

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
for
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION
ACADEMIC YEAR 2012**

1. Preface

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (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.

This document sets forth the expectations of quality of instruction, scholarship, and service held by the faculty of the Mathematics Department. The use of the word "mathematics" in this document is to be understood as encompassing mathematics, mathematics education, and statistics. The criteria and procedures contained herein shall be used to determine whether a faculty member eligible for Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion is meeting those expectations (such a faculty member will be referred to here as a Candidate). This document also describes the responsibility of the Candidate and of the Department's RTP Committee (DRTPC) in all matters of the RTP process.

2. Statements of Responsibility

2.1 The Candidate

It is the responsibility of the Candidate to be familiar with the expectation of quality, criteria, and procedures in this document. The Candidate must be familiar with the University Manual, especially Appendices 10 and 16, which speak directly to matters concerning the RTP process. During the first week of fall quarter of a year of eligibility, the Candidate shall notify the DRTPC Chair in writing of the intent to request an RTP action(s) or that no action will be requested. This notification will be non-binding.

It is the responsibility of the Candidate to furnish the necessary documentation showing that all criteria for the action(s) requested have been met. This documentation must be specific

and verifiable. All decisions will be based only on material contained in the Personnel Action File (PAF), the supporting documentation submitted by the Candidate, and on the Candidate's self-evaluation statement. Therefore, the Candidate shall maintain a complete portfolio of all evidence and documentation in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service supporting the Candidate's requested actions to be made available upon request. Suggestions of possible material to include in this portfolio are given in the respective sections.

The Candidate's self-evaluation statement is an important part of the information to be used in the RTP decision process. Here the Candidate should explain how her or his professional activities and documentation decisively show that the Candidate has met the criteria for each area of responsibility. This documentation must include a detailed description of the teaching, scholarship, or service performed; additional documentation shall normally be placed in the Candidate's portfolio. The Candidate, however, may place specific additional documentation in the submitted RTP package if she or he feels that it is necessary for a proper evaluation and should consult the DRTPC Chair if unsure where to place such materials. In his or her self-evaluation, the Candidate should carefully demonstrate how the documentation establishes the quality of the activity and should not rely solely on quantity of activities. The Candidate should not request points for professional activities but rather shall be clear enough in her or his self-evaluation that the importance of a given activity can be judged properly by the DRTPC. If this document describes expectations for the Candidate regarding involvement in specific activities (such as college or university level committee work) and those expectations are *not* met by the Candidate, he or she must address that failure, specifically, in the self-evaluation. While such a failure may be significant, it does not necessarily preclude the success of a sought after action. Candidates for reappointment must discuss their progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure. All Candidates must discuss progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle. The Candidate is encouraged to submit an electronic version of his or her RTP self-evaluation to the Chair of the DRTPC along with a hard copy of the RTP package.

2.2 The DRTPC

It is the responsibility of the DRTPC to evaluate the quality of the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service activities and to award the appropriate number of points based on the information supplied by the Candidate. After examining, verifying, and evaluating the documentation in the PAF of the relevant evaluation period and that submitted by the Candidate and in accordance with this document's criteria and procedures, the DRTPC will judge the quality and acceptability of the activities. This evaluation may involve the solicitation of recommendations of colleagues from off-campus, in which case the Candidate may suggest names of such colleagues.

Based on this examination and evaluation, the DRTPC will decide whether the Candidate does or does not meet the criteria for the requested action(s) by a simple majority of the DRTPC members eligible to vote on the issue, with abstentions or absences without proxies counting as negative votes. This may entail multiple decisions, one for each requested action. The DRTPC will make a positive recommendation on a requested action(s) if the Candidate was found to meet the criteria and will make a negative recommendation otherwise. The DRTPC shall explain its decision in writing. Any minority report shall be part of the DRTPC recommendation. The DRTPC must also include a discussion of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle. For action requests covering a range of time such as promotions or tenure, the DRTPC will honor the point totals awarded by all previous DRTPC.

Since the decision made by the DRTPC is that the Candidate did or did not meet the criteria for the requested action, the DRTPC's written explanation of their decision is a very important part of the information to be used in the RTP decision process beyond the Department. As the members of the DRTPC will often be more experienced in teaching, scholarship, and research than the Candidate, it is important for them to guide the Candidate in his or her efforts to be a quality teacher-scholar. As Candidates will often emphasize one area or other of teaching, scholarship, and service, it is also important for the DRTPC to respect this choice of activities and evaluate the Candidate holistically. The clarity and logic of this explanation of their decision will assist others in the process and will serve both the Candidate and the Department. Therefore, the DRTPC must fully and completely explain how its evaluation of the Candidate's activities and documentation led them to the decision they reached. In this written evaluation, the DRTPC must identify and explain any exceptional qualities exhibited by the Candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The DRTPC should also address any concerns that arose in their evaluation of the Candidate so the Candidate understands the collective recommendation of the DRTPC. If eligible to evaluate the Candidate, the Department Chair shall independently submit a written statement regarding the Candidate. This statement is submitted as part of the Candidate's evaluation documents.

