DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD

Department:	Computer Information Systems
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2020
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	5

DEPARTMENT

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

Dept. Chair: Drew Hwang (Printed Name) _____ (Signature) 2/20/2020 (Date)

DRTPC Chair: Zhongming Ma (Printed Name) _____ (Signature) 2/11/20 (Date)

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

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

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

CRTPC Chair: Jing Hu (Printed Name) Jing Hu (Signature) 5/1/2020 (Date)

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN

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

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

Dean/Director: Erik Rolland (Printed Name) _____ (Signature) 8/11/2020 (Date)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. X Approved for the following years 2020/21 to 2024/25
2. _____ Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs: Martin Sancho-Madriz (Printed Name) _____ (Signature) 8/15/20 (Date)

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

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Computer Information Systems Department

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria

for

2020-2025

REVISED
January 23, 2020

Approved by Department Feb. 17, 2020

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policies and Criteria
for the 2020-2025 Academic Year

Table of Contents

I. PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT 3

II. SUMMARY OF CRITERIA 5

III. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE 8

IV. DEPARTMENTAL RTP PROCEDURES AND CALENDAR 9

V. DEPARTMENT RTP GUIDELINES 13

VI. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT 17

VII. CRITERIA FOR TENURE 19

VIII. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR 21

IX. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR 22

X. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE/EARLY PROMOTION 24

XI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY SERVING ON TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENT 26

XII. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS 26

APPENDIX A 28

I. DEFINITIONS AND TERMS 28

II. POLICY 29

APPENDIX B-1 Sample MBO Timelines 31

APPENDIX B-2 Sample MBO Format 31

APPENDIX B-3 Sample Performance Review Document 35

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Computer Information Systems Department

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policies and Criteria
for the 2020-2025 Academic Years

I. PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT

A. STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT

The philosophy of the Computer Information Systems (CIS) Department reflects the collective beliefs of the faculty as well as the dynamic, changing conditions of the information technology (IT) industry. This dynamism is most evident in the regular revision of the curriculum to ensure it prepares students for future careers in industry and organizations. The Department is committed to giving students a good understanding of current and expected theory and practice in the IT field so that they are prepared for a career in one of its areas of specialization in CIS, and are able to adapt to rapidly changing technologies and dynamic business conditions.

A highly educated, dedicated, active faculty is required to accomplish these goals. Consequently, the process for evaluating faculty performance with a view toward reappointment, tenure, or promotion is of utmost importance to the tenured faculty of the Department.

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies and criteria for faculty of the Computer Information Systems Department are explicitly described in this document to ensure that:

- Excellence will be rewarded.
- Faculty working towards promotion or tenure, and faculty seeking reappointment will be aware of the areas in which they will be evaluated and understand the criteria that are used in each evaluation area. (See Section III, item I for a discussion of the evaluation areas.)

B. IMPLEMENTING THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT

To clarify to the candidate the criteria used and expectations placed upon them upon starting their employment at Cal Poly Pomona, the candidate will receive a letter which explicitly defines expectations in the evaluation areas of teaching, scholarship and service. These explicit expectations become expectations in the RTP process, in defining areas such as the areas in which the candidate will take a leadership role, the range of classes to be taught, and the quantity and quality of the publication and other efforts required by the department and College.

This correspondence will become part of the Personnel Action File (PAF) and can be used in future RTP actions.

The university requires a candidate for an RTP action to present a request for action with supporting material in an RTP package covering the evaluation period. Since the definition of "evaluation period" varies depending on the requested action, please refer to Appendix A for clarification.

- At the beginning of each academic year, the Faculty Affairs office notifies candidates of the actions for which they are eligible, the evaluation period that the candidate should cover in the RTP package, and the Department RTP criteria to which the candidate may refer.
- This mailing also includes copies of other pertinent documents and information pertaining to the RTP process.

Promotion and tenure within the university system can be a complex process. CIS Department faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in each of the three evaluation areas, to maintain records of their performance, and to prepare a quality RTP package that documents that performance. The CIS Department Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion document is only one of several documents governing the RTP process. The CIS Department Chair will provide new faculty with a copy of the RTP document in effect when they are hired. Other documents governing the RTP process and procedures include:

- The University Manual, approved by the Academic Senate and the President (at https://www.cpp.edu/academic-manual/1300-1399-academic-personnel-policies/1325-1349/policy_1328_reappointment_tenure_and_promotion_policy_and_procedures_04.24.19.pdf)
  - Policy #1330 Faculty Performance Evaluations
  - Policy #1329 Student Evaluation of Teaching
  - Policy #1328 RTP Policy and Procedures

- The Collective Bargaining Agreement for Bargaining Unit 3 (at https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Pages/unit3-cfa.aspx)
  - Article 11. Personnel Files
  - Article 13. Probation and Tenure
  - Article 14. Promotion
  - Article 15. Evaluation

The CIS Department Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (DRTPC) evaluates candidates and determines an overall rating based on ratings in three evaluation areas:

- Teaching Excellence
- Service to the Department, College, University, and Community

- Professional Development.

Possible ratings (defined more fully in Section XI of this document) arranged from lowest to highest are:

- Unacceptable
- Poor
- Good
- Excellent
- Outstanding

The CIS Department uses a Management by Objectives (MBO) process to help faculty develop and monitor professional goals. The departmental MBO process covers the two academic years immediately preceding an RTP Action. The MBO process is designed to make the candidate aware of areas of emphasis and levels of performance important to the department and the candidate in the review process.

After the DRTPC approves the candidate's MBOs, the CIS Department will try to support the candidate's efforts to satisfy those MBOs. The satisfactory attainment of the MBO goals will be an important factor in the DRTPC's assessment of the candidate's performance during the entire evaluation period (see Appendix A for definitions of evaluation periods).

Appendices B-1 through B-3 to this document contain examples of timelines and document formats to help the candidate prepare documentation for MBO submittal and Faculty Evaluation.

If any provisions of this document are held to be contrary to University Regulations or the Collective Bargaining Agreement for Unit 3 (faculty) then, in effect, such provisions will not be deemed valid except to the extent permitted by the governing documents. However all other provisions of this document will continue in full force and effect.

II. SUMMARY OF CRITERIA

The table below gives a summary of the criteria for different levels of faculty promotion. To understand the full requirement for each level of promotion, the section related to that criteria needs to be read.

