). It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our three areas of performance and evaluation, *all* the specific criteria for promotion to Professor. The description of performance that exceeds our expectations in all three areas is as follows:

III.8.a Teaching Performance: Candidates for early promotion to Professor shall demonstrate an exceptional level of accomplishment in a majority of the criteria in each of the areas A-C given in III.3.a above. Exceptional accomplishment is demonstrated by overall scores on student assessments that are consistently above the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC, peer reviews that note exceptional achievement, teaching awards, success with innovative pedagogical approaches (e.g., service learning, new technologies, etc.), success in the creation of

new courses and programs, recognition beyond the Department for contributions to academic programs on campus, effective use of course and program assessment to improve teaching, and evidence of inspiring a high level of achievement in our students (student awards and accomplishments).

When considering whether an exceptional level of accomplishment in teaching has been achieved, more than the student evaluations must be taken into account. As noted in III.3.a above, while instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely to be judged not to be proficient in teaching performance, the DRTPC will make its determination of a candidate's teaching performance based on the totality of evidence presented. Consequently, the achievement (or non-achievement) of student evaluation scores that fall within a desired range shall not be the sole basis for the DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance.

III.8.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities: Excellent performance (which thereby exceeds criteria for tenure and promotion to Professor) in the area of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities is described in **Grid 2** under III.3.b above.

III.8.c Service to the Department, College, University and Community: The candidate for early promotion to Professor will demonstrate exceptional performance in the area of service by performing service in at least five of the areas listed below and by having accepted leadership opportunities in at least three of them (note that this list does not include 1. Attendance at Department meetings):

2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
5. University Committee work
6. Program development
7. Student Club advising
8. Academic Senate
9. CSU System-wide work
10. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including the development and teaching of service learning courses)