3. Statements of Expectations and Assessment in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

3.1 Teaching

The faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes the primary importance of teaching performance among the responsibilities and duties of its members.

The faculty of the Department recognizes the wisdom of promoting a diverse set of learning opportunities for the students of mathematics. Candidates have the freedom to employ pedagogies that they believe will promote learning. Thus, the use of teaching and learning methods such as lecture, board work, technology, homework, projects, presentations, small group techniques, course development in xerographic form, and course management software shall be valued to the extent that they promote student learning.

Using departmental forms, the Candidate must conduct a minimum of one in-class student evaluation per quarter, and a minimum of four evaluations per year in the period under consideration, unless his or her annual assignment is less than four classes. Summaries of these will be included in the Candidate's PAF.

A minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching performance shall be conducted in the period under consideration using the DRTP Peer Evaluation Form. A minimum of one peer evaluation per quarter shall be conducted in at least two different quarters in each academic year unless the Candidate's assignment prevents it. Any classroom visitation by a peer evaluator shall be done before the end of the eighth week of the quarter. Each peer evaluator must review the departmental RTP criteria prior to conducting a peer evaluation. The written evaluation must specifically address those criteria in relation to the performance of the Candidate during the classroom visitation. The Candidate shall supply a copy of the syllabus, handouts, exams, projects, etc. within 3 working days of the time of the visit. The peer evaluator must submit a copy of the evaluation to the DRTPC Chair by the end of the ninth week of the quarter. A copy of the evaluation must be given to the Candidate by the DRTPC Chair within two weeks of the evaluation and no later than the tenth week of the quarter. The DRTPC Chair is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and that these peer evaluations are placed in the Candidate's PAF. These evaluations do not need to be done by DRTPC members. Any request by the Candidate to receive a peer evaluation by a non-member of the DRTPC should be directed to the DRTPC Chair. The author of the peer evaluation should include strengths and weaknesses observed during the visit or in the supplied class materials, and shall specifically note if no deficiencies are observed

All official student evaluations and all peer evaluations conducted during the period under review must be submitted by the Candidate as part of his or her RTP package. The Candidate is expected to discuss the manner in which these tools have influenced his or her teaching. In addition, the Candidate shall put together a teaching portfolio containing syllabi, exams, handouts, and other relevant documentation pertaining to teaching-related activities. The DRTPC may refer to the teaching portfolio in the evaluation of Category 3.1.2. listed below. This portfolio will not accompany the Candidates RTP package, but will be listed in an appendix under "additional materials available".

The Candidate's self-evaluation statement should clearly state his or her principles about and approach to teaching and should explain how she or he meets the department's criteria for teaching. As an evaluation of these objectives is essentially qualitative, the Candidate must demonstrate an acceptable level of performance through submission of appropriate documentation. In the case of non-traditional courses (such as on-line courses, supervising student teaching, etc.), sufficient documentation of the teaching activities should be provided by the Candidate to allow the DRTPC to evaluate the assignment. The DRTPC will consider all documentation regarding the quality of teaching provided by the Candidate that contributes to the Candidate's effectiveness. The DRTPC's main concerns will be with the Candidate's ability to effectively communicate and elucidate mathematical concepts, and with the Candidate's efforts to continuously improve his/her teaching. Generally, activities in the following subsections will be considered in the DRTPC's evaluation:

3.1.1. Effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content

effectively organizing the course,
clearly communicating ideas and concepts,
effectively answering students' questions, both in and outside of class
effectively using teaching and learning methods.

3.1.2. Maintaining appropriate academic standards

adequate coverage of course content,
coverage of course content at an appropriate level of difficulty for a particular course,
evaluation of the student's learning.

In discussing one's effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content, the Candidate should refer to data provided by the following items on the student evaluation from: Item 1, item 2, item 4, and item 8. The following items should be referred to in the Candidate's discussion of how he or she maintains appropriate academic standards: Item 3, item 11, and item 15. In addition, trends in the Candidate's student evaluation scores may be used when discussing his or her efforts to continually improve his or her teaching. If the Candidate has modified his or her teaching techniques in response to previous evaluation scores, those modifications should be described here. The Department wishes to cultivate in the Candidate a curiosity about his or her evaluation scores in relation to his or her teaching practices.

Under no circumstance will the quality of a Candidate's teaching be determined by only one of the following criteria. The potential for abuse of the following criteria is considerable and it is expected that great care will be exercised when these guidelines are utilized to frame a comprehensive evaluation of the Candidate's teaching.