Summary of Overall Criteria

Re-appointment	**Criteria for Tenure**	**Promotion to Associate Professor**	**Promotion to Professor**
Reappointment is denied If candidate gets 'poor' for teaching 2 years in a row. VI E 3	Candidate must be good or better in the 3 evaluation areas. VII B	Candidate must be good or better in the 3 evaluation areas. VIII B	
	Satisfy the MBOs VII A	Can apply at the same time as tenure application. VIII A	Differences in what you apply for, given what you were hired as. IX A
		Satisfy the MBOs VIII A	Satisfy the two year MBOs. Associate professors need to be in rank 4 years before promotion to Full. IX A

Summary of Criteria for Teaching Excellence

Re-appointment	**Criteria for Tenure**	**Promotion to Associate Professor**	**Promotion to Professor**
Two peer classroom evaluations. One course should be level 300 or higher. VI E 1	Peer evaluations must include 4 sections over the 2 year MBO period from at least 3 different courses. One at the 300 or higher level. VII D 2	Two peer classroom evaluations. One course should be level 300 or higher. VIII D2	Peer evaluations must include 4 sections over the 2 year MBO period from at least 3 different courses. One at the 300 or higher level. IX D 2
All courses should receive student evaluations & reflective analysis of those. VI E 2	All courses should receive student evaluations & reflective analysis of those. VII D 3	All courses should receive student evaluations & reflective analysis of those. VIII D 3	All courses should receive student evaluations & reflective analysis of those. IX D 3
Reappointment is denied If candidate gets 'poor' for teaching 2 years in a			

row. VI E 3			

Summary of Criteria for Professional Development

Re-appointment	**Criteria for Tenure**	**Promotion to Associate Professor**	**Promotion to Professor**
Earned doctorate in Information Systems or related field. VI B	Earned doctorate VII F 1	Earned doctorate VIII F 1	Earned doctorate VIII F 1
Minimum: 1 peer-reviewed publication/year during the evaluation period, unless something else is said in the hiring agreement. VI C	Minimum: 1 peer-reviewed publication/year over the evaluation period, unless something else is said in the hiring agreement. 2 Peer Reviewed Journals over the immediate 5 year period. VII F 3	Minimum: 1 peer-reviewed publication/year over the evaluation period, unless something else is said in the hiring agreement. 2 Peer Reviewed Journals over the immediate 5 year period. VIII F 3	Minimum: 1 peer-reviewed publication/year over the evaluation period, unless something else is said in the hiring agreement. 2 Peer Reviewed Journals over the immediate 5 year period. VIII F 3

Summary of Criteria for Service

Re-appointment	**Criteria for Tenure**	**Promotion to Associate Professor**	**Promotion to Professor**
	Demonstrate Leadership as per MBOs VII E 1	Demonstrate Leadership as per MBOs VIII E 1	Demonstrate Leadership as per MBOs VIII E 1
Consistent attendance and participation in department meetings. V F 1	Consistent attendance and participation in department meetings. VII E 2	Consistent attendance and participation in department meetings. VIII E 2	Consistent attendance and participation in department meetings. VIII E 2
Two service commitments per year - must show active participation - at least one committee in university, college or department level - chair of one committee (refer to VI F)	Three service commitments per year - must show active participation - at least two committees in university, college or department level - chair of one committee (refer to VII E)	Two service commitments per year - must show active participation - at least one committee in university, college or department level - chair of one committee (refer to VIII E)	Three service commitments per year - must show active participation - at least two committees in university, college or department level IX E - chair of one committee (refer to IX E)
	One other significant service commitment, like being a center director or advisor to a student club. VII E 4	One other significant service commitment, like being a center director or advisor to a student club. VIII E 4	One other significant service commitment, like being a center director or advisor to a student club. IX E 4

III. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE

A. The CIS Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) will be made up of three tenured full-time faculty members of the department. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members. These faculty members will be elected in staggered terms of two years each, with some members being elected one year and the remaining members being elected the next year.

B. A tenured department chair may be a member of the DRTPC. If not on the committee, a tenured department chair will submit a separate evaluation report. A non-tenured chair may submit signed material for inclusion in the Working Personnel Action Folder using the same procedure as any other faculty peer or student (see Section III, items C ~~and D~~).

C. Only tenured faculty
will be eligible to serve on the DRTPC.

D. An election will be held and must be conducted by March 1st of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle to fill all vacancies created by resignation, retirement, or completed terms. It is possible for an individual to be re-elected to successive two-year terms. Election to the DRTPC will be by secret ballot cast by probationary and tenured faculty. In case of a tie that precludes the designation of the correct number of elected candidates, those individuals involved in the tie will be reconsidered on additional secret ballots until the committee has been filled.

E. If a member of the DRTPC becomes ineligible or unavailable for work on the committee, he/she will be replaced for the remainder of that term by an election process similar to that described above.

F. The elected committee will be responsible for electing the committee chair. The DRTPC Chair shall be a full-time tenured faculty. The DRTPC chair is responsible for ensuring that the committee complies with all department, college, and university procedures and time schedules.

IV. DEPARTMENTAL RTP PROCEDURES AND CALENDAR

A. RTP Calendar:

The Department Chair will ensure that all probationary candidates receive the RTP calendar as soon as it is available to the department in the Fall Semester.

B. Working RTP File:

The DRTPC will maintain a Working RTP File on each candidate being evaluated. The RTP package prepared by the candidate becomes part of this file. The candidate's Working RTP File becomes part of his/her Personnel Action File (PAF), which is kept in the office of the Dean of the College of Business Administration. It is the committee's responsibility to review the candidate's Personnel Action File and previous RTP packages in that file as part of the total input to the evaluation process.

C. Addition of Signed Material to the Working RTP File:

The Chair of the DRTPC will be able to add relevant material to a faculty member's Working RTP File as the material is created during the evaluation period. The faculty member being reviewed shall be provided with a copy of material file five days prior to its going into the file. The faculty member under review shall have the right to submit additional material to his/her file and shall have the right to submit a written rebuttal to any material placed in her/her file within 10 calendar days.

D. Student comments:

The DRTPC will consider signed student comments when making its overall determination of the candidate's performance for an evaluation period. Prior to the date the candidates submit their RTP packages, the DRTPC chair will post on department bulletin boards and/or through electronic communications: 1-the names of candidates for reappointment, tenure, early tenure, promotion, and early promotion; 2-the names of DRTPC members to whom material can be submitted; and 3-the submission procedures. Individual students will then have the opportunity to submit signed evaluation material, commentary, and substantiating documentation to the DRTPC.

Any signed letters from students shall be received at least 10 days before the deadline for RTP packet submission so that the faculty member has time to produce a response that can be added to the RTP package. Comments received after an RTP cycle deadline would be taken into consideration in the next evaluation cycle.

E. Student Evaluations:

Every candidate is required to receive student evaluations in all sections of all courses taught, following the University procedure. Candidates must adhere to the stated procedures for conducting these evaluations (Policy #1329 of the University Manual).

The candidate's RTP package must include in an appendix:

- Copies of computer-generated summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught during the period of evaluation.
- A tabulated summary of all student evaluations, comparing the candidate's performance on each item with the average of the department as a whole on the same item.

