

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
for
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION
2016-17 through 2020-21

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Section 1. Preface | page 1 |
| Section 2. Statements of Responsibility | page 1 |
| 2.1 The Candidate | page 1 |
| 2.2 The DRTPC | page 2 |
| Section 3. Statements of Expectations and Assessment in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service | page 3 |
| 3.1 Teaching | page 3 |
| Performance Areas | page 5 |
| 3.1.1 Effectiveness in Communicating and Elucidating Course Content | page 5 |
| 3.1.2 Maintenance of Appropriate Academic Standards | page 5 |
| 3.1.3 Additional Activities Related to Teaching | page 5 |
| 3.1.4 Efforts Towards Improving Teaching Quality | page 6 |
| Evaluation of Teaching Performance | page 6 |
| Table 1. Minimum range of Very Good and Good responses for Student Evaluations during probationary years | page 7 |
| 3.2 Scholarship | page 8 |
| 3.2.1 Attendance of Meetings, Seminars, and Workshops | page 8 |
| 3.2.2 Service to the Discipline | page 9 |
| 3.2.3 Presentations | page 9 |
| 3.2.4 Publications | page 9 |
| 3.2.5 Grants | page 10 |
| 3.2.6 Scholarly Contributions to the Profession | page 10 |
| 3.2.7 Other Activities | page 11 |
| 3.3 Service | page 11 |
| 3.3.1 Attendance of a Department, College, or University Committee | page 12 |
| 3.3.2 Contributing Member in a Department, College, or University Committee | page 12 |
| 3.3.3 Chair of a Department, College, or University Committee | page 12 |
| 3.3.4 Departmental Coordinator | page 12 |
| 3.3.5 Other Significant Service | page 13 |
| Section 4. The Criteria | page 13 |
| 4.1 Reappointment | page 14 |
| 4.2 Tenure | page 15 |
| 4.2.1 Normal Tenure | page 16 |
| 4.2.2 Early Tenure | page 17 |
| 4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor | page 18 |
| 4.3.1 Normal Promotion to Associate Professor | page 18 |
| 4.3.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor | page 20 |
| 4.4 Promotion to Full Professor | page 21 |
| 4.4.1 Normal Promotion to Full Professor | page 21 |
| 4.4.2 Early Promotion to Full Professor | page 22 |
| Section 5. Procedures | page 24 |
| 5.1 DRTPC Selection | page 24 |
| 5.2 Duties of the DRTPC Chair | page 25 |
| 5.3 RTP Document Review | page 25 |
| 5.4 Evaluation of Faculty on Leave, in Academic Governance Positions, in Administrative Positions, or Performing Administrative Duties | page 26 |
| Mathematics and Statistics Department RTP Classroom Performance Evaluation Form | page 28 |
| Instructional Assessment Form | page 29 |

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
for
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION
ACADEMIC YEARS 2016-17 through 2020-21**

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 Department of Mathematics and Statistics. 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 Appendix 10 and Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as Appendix 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, and 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 his or her 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 an 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

meets the criteria for the requested action(s). The DRTPC's evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of all the DRTPC members eligible to vote on the action. Abstentions shall count 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 met 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 write a separate recommendation for inclusion in the Candidate's RTP package.

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

The DRTPC's evaluation of the Candidate's teaching will include, but will not necessarily be limited to, a statement summarizing and interpreting the results of student instructional assessments, peer evaluations, signed student and faculty comments, a comparison of student evaluations and peer evaluations, and other supporting evidence for quality of teaching.

Either the DRTPC Chair or the Department Chair will invite input from faculty, staff, and students via prominently posted signs. These signs will include the name of each RTP Candidate, with the specific RTP action sought, and instructions for the submission of these comments. A specific deadline (date and time) for these submissions will be included, as well as the name of the DRTPC Chair to whom these submissions must be given. Only signed comments will be accepted. In addition, a student submission must also include the student's Bronco ID number.

Using departmental forms, the Candidate must conduct student evaluations in all non-supervisory classes. Summaries of evaluations conducted during the period of review shall be included in the Candidate's PAF.

A minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching performance shall be conducted in different quarters in each academic year using the Department RTP Classroom Performance Evaluation Form. The specific procedures for conducting peer evaluations may be found in Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as Appendix 16) of the University Manual. Each peer evaluator is encouraged to review the departmental RTP criteria prior to conducting a peer evaluation. The written evaluation should specifically address those criteria in relation to course materials supplied and the performance of the Candidate during the classroom visitation. Peer 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 evaluating teaching performance. 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 teaching principles and approach to teaching and should explain how he or she meets the department's criteria for teaching. The Candidate should supply evidence of success in these areas through 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. As indicated below (3.1.1-3.1.4), the DRTPC's main concerns will be with the Candidate's (i) ability to effectively communicate and elucidate mathematical concepts; (ii) ability to maintain appropriate academic standards; (iii) involvement in teaching activities outside the classroom; and (iv) efforts to continuously improve his or her teaching. Generally, activities in the following subsections will be considered in the DRTPC's evaluation:

Performance Areas

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. Maintenance of 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

3.1.3. Additional Activities Related to Teaching

- supervising undergraduate research projects
- supervising students in independent study
- supervising master's theses
- developing a new course or significantly revising an existing course
- tutoring or mentoring students or faculty in a structured program
- supporting students in mathematics-related activities such as contests, math clubs, conferences
- sponsoring students in programs designed to prepare students for graduate studies

3.1.4 Efforts towards improving teaching quality

- participating in faculty development workshops/activities
- experimenting with and assessing new teaching methods
- using assessment results to improve performance
- peer mentoring and observation
- measureable improvements in student pass rates

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 form: Item 1, item 2, item 4, and item 8, as well as to all relevant comments made in any peer evaluations from the period of review. 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. The Candidate should also refer to all relevant comments made in any peer evaluations from the period of review. In addition, trends in the Candidate's student evaluation scores and peer evaluations may be used when discussing efforts to continually improve his or her teaching. If the Candidate has modified his or her teaching techniques in response to previous evaluations or engaged in efforts listed in 3.1.4, those activities and their effects 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.

Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Standards of acceptable performance in teaching will be based on several types of evidence, that at a minimum will include student evaluations, peer evaluations, signed student and faculty input, additional teaching-related activities, and demonstrated improvement in problematic areas identified previously. Under no circumstance will the quality of a Candidate's teaching be determined by only one of these measures. It is expected that great care will be exercised by the DRTPC when these guidelines are utilized to frame a comprehensive evaluation of the Candidate's teaching.

Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the standard for student evaluations described in this section. The standard is the *overall effectiveness of the instructor* (student evaluation question 14), cumulative across all courses taught during the review period. While the candidate's classes are evaluated on the responses of all questions, emphasis will be placed in question 14. The general expectation for teaching performance is that student evaluation scores should improve as candidates gain experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial standard of 50% or more student responses in the Very Good and Good categories combined for new faculty. The standard increases to 65% or more in the Very Good and Good categories combined for faculty seeking reappointment to their final probationary year. Student evaluation scores below these

standards but within the range specified in Table 1 may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

Table 1. Minimum range of Very Good and Good responses for Question 14 of the student evaluations during probationary years.

| Reappointment to Probationary Year (PY) | Probationary Year For Student Evaluations | Minimum Percentage Responses in the Very Good and Good Categories Combined |
|---|---|--|
| PY 2 | N.A. | N.A. |
| PY 3 | PY 1 | 40% - 50% |
| PY 4 | PY 2 | 45% - 55% |
| PY 5 | PY 3 | 50% - 60% |
| PY 6 | PY 4 | 55% - 65% |

Student evaluations. In evaluating the Candidate's quality of teaching as perceived by students, the DRTPC will refer to the percentage of *very good* and *good* student assessments.

Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All Candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the review period. In addition, Candidates must document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during the previous RTP cycles have been corrected. Student and peer evaluations will be compared for coherence.

Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that Candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.

Additional activities. Involvement in activities such as those that appear in subsection 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 may be considered in evaluating teaching effectiveness provided that student evaluation scores are within or above the range specified in Table 1. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of additional activities for Candidates whose student evaluation percentages are at the low end of the teaching performance range specified in Table 1.

3.2 Scholarship

The faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics recognizes scholarship as part of the professional responsibility of each of its members. This section examines the Candidate's scholarship in mathematics, mathematics education, and/or statistics. Scholarship activities may be collaborative or sole efforts. These activities have been organized into seven 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.