In discussing quality of teaching of a Candidate, the Department will refer to the “class average” that appears on the bottom of each student evaluation summary sheet, directly below the individual survey items. Let μ represent the weighted mean of the class averages for the classes surveyed during the period of review. Below are four ranges for μ with corresponding descriptors.

Surpasses Expectations	$1 \leq \mu < 1.5$
Meets Expectations	$1.5 \leq \mu < 2.5$
Marginally Meets Expectations	$2.5 \leq \mu < 3$
Fails to Meet Expectations	$3 \leq \mu \leq 5$

The following criteria may be used to help evaluate the quality of teaching of the Candidate. References are made to categories A, B, C of activities that appear in subsection 3.1.3 at the end of this section.

Excellent: The Candidate should have a student evaluation ranking of “Surpasses Expectations”. In addition to demonstrating efforts to achieve *Effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content* and to *Maintain appropriate academic standards*, he or she is expected to engage in at least 2 activities from Category A., and at least one activity from each Category B. and Category C. Note that having a student evaluation ranking of “Meets Expectations” does not necessarily preclude a comprehensive teaching rating of “Excellent”. Such an evaluation ranking may be compensated for by participating in additional activities from any of the three Categories.

Very Good: The Candidate should have a student evaluation ranking of “Meets Expectations” or better. In addition to demonstrating efforts to achieve *Effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content* and to *Maintain appropriate academic standards*, he or she is expected to engage in at least 2 activities from Category A., and at least one activity from either Category B. or Category C. Note that having a student evaluation ranking of “Marginally Meets Expectations” does not necessarily preclude a comprehensive teaching rating of “Very Good”. Such an evaluation ranking may be compensated for by participating in additional activities from any of the three Categories.

Satisfactory: The Candidate should have a student evaluation ranking of “Marginally Meets Expectations” or better. He or she is expected to demonstrate efforts to achieve *Effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content* and to *Maintain appropriate academic standards*. Note that having a student evaluation ranking of “Fails to Meet Expectations” does not necessarily preclude a comprehensive teaching rating of “Satisfactory”.

Unsatisfactory: The Candidate has a student evaluation ranking of “Fails to Meet Expectations” AND has consistently made no effort to demonstrate efforts to achieve *Effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content* and to *Maintain appropriate academic standards*. In addition, the Candidate has failed to address any concerns raised by the DRTPC in previous RTP reports. It is expected that such a Candidate will have received notification by the department of teaching deficiencies in peer evaluations during the period of review.

The Department emphasizes the fact that one's quality of teaching is defined solely in terms of the comprehensive performance of the individual Candidate – not in relation to the performances of his or her colleagues.

3.1.3 Additional Activities for Analysis of Quality of Teaching

A. Extra-curricular teaching activities

- supervising undergraduate research projects,
- supervising students in independent study,
- supervising master's theses,
- developing and teaching special topics courses,
- developing curriculum
- teaching an honor's section of a math course

B. Efforts towards improving teaching quality

requesting additional (i.e., beyond the required minimum) peer teaching evaluations for the purpose of improving the Candidate's teaching,
administering additional (i.e., beyond the required minimum) student course evaluations for the purpose of improving the Candidate's teaching,

- attending faculty development workshops,
- experimenting with new teaching methods.

C. Other activities

- helping students or faculty with mathematics-related concerns beyond the classroom and office hours,
- tutoring or mentoring students or faculty in a structured program,
- supporting students in mathematics-related activities such as contests, math clubs, conferences,

- making presentations that relate to teaching or learning mathematics to students, parents, or teachers,
- sponsoring students in programs to support graduate studies.

3.2 Scholarship

This section examines the Candidate's scholarship in mathematics, mathematics education, and statistics. Scholarship activities have been organized into eight categories. Some activities, of course, may not easily fit into a particular category. In this case, the Candidate is encouraged to seek the advice of the DRTPC. Ideally, the Candidate will participate in a range of activities that embrace several categories. The DRTPC will evaluate the Candidate's performance in each of the categories. In each case, the name of the category is followed by the range of points which may be earned by the Candidate in that category.

Before examining each category, we highlight the different assessment approaches used.

- Averaging: Categories 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 involve a modified averaging method. Each year, points are awarded. The mean of these annual point awards is calculated over the number of years in the period under review. The DRTPC will award no fewer points than this mean, rounded to the nearest integer, and no more points than the cap of each category.
 - Unlimited Accumulation: In Categories 3.2.4 and 3.2.5, points are awarded to each item. No upper limit is given for the points that accumulate in these categories.
 - Limited Accumulation: In Categories 3.2.3, 3.2.6 and 3.2.7, each item is awarded points. These points accumulate over the years in the period of review until the cap of the category is reached.
 - One Time Assessment: Points in Category 3.2.8 are only awarded when the Candidate goes up for action. The points are awarded for each item that has not been awarded points in any other category. The total points awarded in this category cannot exceed the cap of the category.
- 3.2.1 *Attendance of Meetings, Seminars, and Workshops (0 – 2)*
 The DRTPC will award **0-2 points** for each item in this category, however, no more than a total of 2 points will be awarded for this category for any given year.. Attending a conference such as a local meeting may be awarded 1 point, while attending an intensive, research specific workshop, such as an AMS national, annual meeting or

