

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	Finance, Real Estate and Law
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2020-2021
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	5 years

DEPARTMENT


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

Dept. Chair:	<u>Wei Yu</u>	<u></u>	<u>4/2/2020</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date
DRTPC Chair:	<u>Majed Muhtaseb</u>	<u></u>	<u>4/2/2020</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

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


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

CRTPC Chair:	<u>Jing Hu</u>	<u></u>	<u>4/17/2020</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN


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

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

Dean/Director:	<u>Erik Rolland</u>	<u></u>	<u>8/11/2020</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

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

AVP for Faculty Affairs:	<u>Martin Sancho-Madriz</u>	<u></u>	<u>09/01/20</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date

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

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
FINANCE, REAL ESTATE AND LAW DEPARTMENT

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND
PROMOTION,

AND

PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY NOT SUBJECT
TO PERFORMANCE REVIEW (Post-Tenure Review)

EFFECTIVE 2020-2021 to 2024-2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT	3
II.	COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE	3
III.	DEPARTMENTAL RTP PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA	4
IV.	CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT ¹³	
V.	CRITERIA FOR TENURE	13
VI.	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	14
VII.	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	15
VIII.	CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION (AND/OR EARLY TENURE)	15
IX.	EVALUATION OF FACULTY SERVING IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION, ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE, OR ON LEAVE DURING PART OF THE REVIEW PERIOD ¹⁶	
X.	PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY NOT SUBJECT TO PERFORMANCE REVIEW ¹⁶	

**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA FINANCE,
REAL ESTATE AND LAW DEPARTMENT**

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT,
TENURE AND PROMOTION**

2020-21 to 2024-25 Academic Years

I. STATEMENT OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT

The Finance, Real Estate, and Law (“FRL”) Department encompasses three disciplines: 1) Finance, 2) Real Estate, and 3) Business Law and Contract Management. The FRL Department offers classes at the undergraduate and graduate level which support the Department, the College of Business Administration, and the University.

Faculty members in the FRL Department teach and contribute to the body of knowledge in the Department’s three disciplines through ongoing scholarly activities. Faculty members are also expected to contribute service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Community. Faculty performance is assessed by an evaluation of 1) Teaching Effectiveness, 2) Professional and Intellectual Contribution, and 3) Service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Community.

It is the intent of the department criteria to make the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (“RTP”) of candidates as objective and predictable as possible. To that end, this document details the FRL Department criteria and methodology by which the performance of candidates is to be evaluated.

II. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE

- a. The FRL Department RTP Committee (“DRTPC”) shall consist of a committee of five tenured faculty members elected by both tenured and probationary FRL faculty members. No tenured faculty member may serve on more than one RTP committee level during any given RTP cycle. The Chair of the DRTPC must have a Full Professor rank. Non-tenured FRL Department Chairs, or Chairs who are candidates for an RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC.
- b. Annual elections by secret ballot must be conducted by March 1st of the academic year preceding the given RTP cycle. The election shall consist of 1) the identification of those tenured faculty members who are willing to serve and 2) a secret ballot wherein each eligible voter casts votes for five tenured faculty member that are willing to serve. The tenured faculty members who receive the top five votes will be selected. In case of a tie for the final position, a runoff election will be

held. In a situation in which a law and/or real estate faculty is being evaluated, at least one law and/or real estate tenured faculty, respectively, should be a member of the committee if feasible. The DRTPC's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC's recommendations have been concluded. The Chair of the DRTPC shall be elected by the committee elect.