- A. 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.
- B. 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 over the period of review.
- C. 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.

3.2.1 Attendance of Meetings, Seminars, and Workshops (averaged value, 0 –1 pt. max)
The DRTPC will award **0-1 point(s)** for each item in this category, however, no more than a total of 1 point will be awarded for this category for any given year. When the Candidate goes up for action, the annual awards 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 1 point. The Candidate should provide a sufficiently detailed description of how attending the meetings has enhanced his or her scholarship 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* (averaged value, 0 – 3 pts. max)

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: Reviewing mathematics books, reviewing journal articles (i.e., writing summaries of articles for an organization such as American Mathematical Society). The DRTPC will generally award more points to activities that are more demanding. For example, reviewing several graduate level texts might be awarded 3 points, while reviewing a single undergraduate text 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* (cumulative total, 0 – 9 pts. max)

The DRTPC will award 0-3 points for **each different item** 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** different 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 presentations, Candidates are encouraged to give additional presentations.

3.2.4 *Publications* (unlimited pts.)

The DRTPC will award **0-5 points** for **each publication** in this category. These points accumulate during the period of review. What constitutes a refereed article varies across the sub-disciplines of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. For the purposes of this document a *refereed article* is defined as an article that has undergone a peer-review process that is considered appropriate for the sub-discipline, examples of this process include the blind referee process as well as review by an editorial board. 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. Many conference proceedings have a thorough review process; the candidate should provide details for such a publication. 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 or technical firm and is subject to less rigorous qualifying methods than those employed by referees of research journals.)

3.2.5 *Grants (unlimited pts.)*

The DRTPC will award **0-4 points** for **each grant** in this category. These points accumulate during the period of review. Travel grants are not considered scholarly in nature and will not be awarded points. Intramural grants, such as Cal Poly Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) mini-grants might receive 2 points, while 3 or 4 points might be awarded to extramural grants, such as federally or internationally competitive grants, or discipline-related grants from foundations or other sponsors. Often the complexity of grant implementation requires Co-Principal Investigators (Co-PI), as opposed to a single Principal Investigator (PI), the Candidate should provide a sufficiently detailed explanation so that the DRTPC can accurately judge the Candidate's role in obtaining grant funds and/or contributing to implementation of the grant(s).

3.2.6 *Scholarly Contributions to the Profession (cumulative total, 0 – 4 pts. max)*

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, 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), and organizing major conferences or special sessions (only if it involves the use of discipline expertise, for example reading articles or abstracts to prepare questions for presenters or to develop the presentation schedule). Such scholarly work dedicated to co-organizing a Sectional AMS Special Session might receive 1 point, while the more intensive scholarly work devoted to organizing an international conference or refereeing journal articles would be awarded 2 points. The Candidate and DRTPC should note that this category is dedicated to items that involve considerable work and time. The Candidate

is responsible for providing detailed information so that the DRTPC can accurately assess these activities.

3.2.7 *Other Activities* (cumulative total, 0 – 3 pts. max)

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 to completion 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.

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 reprints of publications, copies of grant proposals, and other information that the Candidate believes will support his or her contributions in the above categories, e.g. verification of manuscript acceptance.

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. Service activities have been organized into five categories.

Service points will be awarded on an annual basis for each year under consideration. An inactive committee will not generate any service points for the Candidate. 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 sufficiently detailed description of the service performed 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 his or her portfolio.

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 insufficient 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
- Grading college board exams (such as AP Calculus or AP Statistics)
- Judging poster sessions
- Organizing conferences or special sessions (if this activity involves discipline related expertise, the Candidate may list it instead in Scholarship 3.2.6)

Based on 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.

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 Appendix 10 and Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as Appendix 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 all department RTP documents be maintained on the department web page so that they are also available to Candidates for faculty positions.

Requests for early tenure or promotion will not be considered unless the Candidate has completed at least two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on 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. The following sections of this document describe the minimum qualifications for each RTP action.

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 will be evaluated by the DRTPC primarily in the areas of teaching performance and scholarship as the Candidate is not expected to perform any service in the first probationary year. For reappointment beyond a third probationary year, the Candidate must be judged by the DRTPC as progressing satisfactorily toward the expectations for tenure in all performance areas; teaching, scholarship, and service. If any problems were identified in earlier evaluations, the DRTPC will expect to see evidence of progress made in resolving these problems.