mini-course, might be awarded 2 points. When the Candidate goes up for action, the annual totals will be averaged over the number of years in the period under review. The points awarded in this category will be no less than the annual average, rounded to the nearest integer, and no more than 2 points. The Candidate should provide a sufficiently detailed description so that the DRTPC can accurately judge the significance of the meetings or workshops attended by the Candidate.

3.2.2 *Service to the Discipline (0 – 3)*

The DRTPC will award **0-3 points** for each item in this category, however, no more than a total of 3 points will be awarded for this category in any given year..

Activities in this category include, but are not limited to: Judging poster competitions, reviewing mathematics books, reviewing journal articles (i.e., writing summaries of articles for an organization such as “Mathematical Reviews”), and grading college board exams (such as AP Calculus and AP Statistics). The DRTPC will generally award more points to activities that are more time-consuming. For example, reviewing several graduate level texts might be awarded 3 points, while judging a local poster session might receive 2 points.

When the Candidate goes up for action, the annual totals will be averaged over the number of years in the period under review. The points awarded in this category will be no less than the annual average, rounded to the nearest integer, and no more than 3 points.

3.2.3 *Presentations (0 –9)*

The DRTPC will award 0-3 points for each different in this category. This category includes presentations in contributed sessions and colloquium talks, which typically receive 2 points each. Invited presentations, presentations at national and international meetings, and presentations of longer duration may be expected to receive 3 points each. The Candidate should give complete citations of each presentation and explain clearly how presentations are different from one another. When going up for action, the Candidate may sum up the points awarded for no more than **three** presentations given during the period of review. The Candidate may submit more than three presentations for consideration. In this case, the DRTPC will count the three presentations receiving the most points. Even though this category is capped at three talks, Candidates are encouraged to give additional talks.

3.2.4 *Publications (unlimited)*

The DRTPC will award **0-5 points** for **each item** in this category. These points accumulate during the period of review. Moreover, the DRTPC will give more weight to refereed articles published in professional journals and to texts published by well-known publishers. Articles that have been formally accepted for publication, but

have not yet appeared in print, qualify as publications. The Candidate should give complete details of the publication and specify if the journal is a refereed journal. In awarding points, the DRTPC will consider 3 points to be the nominal award for a research article that is published in a refereed journal. Publications that might be awarded fewer than 3 points include papers published in proceedings of conferences. Publications that might merit more than 3 points include textbooks, as well as exceptional research articles. *Technical Reports* may be awarded 0 - 3 points, as long as the content of that article is distinct from any of the Candidate's published articles. (A technical report is an article that is published by a university subject to less rigorous qualifying methods than those employed by referees of research journals.)

3.2.5 *Grants (unlimited)*

The DRTPC will award **0-4 points** for this **each grant** in this category. These points accumulate during the period of review. Cal Poly travel grants are not considered scholarly in nature and will not be awarded points. Smaller grants, such as Cal Poly Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) mini-grants might receive 2 points, while 3 points might be awarded to larger grants, nationally and internationally competitive grants, external discipline-related grants, such as NSF research grants. The Candidate should provide a sufficiently detailed explanation so that the DRTPC can accurately judge the Candidate's role in obtaining the grant(s).

3.2.6 *Scholarly Contributions to the Profession (0 – 4)*

The DRTPC will award **0-2 points** for each item in this category. These points accumulate during the period of review, however the DRTPC will award no more than a total of 4 points for this category for any action under review. Contributions include, but are not limited to: Serving on the editorial board of mathematical journals, organizing major conferences, and refereeing papers for journals (not to be confused with reviewing articles, acting as a referee for a specific journal involves in-depth examination of article submissions to determine if they are of high enough quality and of significant importance to current research in a given area to warrant publication in that journal). The Candidate and DRTPC should note that this category is dedicated to items that involve considerable work and time. Less intensive activities such as co-organizing a Western Sectional AMS Special Session might receive 1 point, while more intensive work such as organizing an international conference or refereeing journal articles would be awarded 2 points. The Candidate is responsible for providing detailed information so that the DRTPC can accurately assess these activities.

3.2.7 *Other Activities (0 – 3)*

The DRTPC will award 0-3 points for each item in this category, however, no more than a total of **3 points** will be awarded for this category for any action under review. Such activities include, but are not limited to leading seminars that meet on a regular basis and successfully directing a graduate student's thesis based on an open research question (the results must be of quality similar to those presented at a regional mathematics conference). Thesis projects that are expository in nature do not qualify. The Candidate is responsible for providing detailed information so that the DRTPC can accurately assess these activities.

3.2.8 *Work in Progress* (0 – 3)

Points will only be awarded during a year when the Candidate is applying for an action. At that time, each scholarly activity for which the Candidate has not been awarded points in another category, will be awarded **0-2 points**, however, no more than a total of 3 points will be awarded for the entire category for any action under review. While points in this category are not awarded in any non-action year, the Candidate may obtain advice from the chair of the DRTPC regarding the merit of his or her work in progress during a non-action year.

The Candidate is encouraged to contact the chair of the DRTPC for more information regarding these activities. In particular, the chair of the DRTPC will aid the Candidate in determining the most appropriate category in which a specific activity should be placed. The DRTPC will award 0 points to any activity which is evaluated as lacking merit or unrelated to the category in which it appears. The Scholarship section of the Candidate's portfolio may contain items such as copies of publications, grant proposals, and other information that the Candidate believes will support her or his contributions in the above categories.

During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for action, the sum of the assessments awarded under categories 3.2.1-3.2.8 (for the period under review) is calculated. A minimum sum of 10 points is required in the area of Scholarship for normal tenure/normal promotion to Associate Professor. A minimum sum of 20 points is required for early tenure/early promotion to Associate Professor. For normal promotion to Full Professor, a minimum sum of 10 points is required, while a minimum sum of 20 points in Scholarship is required for Early Promotion to Full Professor.

3.3 Service

The faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes service as part of the professional responsibility of each of its members. Active involvement in the work of

governance and business of the department, college, or university is expected of each member. In particular, this includes participation in departmental meetings.

During the beginning of the probationary period, the Candidate will be expected to participate in a variety of committees but without assuming any responsibility. This will afford the Candidate the opportunity to learn about departmental governance matters. The Candidate is then expected to become a contributing member on a smaller number of committees of his or her choosing. Toward the end of the probationary period, the Candidate is expected to have developed enough expertise to chair a committee or assume the responsibility of a department coordinator. The Candidate is expected to include in his or her service documentation at least one extra-departmental committee (such as an Academic Senate committee or College committee) or a committee outside the university (such as a Mathematics Association of America committee).

Service points will be awarded on an annual basis only for each year (or two years in the case of reappointment to the 3rd probationary year) under consideration. The Candidate is not expected to perform any service in the first probationary year but will be awarded the appropriate number of points if active service was performed. After the 2nd probationary year, Candidates can expect to receive 0 points for no contribution to a committee, 1-2 points for active participation in a committee, and 3 points for making exceptional contributions to an active committee even if he or she was not the Chair. As some committees have an extensive workload over a prolonged period of time, e.g., the Math Education committee or the Search (Hiring) committee, the DRTPC may award 4 points if the Candidate can appropriately document her or his substantial contributions to such a committee. The points awarded for chairing a committee will be commensurate with the workload of that committee as well as with the performance of the Candidate in the role of chairperson. One year of service connected with a specific committee cannot be counted in more than one category.

Points can only be awarded if the Candidate provides adequate documentation of his or her contributions to the committees' activities. Documentation must include a detailed description of the service performed and in sufficient detail so the DRTPC can accurately award points; the Candidate may also include additional information such as written reports, letters from the committee chair, minutes of meetings, products developed by the committee, letters from members of the committee, etc. and should place this additional information in the Service section of her or his portfolio.

3.3 Service Categories 3.3.1. *Attendance of a department, college, or university committee*

In the first two probationary years, the Candidate may receive service credit for regularly attending committee meetings without contributing. Credit in this area will not be allowed beyond the 2nd probationary year and cannot be applied more than once to

the same committee. The DRTPC will award 1 point per committee per year.

3.3.2. *Contributing member in a department, college, or university committee*

If a Candidate chooses to serve on a committee beyond one year, the Candidate is expected to become a contributing member sharing the workload of that committee. Based upon its evaluation of the submitted documentation, the DRTPC will award 0 points if the documentation is not sufficiently detailed or 1-4 points per committee per year when the documentation is sufficiently detailed.

3.3.3. *Chair a department, college, or university committee*

To receive service credit for this activity, the committee must have been an active committee and the Candidate must submit documentation supporting that activity and the quality of the work of the chair. Based upon its evaluation of the documentation, the DRTPC will award 0 points if the documentation is not sufficiently detailed or 1-6 points per committee per year when the documentation is sufficiently detailed.

3.3.4. *Departmental coordinator*

To receive service credit for this activity, the coordinator must have carried out the work and met the responsibilities of the coordinator position. The Candidate must submit documentation supporting the quality of the work as coordinator. Based upon its evaluation of the documentation, the DRTPC will award 0 points if the documentation is not sufficiently detailed or 1-4 points per year when the documentation is sufficiently detailed.

3.3.5. *Other significant service*

The DRTPC will award points for other service activity for which the Candidate documents and requests recognition. Such service activities include, but are not restricted to:

- Holding an office in a professional organization
- Serving on a committee of a professional organization
- Participating in fund raising activities
- Participating in professionally related student activities
- Participating in professional consultation of benefit to the university
- Participating in special assignments

Based upon its evaluation of the documentation, the DRTPC will award 0 points if the documentation is not sufficiently detailed or 1-4 points per activity per year when the documentation is sufficiently detailed, with the score of 4 being reserved for exceptional contributions.

During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the annual point awards

in Service are totaled. A minimum sum of 14 points is expected in the area of Service for normal tenure/normal promotion to Associate Professor. A minimum sum of 24 points is expected for early tenure/early promotion to Associate Professor. For regular promotion to Full Professor, a minimum of 14 service points are expected, while for early promotion to Full Professor, a minimum of 24 service points are expected.

4. The Criteria

It is the responsibility of each evaluating body to write a report that clearly explains how the Candidate was evaluated and rated, using the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion. Specifically, the DRTPC will support its recommendation(s) with a written analysis of the Candidate's numerical scores, including an assessment of the quality of the Candidate's achievements. In this written evaluation, the DRTPC must identify and explain any exceptional qualities exhibited by the Candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual define university procedures and expectations. This document is a supplement to these policies 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 CBA requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of this document within two weeks of the start of his or her first quarter at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that this document be maintained on the department web page so that they are also available to Candidates for faculty positions.

The following sections of this document describe the minimum qualifications for each RTP action. In exceptional cases, the quality of achievements in one area may compensate for work that is slightly below the minimum requirements for another area.

Requests for early tenure or promotion will not be considered unless the Candidate has completed at least two years of full-time service at this campus prior to the effective date of tenure or promotion.

The period covered by the self-evaluation ("period of review") should be the time period that has passed since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are based on the previous year's performance; tenure evaluations cover the period since original appointment to the probationary position; and promotion evaluations cover the period since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment.

4.1 Reappointment

A Candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria in effect at the time of her or his initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply. For reappointment to a third probationary year, the Candidate must be evaluated by the DRTPC primarily in teaching performance and scholarship. The Candidate is not expected to perform any service in the first probationary year. (A probationary year of service is any three quarters in a period of four consecutive quarters. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.) For reappointment beyond a third probationary year, the Candidate must be judged by the DRTPC as progressing satisfactorily toward the expectations for tenure. If any problems were discussed in earlier evaluations, the DRTPC will expect to see progress made in resolving these problems.

4.2 Tenure

A Candidate for tenure (including early tenure) 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.

A Candidate's credited service period for tenure consideration is the number of years from date of hire at this campus plus the number of years for which credit was granted at time of hiring.

A probationary faculty member is normally considered for tenure during the sixth year of credited service. A faculty member may request early tenure prior to the sixth year of credited service.

4.2.1 Normal Tenure

It is expected that probationary faculty will demonstrate their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. By the end of the probationary period, the DRTPC should consider the Candidate's teaching to be of at least Satisfactory quality as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. To determine one's Student Evaluation ranking, the mean of the μ values over all years in the period of review will be computed. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by previous DRTPC. In order for a Candidate's teaching to be considered successful, it should satisfy the following criteria:

- *Effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content, as described in Section 3.1;*
- *Maintaining appropriate academic standards, as described in Section 3.1.2;*
- *The Candidate's overall contribution to the department, as resulting from categories A-C in Section 3.1.3 should reflect dedication to teaching.*

During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the assessments awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1-3.2.8 (for the period under review) is calculated. The Candidate must have a record, sustained over several years, of dedicated efforts and achievements. A minimum of 10 points in the area of scholarship is required. In the area of service, the Candidate will be expected to have a minimum of 14 points, with active service on at least one committee outside the department during that time.

A total of 35 points is expected in the combined areas of scholarship and service for normal tenure, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate his or her efforts in scholarship or service.

Overall, the DRTPC must be convinced that the Candidate's performance will continue at this level, or higher, in future years. If the Candidate has been promoted to associate professor during the probationary period, it is expected that the level of performance attained prior to that promotion will have been maintained in the period between the promotion and the tenure request.

4.2.2 Early Tenure

In the area of teaching, a Candidate should be judged by the DRTPC to be of Excellent or Very Good quality as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. To determine one's Student Evaluation ranking, the mean of the μ values over all years in the period of review will be computed.

During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the assessments awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1-3.2.8 (for the period under review) is calculated. The Candidate must accumulate a minimum of 20 points. The Candidate's activities in the area of scholarship must also include refereed publications or successful grant proposals for a specific project.