- c. The FRL Department Chair is eligible to participate as a member of the committee if elected according to the procedures identified above. Alternatively, the FRL Department Chair can review the candidates' RTP applications independently and write separate recommendations. Non-tenured FRL Department Chairs, or Chairs who are candidates for an RTP action, are not eligible to write separate recommendations.
- d. In promotion considerations, only those DRTPC members who have a higher rank/classification than the candidates being considered for promotion during the review period are eligible to participate in reviewing and voting for the candidates. In this case, the number of the DRTPC members with a higher rank/classification must be at least three. In the event that the number is less than three, the vacancies will be filled by additional tenured FRL faculty members who are willing to serve on the DRTPC, and any remaining vacancies will be supplemented by faculty members from outside the Department.
- e. If too few faculty members are available to form a DRTPC for all or some aspects of a DRTPC's work, faculty members from outside the Department shall be elected to supplement the DRTPC. Election of members outside the Department shall fully comply with all provisions under the requirements of University Policy No.1328.
- f. The FRL Department Chair shall notify the Dean of the College of Business Administration and the office of Faculty Affairs of the composition of the

DRTPC, immediately after its election.

III. DEPARTMENTAL RTP PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

- a. Each candidate will submit an RTP package (Faculty Performance Review) that summarizes his or her performance in three evaluation categories: 1) Teaching Effectiveness, 2) Professional and Intellectual Contribution, and 3) Service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Community. The evaluation of each candidate's performance shall be based on the Personnel Action File ("PAF") per campus policy, that includes materials that the candidate wishes to be considered.
- b. In the cover memo of the submitted package, the candidate will assign a percentage weight to each of the evaluation categories constrained by the

following weight ranges:

	Weights Possible	
	The candidate is the Department Chair	The candidate is not the Department Chair
1. Teaching Effectiveness	20-50%	40-50%
2. Professional and Intellectual Contribution	20-40%	30-50%
3. Service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Community	30-60%	10-30%
Total of Selected Weights	100%	100%

- c. If the candidate is requesting more than one action (e.g., both reappointment and promotion) the candidate will clearly separate the performance and the time periods covered for each action as stated below.
- Evaluation for reappointment is normally based on the previous year's performance.
 - Evaluation for promotion is based on the entire performance since the last promotion or the original appointment.
 - Evaluation for tenure is based on the entire performance since the original appointment to the probationary position.
 - The candidate may select a different set of weights for each of the actions requested.
- d. The DRTPC will evaluate the candidate's performance based on the procedures and criteria described as follows and will assign points from 0 to 100 for each of the three evaluation categories. A point assignment of at least 70 but less than 80 indicates that the candidate is in need of improvement. A point assignment less than 70 indicates unsatisfactory performance in that evaluative category.

The Committee will assign points separately for each action requested by the candidate. The Committee will not evaluate the candidate's assigned weights. Points will be assigned on the following scale:

Points	Interpretation of Performance
95.00-100.00	Preeminent
90.00- 94.99	Outstanding
85.00- 89.99	Good
80.00- 84.99	Satisfactory
70.00- 79.99	In Need of Improvement
Below 70.00	Unsatisfactory

- e. The DRTPC will explain, in writing, its reasons for assigning points of less than 80 or more than 95 in any evaluation category.
- f. The candidate's overall Rating ("Rating") will be the weighted average of the points assigned by the Committee to each of the evaluation categories using the candidate's assigned weights from Section III.B.
- g. A request for an external review of materials submitted by the candidate may be initiated at any level of review by any party to the review. Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an external reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the President or designee with the concurrence of the candidate.
- h. Evaluation Categories:

1. Teaching Effectiveness

1.1 Introduction

The fundamental mission of the Department is providing high quality education in finance, real estate and business law. Teaching, as used in this document, refers to all of those things that directly relate to the intellectual development of students and their academic performance (as defined in section 1.2 below).

1.2 Evidence of teaching effectiveness

The DRTPC shall use the following criteria to evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness:

- a. Student evaluation of teaching shall be conducted according to the guidelines established in University Policy No. 1329 (<https://www.cpp.edu/academic-programs/univ-manual/avp-documents/1325-1349/1329%20Student%20Evals.pdf>). The instructional assessment in this form is scored on a five point scale from 1 (the best) to 5 (the worst) and is based on sixteen assessment questions. The FRL department recognizes the importance of incorporating intellectual challenge and academic rigor in the upper division and graduate courses, and strongly encourages faculty to follow this policy. In this regard, the Department appreciates teaching evaluations scores that are lower than 2.2. Tampering with student evaluation scores may invalidate the results of the candidate's student evaluation.
- b. Peer faculty evaluations based on a minimum of two classroom visits by at least two tenured faculty members, per year, assigned by the DRTPC. The candidate shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit (and/or online observation, and/or review of online content) is to take place.