Teaching: A Candidate for reappointment is expected to exhibit effective teaching or an improving level of effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, signed faculty and student input, and other documentation of activities such as those listed in section 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the standards for student evaluations as described in section 3.1 Table 1 on page 7. The general expectation for teaching performance is that student evaluation scores on question 14 should improve as candidates gain experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial standard of 50 percent for new faculty. The minimum standard increases to *65 percent* for faculty seeking reappointment to their final probationary year. Student evaluation scores below these standards but within the range specified in Table 1 may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

Scholarship: Throughout the probationary period, the Candidate should be engaged in scholarly and creative activities that will make it possible for him or her to meet the requirements for tenure and promotion. Although there are no specific requirements for scholarly activities for each probationary year, the DRTPC recommends that the Candidate get an early start on activities within categories where a modified average method is used to award points (3.2.1 and 3.2.2). Midway through the probationary period, a Candidate may benefit from submission of one or more grant proposals or presentation abstracts as these activities (and collegial feedback associated with them) can assist the Candidate in solidifying plans and approaches for scholarly work that can lead to funded proposals and/or accepted publications during the later stages of the probationary period.

During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under categories 3.2.1-3.2.7 (for the period under review) is calculated.

Service: During the first two probationary years, the Candidate will be expected to attend the meetings of a variety of committees to learn about departmental governance matters. Thereafter, the Candidate is expected to become a contributing member on a small number of committees of his or her choosing. By the 5th probationary year, 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).

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

4.2 Tenure

A Candidate for tenure (including early tenure) may choose the department RTP criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment or those in effect at the time of the request for action. In either 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

A Candidate for tenure must demonstrate their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching: A Candidate for tenure is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student evaluation question 14, across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive 70% responses in the *very good* and *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 60% to 70% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected.

Scholarship: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 - 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The Candidate must have a record, sustained over several years, of dedicated efforts and scholarly achievements. A minimum cumulative total of 10 points in the area of scholarship is required and must include at least one refereed publication or one significant and successfully funded grant.

Service: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. A minimum cumulative total of 14 points in the area of service is required and must include active participation on at least one committee outside the department during that time.

A cumulative total of 35 points is required 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.

The Candidate is encouraged to seek advice from the chair of the DRTPC, as well as from his or her mentor, as he or she progresses through the probationary period. 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 that justified that promotion will have been maintained in the period between the promotion and the tenure request.

4.2.2 Early Tenure

Criteria for early tenure place emphasis on teaching excellence and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession.

Teaching: A Candidate for early tenure is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching excellence as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student evaluation question 14 (*overall effectiveness of the instructor*), across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early tenure will receive at least 90 percent responses in the *very good* or *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 80 percent to 90 percent may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected.

Scholarship: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 - 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The Candidate must have a sustained and exceptional record of scholarly achievements.

A minimum cumulative total of 20 points in the area of scholarship as described in section 3.2. is required. This list of scholarly achievements must include:

- two refereed publications or
- one refereed publication and one significant and successfully funded grant or
- two significant and successfully funded grants.

Service: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. An exceptional level of involvement and leadership is expected in the area of service. A Candidate for early tenure must have assumed positions of leadership and responsibility at the department, college, or university levels serving as Chair of at least one committee and making notable contributions to at least one committee external to the department. A minimum cumulative total of 24 points in the area of service is required.

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

4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor

A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor (including early promotion) may choose either the department RTP criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment or those in effect at the time of the request for action. In either 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. A Candidate may apply simultaneously for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor.

4.3.1 Normal Promotion to Associate Professor

A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching: A Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student evaluation question 14, across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive 70% responses in the *very good* and *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 60% to 70% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected.

Scholarship: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 - 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The Candidate must have a record, sustained over several years, of dedicated efforts and scholarly achievements. A minimum cumulative total of 10 points in the area of scholarship is required and must include at least one refereed publication or one significant and successfully funded grant.

Service: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. A minimum cumulative total of 14 points in the area of service is required and must include active participation on at least one committee outside the department during that time.

A cumulative total of 35 points is required 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.