The candidate's self-evaluation of teaching should include a reflective interpretation of the results of the student evaluations. The DRTPC will use this information in its evaluation as one element in its evaluation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching.

F. Peer Evaluations:

Every candidate requesting reappointment, tenure, or promotion will receive peer classroom evaluations. The number and level of courses required for peer evaluations varies depending upon the type of RTP action requested. The specific requirements are identified under the criteria for each RTP action (see Sections V through VIII).

Prior to the start of each semester, the candidate will send a memo (email) to the DRTPC chairperson listing the course and section numbers of those classes in which he/she would like to receive peer evaluations during the semester. If the candidate fails to provide a list of courses, the RTP Committee will notify the candidate of the courses, if any, to be visited that

semester. If the DRTPC workload would preclude honoring the request or the DRTPC wishes to evaluate a different class, a mutually agreed upon peer evaluation schedule will be followed. If no agreement between the DRTPC and the candidate can be reached, the Chair of the CIS Department will make a final determination of the classes to be visited.

Each selected section will be visited once, unless the DRTPC determines to visit additional times. The candidate will not be notified in advance of the specific date(s) of scheduled visits. The candidate being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the candidate being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es).

The candidate will submit the course outline for each section subject to peer evaluations to the DRTPC chairperson during the first week of the semester. Samples of handouts, quizzes, examinations, and exercises used in the course will be supplied to each visiting DRTPC member by the end of the semester. Based upon an evaluation of the classroom performance and the course materials, the visiting DRTPC members will submit a written evaluation of the candidate's performance. Written peer evaluations will be one factor in the overall determination of teaching performance.

G. Evaluation by DRTPC:

The DRTPC will not recommend a candidate for reappointment if a candidate's performance on the criterion of teaching excellence is found to be poor or unacceptable two consecutive performance evaluation periods.

The DRTPC will not recommend a candidate for tenure or promotion whose overall determination on the criterion of teaching excellence is poor or unacceptable. Should a candidate receive a poor or unacceptable evaluation, he or she will be visited in three different course sections by three different DRTPC members during the next academic year.

The DRTPC will not recommend a candidate for early promotion or early tenure unless the candidate's performance on all three evaluation areas is outstanding.

Within one week after making its written recommendation, the DRTPC, as a whole, will meet personally with the candidate for a frank and open exchange on the DRTPC's recommendation and the candidate's reaction to the recommendation. The candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing within seven (7) days following this meeting.

H. Management by Objectives (MBO) Process:

The Computer Information Systems Department subscribes to the philosophy of "management by objectives." Thus, individuals applying for tenure, promotion, or early tenure/promotion must establish, in conjunction with the DRTPC, a set of approved activities and objectives during the Spring Semester prior to the start of the evaluation time period. (See Appendix B-1 for a sample

MBO timeline.) The RTP action request occurs in the Fall Semester following the evaluation period, at which time the two-year MBOs should also be complete.

It is important for the candidate to understand that the period for evaluation of specific MBO progress **is the two years (24 months) prior to applying for the RTP action**. The university requires that a candidate document their progress during the evaluation period (see Appendix A for a definition) **since their request for the last comparative action, which is usually longer than two years.** The evaluation period for each RTP action for each candidate is specified in the memo that Academic Affairs sends to each candidate eligible for RTP action at the beginning of the Fall Semester.

The MBO objectives define expectations for performance during the most recent 24-month period prior to the request for RTP action. These objectives then become an important factor in the Departmental evaluation of the candidate's performance for the RTP action request. Progress on the objectives will be part of the regular annual evaluation process, and will be presented as part of the candidate's plan for tenure and/or promotion in his/her self-evaluation in the RTP package.

Each objective will include a statement identifying the level of performance deemed acceptable in order to receive a favorable recommendation. Once the candidate and the DRTPC reach a mutual understanding regarding the objectives and performance levels required, it is the candidate's responsibility to submit the agreement for final approval by the committee. Should an agreement not be reached, the material will be referred to the department's tenured faculty for resolution. Once it is signed by the candidate and members of the DRTPC, the chair of the DRTPC and the candidate shall be provided copies of the candidate's MBO plan, and a copy will be inserted into the candidate's PAF.

Should it become necessary to modify approved objectives, the candidate shall submit a written request to the DRTPC chair explaining the circumstances making the change necessary and a proposal for revising the objectives. The DRTPC and the candidate will meet as soon as possible after the DRTPC chair receives the request to modify previously approved objectives. Subsequent to this, the procedures outlined above for submitting and approving the original objectives will be followed.

In the RTP package, the candidate will provide documentation on progress toward completion of his/her MBOs

I. Procedures to be used for DRTPC recommendation decisions:

1. The CIS Department recognizes that individual faculty members have varying interest and skill sets and consequently wants its MBO-based evaluation system to accommodate individual differences within predefined limits. The candidate working with the DRTPC will develop MBOs whose relative ranking weights fall within the following ranges. The total must sum to 100 percent. The ranking weight ranges are:

- Teaching Excellence (40% - 60 %).
- Department, College, and University Service (20% - 30%).
- Professional Development (20% - 40%).

2. In order to qualify for a positive recommendation from the DRTPC for each of the decisions (reappointment, promotion, early tenure, or early promotion), a faculty member must:
   - Satisfactorily complete each of the (original, or approved as modified) objectives in the candidate's MBO document at the predefined performance level
   - Fulfill the stated RTP criteria for the evaluation period

V. RTP GUIDELINES

For the CIS department, professional development is guided by the principles of Management by Objectives. For faculty subject to RTP actions, the MBOs agreed upon by the candidate and the DRTPC will be included and reported on in the faculty member's RTP document.

MBOs are set two years in advance of promotion to Associate Professor, Full Professor or Tenure.

Each of the following three criteria is followed by a nonexclusive list of approaches for demonstrating performance against the criterion. The candidate must choose to utilize some of the suggested alternatives in the material he/she submits in his/her RTP package. Any statements made to demonstrate performance must be supported by documentation.

A. Teaching Excellence.

There are a variety of ways to demonstrate Teaching Excellence, identified in this section. Student evaluations are the primary measure of Teaching Excellence. But, several other measures are relevant too.

Typically a peer evaluation is written with the RTP Criteria for Teaching Excellence in mind. The candidate can insert quotes or references to the peer-evaluation letter to satisfy these criteria.

Work experience, related publications or signed student input are also ways to demonstrate teaching excellence.

1. The candidate has demonstrated in the classroom a firm command of computer information systems and of the course subject area in which he/she is teaching. This aspect of teaching excellence may be demonstrated by:

   Peer evaluations

Work experience in the area

Publications in refereed journals and conference proceedings, or publications in other outlets relevant to the mission of the CIS department

Signed student input

2. The candidate has demonstrated an ability to effectively communicate course materials to his/her students. The candidate makes understandable course presentations and the students develop a grasp of the course subject matter. This aspect of teaching excellence may be demonstrated by:

    Peer evaluations

    Student evaluations

    Signed student input

3. The candidate has demonstrated an understanding of the department objectives established for each course and a willingness to teach to these objectives. This aspect of teaching excellence may be demonstrated by:

    Peer evaluations

    Comparison of the departmentally specified Expanded Course Outlines to the candidate's course outline and other teaching materials she/he has prepared for the course

4. The candidate has exhibits the ability and desire to remain current with problems and new developments in his/her subject field, and to integrate this knowledge into the classroom. This aspect of teaching excellence may be demonstrated by:

    Additional education including seminar attendance

    Peer evaluation

    The development of new teaching materials that integrate new information and technology into existing courseware and teaching materials

    The development of new course preparations and teaching courses not previously taught

    Teaching courses not recently taught

    Significantly enhancing courses being taught

Signed student input

Industry consulting resulting in teaching materials

5. The candidate has taken the time and care necessary to meet the instructional needs of the department and its students. This aspect of teaching excellence may be demonstrated by:

Willingness to teach in both the day and evening periods and other periods of need

Willingness to teach courses for which other instructors are not available

Willingness to teach subjects not previously taught or not taught for a long time

Willingness to teach upper division courses

Developing and using new types of courseware, innovative media, and presentation techniques

Willingness to share existing or newly prepared course materials with other faculty

Willingness to adapt to the educational needs of students

Scheduling office hours at times convenient to students

Meeting office hour commitments, by holding office hours as scheduled (University Office Hour Policy - http://academic.csupomona.edu/faculty/docs/section302_1.pdf)

Meeting class commitments

Helping students who need additional assistance

Signed student input

B. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community.

The Computer Information Systems Department, the College of Business Administration and Cal Poly, Pomona depend on the cooperation and active support of faculty who participate in self-governance and other forms of service (hereafter referred to as service) to the University at all levels. An important criterion for reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions is a candidate's level and quality of participation in service activities.

All faculty members in the CIS Department are expected to participate by volunteering for and accepting assignments to committees and participating in other service activities. Service

contributions are expected over the entire evaluation period, and should increase in responsibility over time. The rating on this criterion is based on work done during the entire evaluation period and should be appropriate to the action the candidate requests. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to **actively** seek to fulfill the service requirement. The faculty member, not the department chair or the DRTPC, is responsible for finding opportunities to fulfill the service requirement.

Activities that demonstrate service commitments are listed below, but other activities may be submitted for consideration as well.

Membership and active service on department committees

Membership and active service on college committees

Membership and active service on university committees

Chairperson of department, college, and/or university committees

Demonstration of leadership in other department, college or university activities

C. Professional Development.

Professional development includes participation in activities that help the candidate keep current with the theory and practice associated with information technology (IT) and referent disciplines. Professional development activities add to the body of knowledge in IT-related disciplines, contribute to professional practice in the field, increase the faculty member's areas of expertise, increase depth of knowledge in areas previously mastered, and/or regain currency in areas where knowledge has become significantly dated.

Department faculty members are required to engage in professional development activities. Activities demonstrating professional development are enumerated below, but this list is not exhaustive The candidate's MBOs, developed in conjunction with the DRTPC, will identify the areas in which professional development activities will be made.

Professional development activities fall into the following categories, and include the outcome indicators listed in each category:

1. Learning and Pedagogical Research

- Publishing articles on teaching innovation
- Major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of pedagogical or learning-focused journals
- Presentations to education seminars or conventions

- Textbooks and chapters
- Teaching cases
- New learning materials
- New curricula development
- New course creation

2. Contributions to Practice

- Reports from sponsored research on practice issues
- Major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of practitioner journals
- Articles in practitioner journals
- Presentations at practitioner seminars or conventions
- Executive education course creation
- Creation and documentation of software to be used in practice

3. Discipline-based Scholarship

- Presentations at academic conferences and seminars
- Major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of academic journals
- Articles on disciplinary research or theory
- Books, monographs, and chapters
- Reports from sponsored research

4. Other

- Honors, awards, stipends, and course releases
- Completing university or vendor courses
- Attending seminars or symposia
- Attending lectures, conferences, or conventions
- Being employed to work in industry
- Performing consulting services that result in published results
- Producing faculty development programs
- Participating in faculty development programs
- Serving as organizer or session chairperson at professional or academic meetings and conferences
- Active membership in professional or academic societies
- Serving in leadership positions of in professional or academic societies

VI. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT

A. Review for reappointment will be performed on the occasions specified by University policy.

B. Candidates for reappointment must have completed an earned doctorate appropriate to the field of Information Systems.

C. Candidates for reappointment are expected to produce peer-reviewed publications in the field of Information Systems or any of its referent fields (which may include items that are not journal articles e.g., conference proceedings; see Appendix A). While the number of expected publications may be set at the time of hiring, by MBOs, and/or specified as part of previous RTP actions, in no case will this number be less than one peer-reviewed publication (accepted or conditionally accepted pending minor revisions) per year during the evaluation period.

D. Recommendations for appointment or reappointment of probationary faculty members shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee casting a vote. DRPTC members who are opposed to the recommendation must submit a minority report. Initial probationary appointments are for a period of two years. Reappointment is for the period established by the university.

E. Teaching excellence has the following minimum requirements for reappointment per academic year:

1. Two (2) peer classroom evaluations are required each year. One of the courses evaluated must be a 300-level or higher course, if the candidate teaches courses at the 300 level or higher.

2. All courses taught by a faculty member must receive student evaluations. The candidate must include in his/her RTP package for the review period:
   - Course-by-course summaries of all student evaluations
   - A spreadsheet with an overall summary of student evaluations for courses taught during the evaluation period
   - A reflective analysis and discussion of the student-feedback results as part of the self-analysis

3. A recommendation for reappointment will not be made if a candidate is determined to be poor or unacceptable on the criterion of Teaching Excellence for two consecutive years.

F. Service to the department, college, university, and community has the following minimum requirements per academic year for reappointment:

1. Consistent attendance and contribution at department meetings

2. At least two service commitments per year in university, college, and/or department level

a. Membership and regular attendance on at least one committee per year, and service as Chair of one committee.

b. Active participation in the work of the committee that could include activities such as problem analysis, solution design and implementation, and preparation of committee reports.

G. The candidate must present evidence of professional development as defined in Section IV, item C.

VII. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

A. The decision concerning tenure is the most critical decision made by the DRTPC. Tenure is earned based on sustained, progressively more demanding successful performance over a period of six years (which may include service credit received when initially appointed). The two-year MBOs approved by the DRTPC for this personnel action will reflect this expectation.

The candidate should remember that the RTP package must cover the period since the candidate was hired, which usually is longer than that defined by MBOs. The candidate needs to include, summarize, analyze, and discuss teaching evaluations and peer evaluations as well as other accomplishments for the entire evaluation period.

B. Tenure will be recommended only for candidates who are fully qualified–rated Good or better in all three evaluation areas—with an overall average closer to Excellent than Good (see definitions in Appendix A and discussion in Section III, item I).

C. Recommendations for tenure of a probationary faculty member shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee casting a vote. DRTPC members who vote against granting tenure must make a minority report.

D. Teaching excellence has the following minimum MBO requirements for tenure:

1. The CIS Department values teaching excellence, and has high expectations in this area. A candidate's MBOs will specify the requirements in the area of teaching excellence for the MBO period, which will be a major factor in the performance evaluation over the evaluation period.

2. Peer classroom evaluation must include four (4) sections from at least three (3) different courses over the two-year MBO time period. At least one of the sections must be at the 300-level or higher. (CIS Department scheduling is responsible to assign candidates teach at least three (3) different classes in the period in order to meet this requirement.)

3. All courses taught by a faculty member should receive student evaluations. The candidate must include in his/her RTP package for the period of review:
   - Course-by-course summaries of all student evaluations
   - A spreadsheet with an overall summary of student evaluations for courses taught during the evaluation period
   - A reflective analysis and discussion of the student-feedback results as part of the self-analysis.

E. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community has the following minimum MBO requirements (per academic year) for tenure:

1. Demonstration of Leadership in the CIS Department in an area that is mutually agreed upon with the DRTPC in the candidate's MBOs

2. Consistent attendance and contribution at Department meetings

3. At least three service commitments per year in University, College, or Department level

   a. Membership and regular attendance of at least two committees per year; and serving as Chair of one committee.

   b. Active participation in the work of the committees that could include activities such as problem analysis, solution design and implementation, and preparation of committee reports. The candidate must show evidence of committee accomplishments and document his/her contributions to those accomplishments in the RTP package.

4. One other significant service commitment, such as being a center director or advisor to a student club.

F. Professional development has the following minimum MBO requirements for tenure:

1. Satisfying all requirements for a doctorate prior to the beginning date of the appointment.

2. Evidence of professional development in categories defined in Section IV, item C.

3. Candidates for Tenure are expected to produce peer-reviewed publications (which may include items that are not journal articles e.g., conference proceedings; see Appendix A) in the field of Information Systems or any of its referent fields (see Appendix A). While the number of expected publications may be set at the time of hiring, by MBOs, and/or specified as part of previous RTP actions, in no case will this number be less than one peer-reviewed publication (accepted or conditionally accepted pending minor revisions) per year during the evaluation period. Over the immediate 5-year period, the candidate must have published at least two (2) peer-reviewed journal articles.

VIII. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A. A candidate at the Assistant Professor rank who is eligible for promotion may apply for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time that he or she applies for tenure. The candidate's two-year MBOs approved by the DRTPC for this personnel action will cover both promotion and tenure. These MBOs will reflect appropriate levels of performance in all three evaluation areas to attain the new rank level.

   The candidate should remember that the RTP package must cover the period since the candidate was hired, which usually is longer than that defined by MBOs. The candidate needs to include, summarize, analyze, and discuss student evaluations and peer evaluations as well as other accomplishments for that entire period.

B. Promotion will be awarded to candidates who are rated Good or better in all three evaluation areas—with an overall average closer to Excellent than Good

C. Recommendations for promotion of a probationary faculty member shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee casting a vote. DRTPC members who do not support the recommendation must write a minority report.

D. Teaching excellence has the following minimum MBO requirements for promotion to Associate Professor:

   1. The CIS Department values teaching excellence, and has high expectations in this area. A candidate's MBOs will specify the requirements in the area of teaching excellence for the MBO period, which will be a major factor in the performance evaluation over the evaluation period.

   2. Peer classroom evaluations on two different courses per year with at least one of the courses at the 300-level or higher.

   3. <u>All</u> courses taught by a faculty member should receive student evaluations. The candidate must include in his/her RTP package for the period of review:
      - Course-by-course summaries of all student evaluations
      - A spreadsheet with an overall summary of student evaluations for courses taught during the evaluation period
      - A reflective analysis and discussion of the student-feedback results as part of the self-analysis.

E. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community has the following minimum MBO requirements for promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Demonstration of Leadership in the CIS Department in an area that is mutually agreed upon with the DRTPC in the Candidate's MBOs.

2. Consistent attendance and contribution at Department meetings

3. At least two service commitments per year in university, college, or department level. Membership on at least one committee in university, college, or department level, including service as chair of one committee. The candidate must show evidence of committee accomplishments and document his/her contributions to those accomplishments in the RTP package.

4. One other significant service commitment, such as being a center director or advisor to a student club.

F. Professional development has the following minimum MBO requirements for promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Satisfying all requirements for a doctorate prior to the beginning date of the appointment as Associate Professor.

2. Evidence of professional development in categories defined in Section IV (C).

3. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to produce peer-reviewed publications in the field of Information Systems or any of its referent fields (see Appendix A). While the number of expected publications may be set at the time of hiring, by MBOs, and/or specified as part of previous RTP actions, in no case will this number be less than one peer-reviewed publication (accepted or conditionally accepted pending minor revisions) per year during the evaluation period. Over the immediate 5-year period (which might include during prior employment in the case of a promotion prior to tenure) the candidate must have at least two (2) peer-reviewed journal articles.

IX. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

A. Promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.

The request for promotion to Professor will be considered only if the candidate has served four years in the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate may apply at the beginning of the fifth year.

For example, if a candidate becomes Associate Professor effective Fall 2013, that faculty member will be eligible to apply for regular promotion to Full in Fall 2017. The period of review for that application

would be September 2013-September 2017. The candidate would submit MBOs, 2 years prior to the review, during Fall 2015 or the term before that.

The candidate should remember that the RTP package must cover the entire evaluation period (see definitions in Appendix A).

B. Promotion will be based on the candidate's performance in all three evaluation areas.

C. Recommendations for promotion of a probationary faculty member shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee casting a vote. DRTPC members who do not support the recommendation must file a minority report.

D. Teaching excellence has the following minimum MBO requirements promotion to Professor:

1. The CIS Department values teaching excellence, and has high expectations in this area. A candidate's MBOs will specify the requirements in the area of teaching excellence for the MBO period, which will be a major factor in the performance evaluation over the evaluation period.

2. Peer classroom evaluations on four sections over the two-year MBO time period. At least one of the sections must be at the 300-level or higher.

3. <u>All</u> courses taught by a faculty member should receive student evaluations. The candidate must include in his/her RTP package for the period of review:
   - Course-by-course summaries of all student evaluations
   - A spreadsheet with an overall summary of student evaluations for courses taught during the evaluation period
   - A reflective analysis and discussion of the student-feedback results as part of the self-analysis.

E. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community has the following minimum requirements for promotion to Professor per academic year:

1. Demonstration of Leadership in the CIS Department in an area and at a level that is mutually agreed upon with the DRTPC in the Candidate's MBOs

2. Consistent attendance and contribution at Department meetings

3. At least three service commitments per year in University, College, or Department level

a. Membership on at least two committees in university, college, or department level, including service as chair of one of them.

b. Active participation in the work of the committees that could include activities such as problem analysis, solution design and implementation, and preparation of committee reports. The candidate must show evidence of committee accomplishments and document his/her contributions to those accomplishments in the RTP package.

4. One other significant service commitment, such as being a center director or advisor to a student club.

F. Professional development has the following minimum MBO requirements for promotion to Professor:

1. Satisfying all requirements for a doctorate prior to the beginning date of the appointment as Professor.

2. Evidence of professional development in categories defined in Section IV (C)

3. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to produce peer-reviewed publications in the field of Information Systems or any of its referent fields (see Appendix A). While the number of expected publications may be set at the time of hiring, by MBOs, and/or specified as part of previous RTP actions, in no case will this number be less than one peer-reviewed publication (accepted or conditionally accepted pending minor revisions) per year during the evaluation period. Over the immediate 5-year period (which might in some cases be longer than the period since the last previous evaluation) the candidate must have at least two (2) peer-reviewed journal articles.

X. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE/EARLY PROMOTION

A. The decision concerning tenure is the most critical decision made by the DRTPC. Tenure is normally earned based on sustained, progressively more demanding, successful performance over a six-year period. The department's decision and recommendation on the request for early tenure will be based on exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications. The two-year MBOs approved by the DRTPC for this personnel action will reflect this standard.

The candidate should remember that the RTP package must cover the entire evaluation period (see definitions in Appendix A).

B. Individuals may request early tenure and/or early promotion if they can demonstrate and document **outstanding** performance for their rank level (ratings of outstanding in teaching, service, and professional development). The two-year MBOs approved by the DRTPC for this personnel action will reflect this standard.

C. Early Tenure/Early Promotion will be based on the candidate's performance in all three evaluation areas.

D. Recommendation for early tenure/early promotion of a probationary faculty member shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee casting a vote. DRTPC members who do not support the recommendation must file a minority report.

E. Teaching excellence has the following minimum MBO requirements for Early Tenure/Early Promotion:

1. The CIS Department values teaching excellence, and has high expectations in this area. A candidate's MBOs will specify the requirements in the area of teaching excellence for the MBO period, which will be a major factor in the performance evaluation over the evaluation period. A recommendation for early promotion or early tenure requires an overall rating of outstanding in the area of teaching excellence.

2. Peer classroom evaluations on four sections from at least three different courses over the two-year MBO time period. At least two of the sections must be at the 300-level or higher.

3. Student course evaluations in all sections taught during each year of review. The candidate must include in his/her RTP package for the period of review:
   - Course-by-course summaries of all student evaluations
   - A spreadsheet with an overall summary of student evaluations for courses taught during the evaluation period
   - A reflective analysis and discussion of the student-feedback results as part of the self-analysis.

F. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community has the following minimum requirements per academic year for Early Tenure/Early Promotion:

1. Demonstration of outstanding Leadership in the CIS Department in an area and at a level that is mutually agreed upon with the DRTPC in the Candidate's MBOs and over the entire evaluation period.

2. Consistent attendance and contribution at Department meetings.

3. At least four service commitments per year in University, College, or Department level

   a. At least three committee memberships

   b. Chairperson of at least one of the committees

   c. The candidate must show evidence of committee accomplishments and document

his/her contributions to those accomplishments in the RTP package.

4. One other significant service commitment, such as being a center director or advisor to a student club.

G. Professional development has the following minimum MBO requirements for Early Tenure/Early Promotion:

1. Satisfying all requirements for a doctorate prior to the date of the request.

2. Evidence of outstanding professional development in the categories defined in Section IV, item C.

3. Candidates for Early Tenure/Early Promotion are expected to produce peer-reviewed publications in the field of Information Systems or any of its referent fields (see Appendix A). While the number of expected publications may be set at the time of hiring, by MBOs, and/or specified as part of previous RTP actions, in no case will this number be less than one peer-reviewed publication (accepted or conditionally accepted pending minor revisions) per year during the evaluation period. Over the immediate 5-year period (which might in some cases be longer than the period since the last previous evaluation), the candidate must have at least 2 peer-reviewed journal articles.

XI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY SERVING ON TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENT

Individuals serving on temporary assignment outside the CIS Department will have two-year MBOs approved by the DRTPC prior to beginning the assignment. The two-year MBOs approved by the DRTPC for a specific personnel action will reflect the nature of the candidate's assignment. Should the need for such temporary assignment require modification of existing MBOs, such changes will be made in accordance with Section III (H), "Departmental RTP Procedures and Calendar."

The means by which the DRTPC will evaluate the performance of individuals serving on temporary assignment will be set forth by the DRTPC for the specific faculty member intending to serve on such an assignment.

Both the MBOs as well as the means of assessing individual performance constitute a plan which must be accepted by the DRTPC prior to the onset of such an assignment. Upon acceptance, the MBOs and assessment plan constitute the performance parameters expected of the faculty member.

XII. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Candidates are evaluated in each of the three evaluation areas (see definitions in Appendix A).

These evaluations are combined to give each candidate an overall rating.

Performance will be rated as Unacceptable, Poor, Good, Excellent and Outstanding. Definitions of performance at each of these levels and expectations for successful recommendations are:

Unacceptable - candidates rated at this level can expect a recommendation to terminate the candidate. The DRTPC believes that the candidate will not be able to improve performance to a level necessary for continued employment as a CIS faculty member.

Poor - Candidates rated at this level can expect a recommendation for termination if performance in the next review cycle is not substantially improved. Performance at this level is believed to be correctable by the candidate if sufficient effort is made.

Good - This is a minimal level of satisfactory performance but is not sufficient for a positive recommendation unless there are Excellent ratings in other areas.

Excellent - Candidates rated at this level are exhibiting a high level of expected performance. This rating must be met **overall** (the average must be closer to this than to Good) for the action requested to be recommended.

Outstanding - This is a very unusual rating. It identifies candidates who perform well beyond that rated for Excellent. An Outstanding rating will never compensate for an Unacceptable or a Poor rating in other areas. It will balance a Good rating. A rating of Outstanding is needed in all three categories to justify an early action.

APPENDIX A

I. DEFINITIONS AND TERMS

A. Early Tenure - Tenure granted before completion of six credited years of full-time probationary service. (At the time they are hired, some candidates may be awarded service credit for up to two years based on prior university teaching.)

B. Early Promotion - Advancement to the next highest rank that occurs earlier than expected (in less than six credited years from appointment as an Assistant Professor, or less than four years in rank as an Associate Professor).

C. Evaluation Areas – The three areas of evaluation for RTP purposes which are:
- Teaching Excellence
- Service to the Department, College, University, and Community
- Professional Development.

D. Evaluation Period – The period over which the candidate's performance is being evaluated for purposes of the current RTP action.
- For RTP packages requesting tenure, that period begins at the time of the candidate's initial appointment as a probationary faculty member at Cal Poly, Pomona.
- For RTP packages requesting promotion, that period begins at the time the candidate last successfully applied for promotion, or at the time of the candidate's initial appointment as a probationary faculty member at Cal Poly, Pomona
- For faculty members hired with tenure as an Associate Professor, that period for promotion begins at the time of the candidate's initial appointment as a tenured faculty member at Cal Poly, Pomona.

E. Faculty -

1. Probationary - A full-time faculty member who has received a probationary appointment and has not yet earned tenure.

2. Tenured - A faculty member who has been granted tenure (a permanent appointment)

F. Information Systems – The field that deals with the use of information technology in organizations. It includes sub-fields including Decision Sciences, Information Security, Information Systems Education, Management Science, Organizational Behavior, Technology Management, Telecommunications, etc. as well as some aspects of Computer Science.

G. Management by Objectives - An evaluation process where objectives and minimum levels of acceptable performance against the objectives are established at the beginning of a specified period. At the end of this period a review of actual performance against the objectives and their

related established performance levels is made. When the standards established by the MBOs (and/or over the evaluation period) are met or exceeded, the DRTPC would normally make a favorable recommendation in support of the candidate's application, except under extraordinary circumstances, which must be documented.

H. Peer Reviewed Publications - Publications in recognized scholarly outlets such as journal articles, conference proceedings, book chapters, etc. where the article is reviewed and accepted by qualified experts in the topic area or field. For purposes of this document, being either accepted or conditionally accepted pending minor revisions counts as a publication.

I. Personnel Action File - The one official personnel file containing employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty member. The term "Working Personnel Action File" as used in this document refers to that portion of the Personnel Action File used during the time of performance review of a faculty member. All final documentation, including the RTP package that the candidate submits, becomes part of the Personnel Action File.

J. Promotion - Advancement to the next higher rank from the current rank.

K. Reappointment - Reappointment as a probationary faculty member in the Computer Information Systems Department.

L. Tenure - The right of a tenured faculty member to continued permanent employment on the campus as a faculty member except when such employment is voluntarily terminated or terminated by the Employer pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement for Unit 3 (faculty) or by law.

M. Contingency Action - An action granted to a candidate based upon the contingency of completing specific requirements. A candidate must understand that recommendation of a contingency action is a prerogative of the committee, not a right of the candidate.

II. POLICY

A. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion policy - The criteria specified to implement that policy; and the actions of all persons and groups in implementing that policy will conform to the requirements of the University Manual, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement for Unit 3 (faculty).

B. The faculty member requesting any personnel action will be responsible for completing the official University RTP form and preparing an RTP package for review. The candidate should present and document his/her own qualifications for the requested action, using the criteria specified in this document.

C. Reappointment, tenure, and promotions will be recommended for the candidates rated Good or

better in all three evaluation areas—with an overall average closer to Excellent than Good—by the departmental RTP committee.

D. The qualifications of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated using the criteria specified in this document, the candidate's MBO plan, and other documents that may apply as cited in Section I, item B of this document.

E. The CIS department supports and strictly follows the university's approaches to promoting diversity in all reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures and decisions.

F. For persons not possessing a doctorate at appointment, tenure will not be awarded unless the candidate has completed all of the requirements for a doctoral degree. The doctoral degree must be in a program approved in writing by the DRTPC prior to the beginning date of the tenure appointment. Persons requesting tenure or a promotion, which requires tenure prior to the effective date of the promotion, must document to the satisfaction of the DRTPC that they will successfully complete their doctorate prior to the effective date of such action. Recommendation of a contingency action is the prerogative of the DRTPC.

For faculty members holding a doctorate, but having certain deficiencies or categorical requirements for additional course work or who hold a doctorate in a field substantially distant from the CIS/IT disciplines taught by the CIS department, tenure will not be awarded unless such deficiencies are rectified or an appropriate doctoral degree earned. The additional course work or doctoral degree must be in a program of study approved in writing by the DRTPC prior to the beginning date of the tenure-track appointment.

G. An untenured department chair may submit a signed evaluation, using the same process that other faculty or students may submit evaluations or signed comments, outlined in Section III (C and D).

To be considered for subsequent promotion, faculty members are expected to continue to perform in a manner consistent with the level of performance they achieved to earn appointment to their current rank.

APPENDIX B-1 Sample MBO Timelines

MBO TIMELINES FOR RTP ACTIONS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE DECISIONS

The goal of the MBO process in the CIS Department is to establish an agreed-upon level of performance on specific activities during a specified time period prior to the evaluation and recommendation of an RTP Action. For this discussion, an RTP Action is defined as a promotion or tenure request. The process involves developing, with the RTP Committee, an MBO Plan, which spells out in detail the expectations of both the department and the candidate. The MBO Plan is tailored to each individual candidate and details the emphasis of the candidate but the candidate must also fulfill the basic requirements specified elsewhere in this document.

The MBO process for promotion and tenure in the CIS Department has a two-year MBO timeline. A single MBO Plan can be submitted for actions that run in parallel (e.g., promotion and tenure) and culminates on the same date. Two-year MBOs are required for promotion to Professor by candidates who already have tenure.

To understand the timelines, we must consider the University RTP Calendar. The University Calendar requires a candidate to apply for RTP actions one year before the action is granted. The MBO Plan must be submitted and accepted in the Spring Semester BEFORE the Plan begins to make sure that the candidate has the required years to complete his/her objectives. Given these constraints, the following is a representation of the timeline required for each type of action.

APPENDIX B-2 Sample MBO Format

_____ YEAR TENURE/PROMOTION DECISION

MBO TARGETS

A. TEACHING EXCELLENCE OBJECTIVES

TE1. I will prepare and teach the following existing courses, which I have not previously taught:
_____
_____.

TE2. I will prepare and teach the following new course(s):
_____
_____.

TE3. I will maintain my cumulative average student evaluation score over the evaluation period better than _____.

TE4. I will continue to enhance all my courses with examples of problems and cases from my own field experience.

TE5. I will receive _____ (#) peer evaluation ratings for my teaching.

TE6. I will make myself available to teach classes during the day and at night to assist the CIS Department in planning the most effective schedule.

(Reserved for additional measurable Teaching Excellence objectives)

B. DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE OBJECTIVES

S1. I will serve as course coordinator for at least _____ course(s).

S2. I will serve on at least _____ CIS Department committee(s) and chair - _____ of them.

S3. I will serve on at least _____ College-level committee(s) and chair _____ of them.

S4. I will serve on at least _____ University-level committee(s) and chair _____ of them.

S5. I will take a leadership role in _____
_____
_____
_____

by doing _____
_____
_____.

(Reserved for additional measurable Service objectives)

C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

PD1. In discipline-based scholarship, I will have a minimum of _____ peer-reviewed journal articles accepted for publication, and a minimum of _____ other articles consistent with the mission of the department accepted for publication within the next _____ years. The research area will be the following:

_____
_____
_____.

PD2. I will make a minimum of _____ presentations within the next _____ years. The research area will be the following:

_____
_____
_____

PD3. I will attend at least _____ seminars, workshops, or conferences during each of the next _____ years.

PD4. I will be an active member/officer of the following organizations:

_____
_____
_____.

(Reserved for additional measurable Professional Development objectives)

I recognize that it is my responsibility to inform the CIS Department RTP Committee immediately when any MBO becomes impossible to achieve. I realize I must revise my MBOs at that time so that every MBO can be met by the time of the application for the requested action

Candidate: _____ Date: _____

RTP Committee:

_____ _____

_____ _____ (+ 3 more signature lines)

APPENDIX B-3 Sample Performance Review Document

CANDIDATE'S SELF EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

Please address each of the items identified in your department's approved RTP criteria for the requested action, being as specific as possible. Indicate how you have met or exceeded each criterion (refer to department RTP criteria by number, if possible). In addition, candidates for reappointment must discuss their progress toward meeting department requirements for tenure. All candidates must discuss progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle.

The following items should be uploaded.
1. Summary sheets for all student evaluations that were administered for you during the period of evaluation
2. A copy of the questions to which students responded for these evaluations
3. All peer evaluation reports for the period of evaluation
4. Signed letters from students, faculty, or administrators

Supplemental materials, such as publications, should be included and uploaded.

This self-evaluation is based on the 20XX – 20XX Computer Information Systems Department RTP criteria which is attached. This self-evaluation is organized around the three RTP categories: (A) Teaching Excellence, (B) Service to the Department, College, University, and Community, and (C) Professional Development.

A. Teaching Excellence:

Briefly cite Teaching criteria from Department RTP criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure, whichever applies to you.

A.1 Teaching Philosophy
This section contains your teaching philosophy.

A.2 Overall Student Evaluation in 20XX – 20XX
This section uses a table to show aggregated average student evaluations of yours, the department's and the differences as follows.

Item #	Category	Candidate Average (20XX-20XX)	Department Average (20XX-20XX)	Difference (candidate – department)
1	Instructor encouraged critical thinking	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
2	Instructor helped me understand concepts	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
…	…	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
16	I recommend this instructor	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
	Average	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx

Then, discuss your performance on basis of your aggregated averages, especially, the differences between yours and department averages.

A.3. Student Evaluation by Category in 20XX – 20XX

The department criteria for evaluating teaching are divided into 5 categories: Command of subject, Effective of communication, Teaching to the department objectives, Remaining current and incorporating new knowledge in the classroom, and Meeting instructional needs of the department and students.

Provide a table and discuss your corresponding performance in four of these categories.

1. Command of Subject

Item #	Item Description	Candidate Average (20XX-20XX)	Department Average	Difference
4	Instructor presented the course material clearly	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
6	Practical examples were used	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
8	Grading system was clearly explained	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
11	Class participation was encouraged	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
12	The instructor treated students with respect	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx

2. Effective Communication

Item #	Item Description	Candidate Average (20XX-20XX)	Department Average	Difference
2	Instructor helped me understand concepts	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
5	Instructor responded well to student questions	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
16	I recommend this instructor to other students	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx

3. Teaching to Department Objectives

Item #	Item Description	Candidate Average (20XX-20XX)	Department Average	Difference
13	Course objects were clearly specified	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
14	Course topics described in syllabus were covered	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
15	Exams/assignments related to the material covered	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx

4. Remaining current and incorporating new knowledge in the classroom

5. Meeting Instructional Needs of the Department

Item #	Item Description	Candidate Average (20XX-20XX)	Department Average	Difference
1	Instructor encouraged critical thinking	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
3	Instructor was genuinely interested in teaching	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
7	Instructor was well prepared for each class meeting	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx

If you report results of multiple years, revise the above four tables as follows to report results of each

year.

Item #	Item Description	Candidate Average (AY n)	Department Average (AY n)	Difference 1	Candidate Average (AY n+1)	Department Average (AY n+1)	Difference 2	…
x		x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	
x		x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	
x		x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	

A.4 Peer Evaluations
Use the following table to list ratings you received form peers' class visits.

Category	Class 1 (semester year)	Class 2 (semester year)	…
Command of Subject	Your rating	Your rating	
Effective Communication	Your rating	Your rating	
Teaching to Department Objectives	Your rating	Your rating	
Meeting Instructional Needs	Your rating	Your rating	
Overall Rating	Your rating	Your rating	

Attach peer reviews and analyze the assessments.

A.5 Response to Prior DRTPC's Comments in Teaching
Explicitly respond to all comments and suggestions in teaching from the last year's DRTP committee.

B. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community:

Briefly cite Service criteria from Department RTP criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure, whichever applies to you.

Group and report your services at the Department, College, and University levels in details. You should describe specific service activities in addition to listing committee names.

B.1 Service to Department

B.2 Service to College

B.3 Service to University

B.4 Service to Community

B.5 Response to Prior DRTPC's Comments in Service

C. <u>Professional Development</u>:

Briefly cite Professional Development criteria from Department RTP criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure, whichever applies to you.

C.1 Peer-reviewed journal articles

C.2 Conference presentations, abstracts, or papers

C.3 Reviewer services

C.4 Other, such as the following
- *Book or book chapter*
- *Authored software*
- *Chaired panels at academic conferences*
- *Grant received*

C.5 Response to Prior DRTPC's Comments in Professional Development

D. MBO Progress [Compare target MBOs with actual performance if you need to.]
The CIS Department RTP Criteria demand a candidate to meet his/her MBO requirements for tenure and promotion. Compare your target MBOs with actual performance and discuss your performance.

Target #	Target Description	Satisfied or not
1	I will teach …	Satisfied
2	I will serve …	Satisfied
…	…	…

Target 1. I will teach...

During the two-year evaluation period I taught...

E. <u>Self-Evaluation Summary</u>:

[Highlight your accomplishments in teaching, service to the CIS Department, the College of Business Administration, the University and professional development over the year(s).]

Provide a **summary of the status of your X year(s) (and MBO Targets if needed).**