There shall be consultation between the candidate and the peer evaluators regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. The peer evaluations shall be done using the Department's peer faculty evaluation form. A copy of each written evaluation is submitted to the faculty member by the peer evaluator within two weeks of the class visit. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. The candidate may request an additional visitation after reviewing his/her visitation report, whereupon the Department Chair shall assign another tenured faculty member for an assessment visit prior to the end of the semester.

- c. The candidate's discussion and analysis of his/her teaching performance during the evaluation period. At a minimum, this will cover:
 - an analysis of the questions on the computer summaries of the candidate's student evaluations,
 - teaching philosophy and methodology,
 - grading policies and grade distributions,
 - course syllabi, exams and other materials (include as Appendices),
 - a discussion of what the candidate has done or is doing to improve his/her teaching, in specific, action-oriented terms.

- d. Other written and signed materials (if any). It will be incumbent upon the candidate to explain how this evidence is to be interpreted.
 - In addition to the regular course evaluations, students may submit signed evaluative material, commentary, and substantiating documentation to the DRTPC through the DRTPC chair. This information shall be based only on the review period for the action requested.
 - The DRTPC Chair will solicit student opinion on teaching performance via email notification to students collectively. The email notification 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/time (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) 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.
 - The department chair may, in response to an unsolicited oral comment from a student, advise the student that any formal consideration of the comment requires that it be reduced to a written, signed statement that also include the student's Bronco ID number.
 - At any time a student may submit a letter/petition expressing his/her opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter/petition must be signed and addressed either to the chair of the FRL department or the

DRTPC chair. The letter/petition must include the Bronco ID **Number of all student signators**. The department chair must provide the RTP candidate with copies of such letters/petitions. The RTP candidate shall be allowed at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal.

- Comments received **after an RTP cycle deadline** would be taken into consideration in the next evaluation cycle; however, they still need to be given to the faculty member right away and provide the opportunity for rebuttal. Both documents would go to the PAF and considered in the next cycle.

e. In evaluating improvement in the candidate's teaching performance, the DRTPC will consider his/her outside-classroom teaching-related activities. These include, but are not limited to:

- the use of innovative and effective teaching methodologies,
- scholarly activities relating to teaching and curricula,
- the development of materials designed for student use,
- attendance at teaching and curriculum-related workshops, if the candidate can show how such attendance impacted his/her teaching performance,
- other evidence of outside-classroom academic service to students, e.g., supplemental student study sessions, workshops or seminars, and
- evidence in the area of student advising and/or mentoring.

f. Any teaching activity performed by the candidate during the period of review whilst the candidate was on professional leave of absence from Cal Poly Pomona shall be considered by the DRTPC in accordance with criteria a.-f. of this subsection.

2. Professional and Intellectual Contribution

Each faculty member is expected to pursue activities that contribute directly to his or her professional growth and development.

The Department requires a consistent and satisfactory intellectual contribution of each faculty member of the department. Intellectual contribution consists of discipline-based research, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice. The DRTPC will assess performance in this area by considering the quality of the scholarship and the relevance of the contribution to the disciplines in the FRL Department or to the individual's teaching effectiveness. It is incumbent on the candidate to provide evidence of quality and relevance.

Discipline based research contributes to the knowledge base, empirical or theoretical, on the subject of finance, real estate, business law, contract management or related areas. Its outputs include refereed articles in academic journals.

Pedagogical research reflects contributions that relate to teaching/learning on the subject of finance, real estate, business law, contract management or related areas. Its outputs include refereed books and peer-reviewed articles in recognized academic/professional journals.

Contributions to practice involve research related to professional practice on the subject of finance, real estate, business law, contract management or related areas. Its outputs include refereed articles in practitioner/trade journals.