In the area of service, the Candidate shall accumulate a minimum of 24 points, with active service on at least one committee outside the department during that time.

A total of 60 points is expected in the combined areas of scholarship and service for early tenure, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate her or his efforts in scholarship or service.

4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor

A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor (including early 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.

A Candidate is normally eligible to apply for promotion to associate professor at the time they apply for tenure.

4.3.1 Normal Promotion to Associate Professor

It is expected that probationary faculty will demonstrate their accomplishments in the area of teaching scholarship, and service. For promotion to Associate Professor, the DRTPC should consider the Candidate's teaching to be of Satisfactory quality or better as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. To determine one's Student Evaluation ranking, the mean of the μ values over all years in the period of review will be computed. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by previous DRTPC.

During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the assessments awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1-3.2.8 (for the period under review) is calculated. The Candidate must have a record, sustained over several years, of dedicated efforts and achievements. A minimum of 10 points in the area of scholarship is expected.

In the area of service, the Candidate will be expected to have a minimum of 14 points, with active service on at least one committee outside the department during that time.

A total of 35 points is expected in the combined areas of scholarship and service for normal promotion to associate professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate his or her efforts in scholarship or service.

4.3.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor

In the area of teaching, a Candidate must be judged by the DRTPC to be of Excellent or Very

Good quality as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. To determine one's Student Evaluation ranking, the mean of the μ values over all years in the period of review will be computed. During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the assessments awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1-3.2.8 (for the period under review) is calculated. The Candidate shall accumulate a minimum of 20 points. The Candidate's activities in the area of scholarship must also include refereed publications or successful grant proposals for a specific project.

In the area of service, the Candidate shall accumulate a minimum of 24 points, with active service on at least one committee outside the department during that time.

A total of 60 points is necessary in the combined areas of scholarship and service for early promotion to associate professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate her or his efforts in scholarship or service.

A Candidate may apply simultaneously for early tenure and early promotion to associate professor.

4.4 Promotion to Full Professor

A candidate for promotion to Full Professor (including early promotion) may choose between the criteria at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action

Faculty shall not be considered for promotion to full professor unless they are tenured. A Candidate may apply simultaneously for tenure and promotion to full professor. Once tenured, the Candidate is eligible for a subsequent promotion after having served four years at the rank of associate professor. An application for promotion prior to attained eligibility is an application for early promotion.

A Candidate requesting promotion to full professor must have an extensive record of achievements. There should be a continued involvement in professional development activities and a continued engagement in service activities.

4.4.1 Normal Promotion to Full Professor

In the area of teaching, the Candidate must be judged by the DRTPC to be of Satisfactory quality (or better) as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. To determine one's Student Evaluation ranking, the mean of the μ values over all years in the period of review will be computed.

In the area of scholarship, the Candidate must have a record of scholarship sustained over several years of dedicated efforts and achievements and shall accumulate a minimum of 10 points. It is expected that this record will include publications or successful grant writing.

In the area of service, an increase in involvement is expected, compared to what is expected from a Candidate for promotion to associate professor. A Candidate must have assumed positions of leadership and responsibility at the department, college, or university levels. A minimum of 14 points in service is expected.

A total of 35 points is expected in the combined areas of scholarship and service for promotion to full professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate his or her efforts in scholarship or service.

4.4.2 Early Promotion to Full Professor

The DRTPC must be persuaded that the strength of the Candidate's achievements compensates for the brief time period.

In the area of teaching, the Candidate must be judged, by the DRTPC to be of Excellent or Very Good quality as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. By the end of the probationary period, the DRTPC should consider the Candidate's teaching to be of Excellent or Very Good quality as defined in Section 3.1 of this document. To determine one's Student Evaluation ranking, the mean of the μ values over all years in the period of review will be computed.

In the area of scholarship, the Candidate must have an impressive record of achievements, sustained over several years and shall accumulate a minimum of 20 points. The Candidate's activities in the area of scholarship must also include refereed publications or successful grant proposals for a specific project.

In the area of service, a significant increase in involvement is expected, compared to what is expected from a Candidate for promotion to associate professor. A Candidate for early promotion to full professor must have assumed positions of leadership and responsibility in service activities at the department level as well as the college or university levels. A minimum of 24 points in service is expected.

A total of 60 points is expected in the combined areas of scholarship and service for early promotion to full professor, thus giving the Candidate the flexibility to concentrate her or his efforts in scholarship or service.

5. Procedures

5.1 DRTPC Selection

The DRTPC shall consist initially of seven (7) and three (3) alternate full-time, tenured faculty members who will serve for the academic year. The DRTPC shall be elected in the winter quarter preceding the beginning of service and shall meet during this quarter to select a chair. Its term of service shall begin in the subsequent spring quarter and last for one calendar year. 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 and may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. The DRTPC is responsible for all issues arising from its recommendation even if they arise after the completion of its term of service.

The election of the DRTPC shall be by means of a mail ballot. The ballot shall contain the names of all full-time, tenured faculty members able to serve. The Department Chair is not eligible to serve on the DRTPC in any capacity. The ballot will be distributed by the Department Chair to all probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and shall contain the instruction: "Vote for seven."

Upon completion of the balloting, the vote totals for each individual will be listed in decreasing order. The ten individuals with the highest vote totals will be resubmitted to the probationary and tenured faculty again with the instruction: "Vote for seven." In the event of a tie for the 10th position, all Candidates tied for this position shall be submitted on the second ballot. Without ratification of the majority of the probationary and tenured faculty the voting process is to be repeated.

The seven individuals with the highest vote totals form next year's RTP committee, and the remaining three will serve as alternates. Any necessary replacements or additions to the initial DRTPC shall be made in a similar manner from the same list during the beginning of the Fall quarter of the committee's year of service.

Any member of the initial DRTPC who becomes a Candidate for promotion shall be ineligible to participate in DRTPC committee deliberations concerning promotion or tenure. In promotion considerations, the DRTPC members deliberating must have a higher rank than the Candidate being considered. If the initial seven-member DRTPC has fewer than three members senior in rank to all promotion Candidates, then the DRTPC shall be increased in size by selecting such individuals until there are three members senior in rank to all promotion Candidates.

5.2 Duties of the DRTPC Chair

The DRTPC Chair shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of this document and those of Appendix 16 of the University Manual are carried out. The DRTPC Chair will be the official overseer 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. Specifically, in this period the DRTPC Chair and only the DRTPC Chair shall be responsible for additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.

In the Fall quarter, the DRTPC Chair (i) ensures that Candidates have information they need, including information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests, department criteria, and the names of their prospective peer evaluators; (ii) assists Candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages; (iii) informs Faculty Affairs of requests; (iv) ensures that packages are complete; (v) provides the department recommendation to the Candidate. Throughout the year, the DRTPC Chair ensures that peer evaluations are conducted for all faculty members who will be Candidates for RTP action in the future and ensures that peer evaluations are provided to Candidates in a timely manner (within two weeks of a classroom visit). The DRTPC Chair is also responsible for forwarding the peer evaluations to the Dean for the inclusion in the Candidate's PAF.

All eligible Candidates are to notify the DRTPC Chair before the end of the first week of the fall quarter of intent to request an RTP action(s) or that no action will be requested. This notification shall not be binding.

5.3 RTP Document Revision

Each year the department shall appoint an RTP Document Review Committee. This committee shall be viewed as an adjunct of the RTP Committee for the sole purpose of proposing changes in departmental RTP criteria or procedures. The RTP Document Review Committee shall work with the Mathematics Department, the Mathematics RTP Committee, the College of Science RTP Committee, the Dean's office, and other segments of the University involved in the RTP process to produce a document which reflects the University's commitment to quality education.

Proposed revisions shall be submitted in writing to all probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. During the week following this submission, critical comments or alternative proposals may be communicated in writing to the Document Review Committee Chair. The committee shall subsequently consider such written communications and finalize the proposed revisions.

Following the submission of the finalized revision proposals to the probationary and tenured faculty, a department meeting shall be held, no later than March 1, to discuss the acceptance or rejection of the proposed revisions. No further changes in the RTP Criteria and Procedures document will be considered after this meeting. Ratification of the finalized revision proposals on an item by item basis shall take place by means of a written mail ballot. Adoption of each item shall require the approval of a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty. The RTP document with ratified revisions shall be forwarded to the College Dean for review no later than April 1.

5.4 Evaluation of Faculty on Leave and Department Chairs

The Department Chair and a faculty member who is still eligible for some RTP action and who requests a leave of absence from normal faculty duties will prepare a Memo of Understanding (MOU) detailing activities and conditions of evaluation for RTP purposes during the leave so that existing and appropriate RTP Document criteria will apply. This MOU, which must be agreed to by the current DRTPC, the Chair, and the Candidate, will detail precisely what is expected of the Candidate for each action still pending. Candidates shall observe the same criteria, procedures, and timelines as Candidates in residence, unless the MOU explicitly states otherwise. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by fax, and must provide fax numbers or addresses to be used for sending recommendations to the Candidate. It will be the Candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines. It is recommended that the Candidate acquire assurances that the work duties associated with the leave will allow for fulfillment of the activities in the MOU. A faculty member serving as Chair of the Department who is still eligible for some RTP action should prepare a similar memo of understanding with the Dean of the College prior to beginning his or her term of office.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT RTP CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

1. Candidate's Name:
2. Class Visited (MAT/STA Number and Section):
3. Time: Date: Quarter:
4. Performance Evaluation:

5. Evaluator's Name/Signature: /