The Candidate is encouraged to seek advice from the Chair of the DRTPC, as well as from his or her mentor, as he or she progresses through the probationary period.

4.3.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor

Criteria for early promotion to Associate Professor place emphasis on teaching excellence and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession.

Teaching: A Candidate for early promotion to Associate Professor is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching excellence as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student evaluation question 14 (*overall effectiveness of the instructor*), across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early promotion to Associate Professor will receive at least 90 percent responses in the *very good* or *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 80 percent to 90 percent may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected.

Scholarship: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1-3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The Candidate must have a sustained and exceptional record of scholarly achievements.

A minimum cumulative total of 20 points in the area of scholarship as described in section 3.2. is required. This list of scholarly achievements must include:

- two refereed publications or
- one refereed publication and one significant and successfully funded grant or
- two significant and successfully funded grants.

Service: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. An exceptional level of involvement and leadership is expected in the area of service. A Candidate for early promotion to Associate Professor must have assumed positions of leadership and responsibility at the department, college, or university levels serving as Chair of at least one committee and making notable contributions to at least one committee external to the department. A minimum cumulative total of 24 points, in the area of service is required.

A cumulative 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 his or her efforts in scholarship or service.

4.4 Promotion to Full Professor

A Candidate for promotion to Full Professor (including early promotion) may choose either the department RTP criteria at the time of the initial probationary appointment or those in effect at the time of the request for action.

If the Candidate has already been awarded tenure, he or she is eligible to apply for a subsequent promotion after having completed four years of service at the rank of Associate Professor.

4.4.1 Normal Promotion to Full Professor

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.

Teaching: A Candidate for promotion to Full Professor is expected to have maintained a consistently high level of teaching effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the Candidate.

The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student evaluation question 14, across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Full Professor will receive 75% responses in the *very good* and *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 65% to 75% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the

Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected.

Scholarship: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 – 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. The Candidate must have a sustained record of dedicated efforts and scholarly achievements and shall accumulate in total a minimum of 10 points over the period of review. This record must include at least one refereed publication or one significant and successfully funded external grant on which the Candidate serves a primary role as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.

Service: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. 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 serving as Chair of at least one committee and contributing actively to at least one committee external to the department. A minimum cumulative total of 14 points in the area of service is required.

A cumulative total of 40 points is required 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 abbreviated time period.

Criteria for early promotion to Full Professor place emphasis on teaching excellence and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession.

Teaching: A Candidate for early promotion to Full Professor is expected to have reached a consistently high level of teaching excellence as indicated by student evaluations, peer

evaluations, and other documentation provided by the Candidate. Progress must be demonstrated in areas where need for improvement was indicated by any previous DRTPC.

The Candidate partially satisfies the requirements for teaching performance by using student evaluations to demonstrate a cumulative percentage for *very good* and *good* marks on student evaluation question 14 (*overall effectiveness of the instructor*), across all courses taught during the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early promotion to Full Professor will receive at least 90 percent responses in the *very good* or *good* categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 80 percent to 90 percent may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the Candidate is committed to teaching excellence as described in peer evaluations, signed input from students and faculty, and evidence of the Candidate's involvement in additional activities such as those listed in sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.

The Candidate must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period and document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected.

Scholarship: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded under scholarship categories 3.2.1 – 3.2.7 for the entire period under review is calculated. A minimum cumulative total of 20 points in the area of scholarship is required and must include:

- two refereed publications or
- one refereed publication and one significant and successfully funded external grant on which the Candidate serves a primary role as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator or
- two significant and successfully funded external grants on which the Candidate serves as a primary role Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.

Service: During a year in which a Candidate is being evaluated for an action, the sum of the points awarded in service categories 3.3.1 – 3.3.5 for the entire period under review is calculated. 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, college or university levels serving as Chair of at least one committee and making notable contributions to at least two committees external to the department. A minimum cumulative total of 24 points in the area of service is required.