Other intellectual and professional contributions include paper presentations at academic or professional meetings, proceedings from scholarly meetings, and competitive awards related to the candidate's research papers.

The DRTPC shall consider professional and intellectual contributions performed during the period covered by the review whilst the candidate was on temporary leave from teaching duties in the same way it evaluates such contributions for candidates not on temporary leave. Examples of temporary leave include: sabbaticals, difference -in-pay leaves, fellowships, teaching abroad, administrative assignments for the university, and visiting professor/scholar at other institutions.

2.1 Types of Refereed Publications

Refereed publications must be written in English and be on the subject of finance, real estate, business law, contract management or related areas. They are divided into three groups and a different number of points is awarded for publications in each group.

Type I refereed journal publication (14-20 points): Included in this category are peer-reviewed publications of articles in the leading journals in the above disciplines. The editors and the editorial boards of these journals tend to be the most prominent scholars in their fields and hold appointments at the major research universities. The Thomson Reuters Impact Factor of 1 or higher automatically qualifies a journal as a Type I journal.

Type II refereed publication (10-17 points): Included in this category are peer-reviewed publications of articles in high quality journals in the above disciplines. The editors and the editorial boards of these journals tend to be active scholars who publish frequently in Type I and Type II journals and hold academic appointments at the major universities granting doctoral degrees. The existence of a Thomson Reuters Impact Factor for a journal in this category automatically qualifies it as a Type II journal. Also included in this category are scholarly books that are similar in nature to refereed articles. These books are written for the academic specialist and undergo a review process similar to that of refereed articles. Book chapters, articles appearing in books, textbooks, practitioner oriented and general interest books are not considered refereed within the context of this document.

Type III refereed journal publications (5-12 points): Included in this category are all other peer-reviewed publications of articles in journals that do not meet the standards for Type I and Type II journals. While the articles appearing in these journals are often of acceptable quality, the selection process is likely to be less competitive and these journals are likely to be less widely read, serving primarily as secondary or tertiary publication outlets. Typically, editorial board members tend to publish in Type II and Type III journals and the journals tend to be published at universities not granting doctorate degrees and not known for their research productivity. Teaching and education focused journals are also included in this category. Also included in this category are refereed articles in journals that appeal primarily to professionals, practitioners and individuals interested in more applied topics in the above disciplines. The primary reviewers of articles published in these journals tend to be either the editors or an editorial board comprised of practitioners.

The candidate may refer to the DRTP document Appendix for a list of journals in each of the three categories.

2.2 Other Professional and Intellectual Contributions

Presentations (1-3 points): The points awarded for a paper presentation shall reflect the prestige and the process used to select papers for presentation at the particular conference. While the selection of papers for presentation sometimes involves a refereed process, the standards employed vary greatly. In describing presentations in the portfolio, the candidate should document the nature of the review process used to select papers for presentations. Unless the candidate's portfolio shows otherwise, it will be assumed that no review of presentations took place prior to their acceptance for a program.

Conference proceedings and book chapters (1-3 points): Papers presented at conferences sometimes appear in publications called "conference proceedings". Chapter in a scholarly book or a monograph that involves scholarly research and that is published by a university press or academic publisher. The points awarded in this category should reflect the category of the publication as described in Section 2.2 above, and the type of review process. Since the level of review involved in such publications varies considerably, the candidate must provide documentation about the nature of the review process employed and indicate the criteria used in selecting those papers that were published in the proceedings.

Awards for papers (1-2 points): Included in this category are competitive awards that the papers written during the evaluation period received at conferences or in refereed journals. The candidate must provide documentation about the nature of the review process employed in the selection of papers for the awards.

Receiving an internal or an external research grant or contract that was peer reviewed (1-3 points)

Receiving and maintaining a relevant certification, designation or license (1-5 points)

2.3 Awarding Points for Particular Contribution

The number of points awarded for a particular professional or intellectual contribution varies with the category described in Sections 2.1 and 2.2. While the points within each category is a judgment made by DRTPC, the DRTPC members shall consider the following factors:

Contribution to the subject of finance, real estate, business law, contract management or related areas: The quality of publications vary within each category and should be reflected in the award of points.

Number of co-authors (if more than three): Co-authorship is the normal state of affairs in the above disciplines. However, when the number of co-authors exceeds three, the DRTPC members may question the magnitude of the contribution of the various individuals.

The candidate's contribution to publication: Statements of co-authors shall be used to evaluate the candidate's contribution to the publication. Unless the names on publications are in alphabetical order, it will be assumed that names of authors are listed in terms of the magnitude of their respective contributions.

Number of citations: Papers that are frequently cited by other scholars are an indicator of the quality of scholarly activity.

Acceptance rate and impact factor: A low acceptance rate and a high Thomson Reuters Impact Factor are indicators of a higher quality of the candidate's professional and intellectual contribution.

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

The intent here is to recognize effective service by the individual, which benefits the Department, the College, the University, and the Community. It is important that faculty members be engaged in shared governance by participating in service activities. The candidate should describe the nature and significance of his/her service activities.

a. FRL Department service activities include serving as:

- The chair of the department

- The chair of a department committee
 - The coordinator of a department function
 - The assistant to the department chair for specific tasks
 - A faculty advisor to a department student organization
 - A member of the department standing committee
 - The chair of a department task force
 - A member of the department task force
- b. College of Business Administration service activities include serving as:
- The chair of a college standing committee
 - A member of a college standing committee
 - The chair of a college task force
 - A member of a college task force
 - An advisor to a college student organization
- c. University service activities include serving as:
- The chair of the Academic Senate
 - A member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
 - The chair of an Academic Senate standing committee
 - An academic Senator
 - A member of an Academic Senate committee
 - An Academic Senate representative to a board of directors
 - The chair of an Academic Senate task force
 - A member of an Academic Senate task force
 - The chair of a University committee or task force
 - A member of a University committee or task force
- d. Community Service Activities include:
- Serving as a member of the Board of Directors of a corporation or a non-profit organization
 - Serving as a member of an executive committee of a professional organization
 - Engaging in service learning activities
 - Engaging in public speaking related to one's academic or professional field
- e. The DRTPC shall also explicitly consider
- any service rendered in administrative positions, or in the performance of administrative duties;
 - any service rendered in administrative governance; and
 - any service rendered while on temporary leave from teaching duty, such as

sabbaticals, difference-in-pay leaves, fellowships, teaching abroad, administrative assignment for the university, visiting professor/scholar at another institution.

IV. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT

Criteria for reappointment decisions shall be the criteria that were in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus.

- a. The DRTPC will evaluate each candidate for reappointment and assign a Rating under the criteria and methodology of section III. The DRTPC will include a discussion of the faculty member's progress toward satisfying the tenure criteria.
- b. Reappointment may be recommended only for candidates who have received point scores of 70 or more in each of the three evaluative categories and a Weighted Average Rating of at least 80 points. Reappointment will be recommended using progressively more rigorous criteria as the candidate moves toward tenure (see also Section V. b.).
- c. A terminal year appointment may be recommended for probationary candidates who have not evidenced satisfactory progress in teaching effectiveness, intellectual and professional contributions, or service activities after the third year of the RTP consideration. The candidate needs to present evidence of acceptance for publication of at least one peer-reviewed journal article (or evidence of a conditional acceptance) and a total of at least 10 points in the category of intellectual and professional contributions by the end of his/her 3rd probationary year when applying for reappointment to the 5th probationary year. Failing to do so would place the candidate's performance in this evaluation category below the satisfactory level as described in Section III.d. The candidate should also discuss research pipeline, working papers, and any papers under journal review, in which case the category of the corresponding journals should be included.

V. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Each candidate for tenure (including early tenure) may use either the departmental RTP criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus or the departmental RTP criteria in effect in the year the candidate requests action.

- a. The candidate should have earned a total of at least 40 points in the category of professional and intellectual contribution. Of these 40 points at least 30 must be in the category "Refereed Publications" and at most 10 can be in the category "Other Professional and Intellectual Contributions", as described in Sections III.g.2.1 and III.g.2.2, respectively. The candidate may discuss achievements outside the period

of review, but only for the purpose of demonstrating consistency of performance. These may include research pipeline, working in progress, and any papers under journal review, in which case the category of the corresponding journals should be included.

- b. Tenure normally is earned with sustained, progressively more demanding, successful performance over the six-year probationary period in teaching effectiveness, professional & intellectual contributions, and service activities.
- c. The DRTPC will evaluate each candidate for tenure and assign a Rating under the criteria and methodology of section III.
- d. In the sixth year's evaluation, the candidate will either be recommended for tenure or for a terminal year. The Committee may recommend a terminal year earlier if the candidate has not evidenced satisfactory progress in teaching effectiveness, intellectual and professional contributions, or service activities.
- e. The candidate for tenure is expected to achieve a minimum point assignment of 90 points in each of the three evaluative categories. For this Rating, the Committee will review the candidate's performance the original appointment to the probationary period. For the professional and intellectual contribution category a multiplicative factor of 2.25 will be applied to the points earned in this category (as described in Section III.g.2) to determine whether the candidate has achieved the 90 point threshold.
- f. Tenure normally requires consideration of promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor or probationary Associate Professor to Professor as outlined in Sections VI and VII.

VI. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the candidates must demonstrate a consistent pattern of satisfactory progress in teaching effectiveness, intellectual and professional contributions, and service activities over the period covered by the request for action.

- a. The DRTPC will evaluate each candidate for promotion to Associate Professor and assign a Rating under the criteria and methodology of section III.
- b. Promotion to Associate Professor requires demonstration of outstanding performance as indicated by a Weighted Average Rating of at least 90 points.
- c. Promotions normally will be made only after six years of service after appointment to current academic rank/classification and simultaneous with the candidate's request for tenure.

- d. Promotion to Associate Professor will be recommended only for candidates holding the terminal degree: Ph.D., J.D., D.B.A., or the equivalent. Candidates with J.D. must be licensed member of a State Bar Association.
- e. Recommendations for promotion to Associate Professor may be made on a contingency basis provided the contingency does not conflict with the departmental criteria and that the contingency is met prior to the individual's anniversary date. If the contingency is not met, promotion eligibility will be deferred to the next evaluation cycle.
- f. A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation, nor promoted beyond the rank of Associate. A probationary faculty unit employee shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time s/he is considered for tenure.

VII. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate a consistent pattern of teaching effectiveness, intellectual and professional contributions (including three peer reviewed journal articles), and service activities over the period covered by the request for action.

- a. The DRTPC will evaluate each candidate for promotion to Professor and assign a Rating under the criteria and methodology of section III.
- b. Promotion to Professor normally involves a simultaneous application for tenure if untenured and normally is effective at the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to current academic rank.
- c. Promotion to Professor requires outstanding performance, as evidenced by a minimum Weighted Average Rating of 90 points.
- d. A request for granting of tenure must be considered and approved by the DRTPC before it considers promotion to Professor for faculty who are not tenured.
- e. A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. A probationary faculty unit employee shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time s/he is considered for tenure.

VIII. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION (AND/OR EARLY TENURE) a. Early promotion (and/or early tenure) may only be recommended in those cases where the candidate has taught a minimum of the equivalent of four academic years in the FRL Department.

- b. Requests for early promotion (and/or early tenure) shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time teaching in the FRL Department prior to the effective date of the tenure and/or promotion.
- c. The DRTPC will evaluate each candidate for early promotion (and/or early tenure) and assign a Rating under the criteria and methodology of section III. The period of evaluation consists of all years of the candidate's tenure track service.
- d. Early promotion (and/or early tenure) will be recommended only for candidates who have evidenced preeminent performance by achieving a minimum point assignment of 95 in Teaching Effectiveness and a minimum 90 point assignment in all three evaluative categories in section III.
- e. Depending on the early action sought, the corresponding criteria in Sections V – VII apply, insofar they are not superseded by subsections a. – d. of this section.

IX. EVALUATION OF FACULTY SERVING IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION, ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE, OR ON LEAVE DURING PART OF THE REVIEW PERIOD

The evaluative criteria of this document apply to probationary faculty with return rights to the Department or assigned time awards, also. Said faculty is still expected to submit an RTP package that summarizes his or her performance in the three evaluation categories (Teaching Effectiveness, Professional and Intellectual Contribution, and Service). In order for the Committee to evaluate teaching effectiveness, the candidate must have taught a minimum of two courses, including an upper division, elective or graduate course. To the extent that his or her work in the temporary assignment may not apply to the three categories, it will be the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the relevance and importance of the work in furthering the Department's objectives. The faculty member is responsible for submitting a memorandum of understanding as to how his/her performance will be evaluated and obtaining approval by the RTP Committee before departure from the standard faculty role.

X. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY NOT SUBJECT TO PERFORMANCE REVIEW (Post-Tenure Review)

This periodic review is not a performance review subject to the RTP Criteria and Procedures enumerated in sections I through IX. Tenured Associate Professors who after 5 years in this rank have not applied or have not been granted promotion to Professors are also subject to post-tenure periodical evaluations.

The FRL Department Periodic Review Committee (“DPRC”) will consist of three faculty elected from the tenured faculty by the tenured and probationary faculty and

the Department Chair. The chair of the DPRC will be elected by a vote of the committee members.

Upon notification by the Department Chair, the faculty member subject to periodic review will submit a Periodic Review Package that summarizes his/her performance in three evaluation categories: 1) Teaching Effectiveness, 2) Professional Development and Intellectual Contributions, and 3) Service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Community.

Consistent with Policy 1335, Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated at intervals of no greater than five years. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator. Evaluations shall be conducted during the spring term. The contents of the Post Tenure Review file shall be compiled and reviewed in electronic format beginning academic year 2020-2021. The evaluation of the tenured faculty member shall terminate at the college dean/director's level.

a. Evaluation Categories

1. Teaching Effectiveness

The tenured faculty members are expected to demonstrate a pattern of high quality teaching. The tenured faculty members subject to periodic evaluation will prepare a discussion and analysis of his/her teaching performance. This analysis will include a representative sample of an interpretation of student evaluations for the evaluation period. The computer summaries for all classes taught during the period shall be attached. The analysis may also make reference to course syllabi and related teaching materials.

2. Professional Development and Intellectual Contribution

The Department expects academic research, peer-reviewed or market-tested publication and/or professional development related to the tenured faculty member's discipline and/or teaching assignment. Faculty subject to periodic review shall demonstrate a pattern of scholarly productivity over the evaluation period.

Intellectual Contributions may include discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice. Professional Development encompasses experiences that enhance classroom effectiveness.

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

The Department expects service from a tenured faculty member, which benefits the Department, the College, the University, and the Community. Service to the

Community encompasses activities related to the Department's three disciplines.

b. Evaluation by the FRL Department Periodic Review Committee

The DPRC will review the tenured faculty member's performance in each of the three evaluative categories. Performance shall be rated "acceptable" or "in need of improvement" by evaluative category. The tenured faculty member will be given the opportunity to submit a limited supplementary material if a performance rating of "in need of improvement" is indicated.

If performance is rated "in need of improvement" the DPRC will provide written recommendations as to how performance might be improved to an "acceptable" Rating level. The DPRC Chair shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation.

- c. The Faculty Affairs Office establishes the calendar for the periodic reviews and performance evaluations. Therefore, the Faculty Affairs Office establishes the calendar for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members. You have ten (10) days after this report is provided to submit a response/rebuttal.

**FRL Tenured Faculty
Member**

Ekaterina Chernobai

F. "Phillip" Ghazanfari

Shady Kholdy

Majed R. Muhtaseb

Paul Sarmas

Ahmad Sohrabian

Libo Sun

Lin Tan

Gerd Welke

John B. Wyatt, III

Wei Yu