A cumulative total of 65 points is required 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

Full-time tenured faculty and, if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President, faculty participating in FERP are eligible for the DRTPC membership. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing subject to the stipulations in the Acceptance of Paid Professional Leave form. 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 shall consist initially of seven (7) and three (3) alternate full-time, tenured and FERP faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. 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. 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 no more than seven." Upon completion of the balloting, the vote totals for each individual will be listed in decreasing order. The ten or more (in the event of a tie for the 10th position, all candidates tied for this position shall be submitted on the second ballot) individuals with the highest vote totals will be resubmitted to the probationary and tenured faculty for a second vote with the instruction: "Vote for no more than seven and rank all individuals on the second ballot with 1 being your first choice, 2 being your second choice, etc. If there are no ties, the seven individuals having the highest vote totals comprise the DRTPC while the remaining individuals make up the alternate list in order of their vote totals. In the event of ties, individuals having a lower sum of ranks will be placed on the DRTPC before others (the sum of ranks statistic will also determine the order of individuals on the alternate list in the case of ties). In the unlikely event, that the sum of ranks is also tied then a random procedure (e.g. coin flip) will be used to break these ties. Any faculty member

whose name was included in the second vote and has not achieved a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty in either the first or second voting process, must be ratified by a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty in another separate confirmation vote in order to serve on the DRTPC.

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 Policy No: 1328 (formerly known as 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; and (v) provides the DRTPC's recommendation to the Candidate. Throughout the year, the DRTPC Chair ensures that the minimum number of peer evaluations are conducted on behalf of faculty who remain eligible for RTP action(s); ensures that reports written by peer evaluators are provided to Candidates within two weeks of a classroom visit; and forwards peer evaluations in a timely manner to the Dean for inclusion in the Candidate's PAF.

5.3 RTP Document Review

Each year the department shall appoint a 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 and procedures. The RTP Document Review Committee shall work with the Mathematics and Statistics Department, the DRTP

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 that 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 proposed by the Department 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 CRTPC and the College Dean for review no later than April 1.

5.4 Evaluation of Faculty on Leave, in Academic Governance Positions, in Administrative Positions, or Performing Administrative Duties

A faculty member who is still eligible for some RTP action and whose assigned duties vary from normal faculty duties (see list given below) 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 jointly developed 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.

Situations in which the Candidate's assigned duties may vary from the norm:

- Serving in administrative positions such as Department Chair
- Performing administrative duties

- Serving in positions of academic governance
- Taking sabbatical leave
- Taking fellowships
- Teaching overseas
- Taking a position at another university such as Visiting Professor/Scholar

**MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS 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: _____ /
6. Date of Evaluation Submission: _____

7. Candidate's Name/Signature:

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT

C.S.P.U. POMONA

| CRN | QUARTER | YEAR | SUBJECT | COURSE | COURSE TITLE | INSTRUCTOR NAME | | | | | |
|--|--|------|---------|--------|--------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | WINTER <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SPRING <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SUMMER <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| | FALL <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| INSTRUCTIONS: 1. USE A NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY. 2. MARK HEAVY BLACK MARKS THAT FILL THE CIRCLE COMPLETELY. 3. PRINT THE YEAR, SUBJECT, COURSE, COURSE TITLE & INSTRUCTOR NAME. 4. MARK ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION. 5. ALL CHANGES MUST BE CLEANLY ERASED. 6. USE AREA PROVIDED ON OTHER SIDE OF FORM FOR WRITING COMMENTS. | | | | | | RATINGS VERY GOOD SATISFACTORY VERY POOR 1 2 3 4 5 | | | | | |
| 1 | Instructor's planning and organization of the instructional material. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2 | Instructor's concern that students learn and understand the material. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3 | Instructor provided students with challenge. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4 | Instructor's ability to explain information and concepts. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5 | Instructor's ability to create and maintain the students' interest in the subject matter. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6 | Instructor's enthusiasm about the teaching of the course material. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7 | Instructor's willingness to answer students' questions in class. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8 | Instructor's effectiveness in answering students' questions. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9 | Instructor's availability and willingness to assist students. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10 | Clarity with which the instructor explained the grading system at the beginning of the term and followed it during the term. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11 | Tests, quizzes, or other assignments were representative of the subject material covered in the course. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12 | The fairness with which the instructor graded students' work. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13 | Instructor reported results of exam in a reasonable amount of time. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14 | The overall effectiveness of the instructor. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15 | How effectively was all the material in the course outline covered? | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17 | PLEASE DO NOT MAKE ANY WRITTEN COMMENTS ON EITHER SIDE OF THIS FORM. | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 18 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 20 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 23 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 24 | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |