

Biological Sciences Department

Criteria and Guidelines for RTP Evaluation and Procedures

For Academic Years 2023-2024 through 2027-2028

Revision #36

Table of Contents

Statement of Purpose	1
Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)	2
Department RTP Procedures	3
Student Evaluation of Teaching	4
Peer Evaluation of Teaching	4
DRTPC Evaluation of Candidates	5
Evaluation of Teaching Performance	5
Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities	6
Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University, and Community	6
Candidates' Responsibilities	6
Criteria for RTP Actions	7
Criteria for Reappointment	8
Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	10
Criteria for Promotion to Professor	12
Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion to Associate Professor	15
Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor	16
Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave	17
RTP Document Changes	19
Appendix A. Instructional Assessment by Students: Procedure for Administering Assessment Forms.....	20
Appendix B. Other Supporting Evidence for Quality of Teaching	21
Appendix C. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities	22
Appendix D. Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University and Community	24

1. Statement of Purpose

- 1.1. The Biological Sciences Department believes that it is the right and responsibility of the department to weigh the merits of its faculty. We, as biologists, are the most qualified to judge professional competence in the field of biology.
- 1.2. The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the university president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The department RTP document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators.

2. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)

- 2.1. The DRTPC shall consist of seven eligible (according to the University Manual) full time, tenured, and FERP faculty members in the department. Policy No. 1328 (Section 1.17a) requires a majority vote and approval by the president for FERP faculty to be allowed membership on the RTP committee. Members of the DRTPC are elected annually, for a one-year term, by secret ballot by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The department chair will not be a member of the DRTPC but will write a separate evaluation of each RTP candidate.
- 2.2. DRTPC Election Procedure: All full time, tenured, and FERP faculty members in the department are eligible as DRTPC candidates, except for those who are serving on the CRTPC or URTPC. Candidates being considered for promotion are not eligible for service on promotion or tenure considerations. Members of the DRTPC will be elected for a one-year term by secret ballot by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department, presided by the department chair (or the existing DRTPC chair) at a department meeting. The election will be conducted by 1 March preceding the academic year in which the new DRTPC members will begin service. The department chair shall notify the college dean of the composition of the DRTPC, including election results, immediately after the election.
- 2.3. A special election may be held to replace a DRTPC member in the event that a member cannot serve on any particular RTP action, during a particular semester(s), or for the remainder of the member's term. At least two eligible faculty members shall be nominated for each position to be filled. The candidates with the highest number of votes (by secret ballot) will be elected to serve. The department chair shall notify the college dean of the composition of the DRTPC shortly after a special election.
- 2.4. A quorum for meetings involving deliberations and voting on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be six of the seven DRTPC members, all of whom must be present in person to vote. The DRTPC evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the committee. In all DRTPC deliberations, abstentions by members present count as negative votes.
- 2.5. After the election of the DRTPC, the committee will elect a Chair by any procedure agreed upon by all committee members. The DRTPC chair shall be a full-time tenured faculty member and shall serve a term of one full RTP Cycle. The DRTPC chair shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the DRTP document and appropriate university policies are carried out. In addition, the DRTPC chair shall perform the following duties:
 - 2.5.1. Provide all appropriate RTP evaluation forms to the RTP and pre-RTP candidates.
 - 2.5.2. Provide each candidate with a copy of the university RTP and pre-RTP calendar for the current academic year.
 - 2.5.3. Provide instructions for scheduling peer evaluations for all faculty and indicate the minimum number of peer evaluations required for an RTP action.
 - 2.5.4. Coordinate all necessary meetings of the DRTPC.
 - 2.5.5. Coordinate all necessary meetings with candidates, including meetings to review RTP and pre-RTP packages and to convey the DRTPC recommendations.
 - 2.5.6. Identify a faculty mentor for each candidate and inform candidates of their faculty mentor.
 - 2.5.7. Post announcements for the purpose of receiving input from students, faculty, staff, and alumni within one week of receiving notification from a faculty member requesting RTP action (see Section 3.2 in this document).
 - 2.5.8. In the case when there are candidates seeking promotion to Professor and not all elected DRTPC members are at the rank of full professor, a subcommittee composed of full time tenured full professors and/or FERP professors will be formed. The subcommittee should have at least five members and will include all full-time tenured full professors and/or FERP professors who are already serving on the DRTPC. If the subcommittee has fewer than five members, or has six members, then the DRTPC chair should hold an election for the additional member(s) so the subcommittee has a total of five or seven members, respectively. The election will be held at a department

meeting by a secret ballot vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The chair of the subcommittee should be elected by the subcommittee members if the DRTPC chair does not have a higher rank than the candidate(s) considered for promotion.

3. Department RTP Procedures

- 3.1. Newly appointed faculty shall be given relevant information on RTP-related dates by the DRTPC chair and assigned a faculty mentor at the beginning of their first semester. At the request of the faculty member, a new mentor may be assigned. Faculty members who are up for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion should expect to receive a letter of memorandum from the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs in advance of the RTP due date indicating the specific RTP action for which the candidate is eligible to apply. Typically, without including service years, a new faculty member is eligible to apply for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor after completing 5 years of full-time service. Similarly, a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to Professor after completing 10 years of full-time service. Exceptional faculty members may also consider early tenure and/or early promotion (see Sections 10 and 11 in this document). Probationary faculty must use the version of the departmental RTP document that was in effect the year of the candidate's hiring for pre-RTP and reappointment RTP actions. Faculty members who are eligible to apply for tenure and/or promotion may elect to use the same version of RTP document used in previous RTP actions, or the most current revision of the RTP document that is in effect. A request for an external review of materials submitted by a faculty unit employee 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 with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee.
- 3.2. For the purpose of receiving input from students, faculty, staff, and alumni, the DRTPC chair shall post announcements, using typical departmental procedures, of the names of candidates requesting RTP action, the type of action requested, the deadline (date and time) for receipt of signed comments, and the name of the DRTPC chair to whom signed comments or recommendations should be delivered. This posting will take place within one week of notification to the DRTPC chair by the candidate requesting RTP action. Signed comments that are received after the posted deadline will be given to the faculty member but will not be taken into consideration until the next evaluation cycle. The deadline for comments should be at least 10 days before the deadline for the RTP packet submission.
- 3.3. The DRTPC shall gather the necessary information and make recommendations on each candidate being considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion according to the guidelines set forth in this document. In formulating its evaluation, the DRTPC must address specific criteria that apply to the request being considered. The evaluation should discuss the extent to which the candidate meets each criterion for the action requested. All evaluation and discussion of candidates shall be based upon the following materials:
 - 3.3.1. The self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate the candidate's statements).
 - 3.3.2. Signed material received from other faculty members, academic administrators, and students.
 - 3.3.3. Material from the Personnel Action File in the Dean's office.
 - 3.3.4. Student instructional assessment summaries.
 - 3.3.5. Peer evaluations of teaching.
 - 3.3.6. Other material, identified by source, submitted to the DRTPC before the closing date.
- 3.4. The DRTPC, after thorough deliberation, shall make its recommendation for or against reappointment, tenure or promotion. The DRTPC shall commit the reasons for the recommendation in writing on the standard university form. The DRTPC evaluation shall include a discussion of the candidate's strengths and deficiencies, as well as cite specific sections of the departmental RTP criteria and summarize the evidence upon which the recommendation is based. The DRTPC shall also include a discussion of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle(s).

- 3.5. Any member of the DRTPC who does not agree with the committee's recommendation may submit their comments on additional pages as a minority report. Minority reports, if submitted, must accompany the recommendation in question and must have been made available to all members of the committee and to the candidate.
- 3.6. Before forwarding its recommendations to the dean, the DRTPC shall notify each candidate of its recommendation. Such notification shall consist of a copy of the committee's written statements. The candidate shall accept or respond to the committee's evaluation and recommendations by checking the appropriate box, and by signing on the appropriate page of the Faculty Performance Review form.
- 3.7. Candidates for RTP actions are subject to evaluation in all categories of performance. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide materials for evaluation.

3.8. Student Evaluation of Teaching

- 3.8.1. Instructional assessment by students is required for **every section of every course** taught during the evaluation period.
- 3.8.2. Student evaluation of teaching is not required for supervisory and internship courses (i.e., BIO 2000, BIO 4000, BIO 4410, BIO 4620, BIO 4920, BIO 5000, BIO 5990, BIO 6910, BIO 6920, BIO 6930, BIO 6940, BIO 6960, and BIO 6990). Also, student evaluation of teaching is not required for any course section with an enrollment of 5 or fewer students.
- 3.8.3. Department-approved procedures (see Appendix A) must be followed when student evaluations are conducted.
- 3.8.4. Separate student assessment forms shall be submitted for associated lecture and laboratory courses (e.g., BIO 1210 and BIO 1210L) taught by the same instructor if the enrolled student populations are different. In cases where the student population in a lecture and laboratory course are the same (e.g. BIO 4180/4180L), only one instructional assessment by students should be conducted.

3.9. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

- 3.9.1. Peer evaluations of teaching shall be conducted at the frequencies indicated below. Additional peer evaluations may be requested by the candidate under review. Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted is the responsibility of the DRTPC. The candidate is encouraged to be proactive in ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted.
- 3.9.2. A candidate for a RTP action must submit a minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching for each year being evaluated. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught.
- 3.9.3. Peer evaluations of teaching shall include a classroom visit and a review of course syllabi as well as potential review of other course related material.
- 3.9.4. DRTPC members or a designee shall conduct peer evaluations. The evaluator shall confer with the faculty member for an appropriate time and date for the evaluation. The faculty member being observed shall be notified at least five days before the classroom observation. The faculty member being observed should inform the peer evaluator of how the particular class being observed relates to the overall course.
- 3.9.5. Classroom visits should be followed by the submission of a written report by the evaluator, using the Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching form (available on the Biological Sciences Department website), no more than two weeks following the classroom visit. The report will address observations of teaching performance and must include an evaluation of the course syllabus to confirm compliance with University Course Syllabus Policy 1200. If applicable, the evaluator may also address other materials and procedures established in the class. The evaluator is to submit their report to a permanent staff member in the Biological Sciences Department office, who will timestamp the original document, and give it to the DRTPC chair. The DRTPC chair will physically transport it to the College of Science Dean's Office to be placed into the candidate's

Personnel Action File (PAF). The DRTPC chair also will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member for their records to be submitted with their RTP package, and a copy will be placed in departmental files.

- 3.9.6. The use of peer evaluation data by the DRTPC in the analysis of tenured, probationary, or temporary faculty members shall fall within the designated evaluation period.

4. DRTPC Evaluation of Candidate

- 4.1. The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable at any RTP level, unless stated in writing, with the agreement of the candidate, the DRTPC, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- 4.2. The deliberations of the DRTPC shall remain confidential. The committee shall not assign any of its deliberation and recommendation responsibilities to any other group or individual.
- 4.3. All faculty shall be evaluated according to all applicable university policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. (Policies may be obtained from the DRTPC chair.) The evaluation of candidates for RTP shall be based on the categories of (1) teaching performance, (2) scholarly and creative activities, and (3) service to the department, college, university, and/or community/profession. Candidates shall be evaluated primarily in terms of their performance as it relates to the academic areas for which they were employed, or as modified for the benefit of the department.

4.4. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

- 4.4.1. All probationary faculty are normally expected to teach 12 WTUs per semester after the second probationary year, unless they receive reassigned time for research, service, or workload reduction.
- 4.4.2. The DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance shall be recorded in the candidate's RTP package. Evaluation of teaching will include, but not be limited to, a statement summarizing and interpreting the results of student instructional assessments, peer evaluations, student and faculty comments, a comparison of student evaluations and peer evaluations, and other supporting evidence for quality of teaching.

4.4.3. Instructional Assessment by Students

- 4.4.3.1. The DRTPC places emphasis on evidence of teaching performance in its deliberations on RTP matters. Examination of student instructional assessments is required. Candidates are required to examine in detail the results of the student evaluations (all questions on the Student Instructional Assessment Form, on file at the Biological Sciences Department) and comment upon them in the RTP package. The DRTPC members in their deliberations and recommendation shall examine and evaluate the candidate's student evaluations in detail.
- 4.4.3.2. Student evaluations by students enrolled in the candidate's classes are evaluated on the response of students to all questions, with an emphasis on Questions 9 and 10, on the standard departmental student instructional assessment form. Questions 9 and 10 read as follows: "9. This instructor was an effective teacher." and "10. This course was a worthwhile learning experience."
- 4.4.3.3. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to arrange for student instructional assessments according to Appendix A.
- 4.4.3.4. It is expected that each course will meet the minimum requirements for evaluation responses, as specified in the sections below dealing with Criteria for Reappointment (Section 7.1.3), Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor (Section 8.1.3), and Criteria for Promotion to Professor (Section 9.1.3). The DRTPC recognizes that student evaluation scores in occasional courses may not meet this standard. The department chair will examine the student evaluation materials and place the university-produced assessment results summary in the faculty member's Personnel Action file (PAF) in the Dean's Office. A copy of the assessment results summary will be forwarded to the faculty member along with the original instructional assessment forms for their own use. Copies of the

assessment results summary must be included in the RTP Package by candidates for the purpose of RTP evaluation.

4.4.3.5. 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.

4.4.4. Peer evaluation of teaching. To assure sufficient breadth in collecting this kind of evidence, peer evaluations shall be conducted at the frequencies stated in Section 3.9.2.

4.4.5. Other signed student and faculty input (Original, PAF; Copy, Candidate; Copy, RTP package).

4.4.6. Other supporting evidence for quality of teaching, including evidence of integration of teaching and scholarship. See Appendix B.

4.5. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities

4.5.1. All performance in this category will be evaluated based on the time commitment, the level of participation, accomplishments in the identified activity, as well as the relevance and benefit to the Biological Sciences Department.

4.5.2. With the guidance of the DRTPC, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide materials documenting these activities. Lack of documentation will be considered as an indication that no scholarly and creative activities have been conducted.

4.5.3. The DRTPC's evaluation of scholarly and creative activities shall be recorded in the candidate's RTP Package. The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category are found in Appendix C, including evidence of integration of scholarship and teaching.

4.6 Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University, and Community/Profession

4.6.1. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide materials documenting service activities to the DRTPC. Lack of documentation will be considered as an indication that no service activities have been conducted.

4.6.2. It should also be recognized that community services related to a faculty member's discipline carry more weight than general types of community services.

4.6.3. The DRTPC's evaluation of these services shall be recorded in the candidate's RTP package. The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category are found in Appendix D.

5. Candidate's Responsibilities

5.1. In the self-evaluation, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain clearly and specifically how the documentation submitted meets or exceeds each criterion in each category cited above and the criteria for specific RTP actions described below.

5.2. Reference to each criterion by section number should be made, if possible. The evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:

5.2.1. Discussion of Teaching Performance. This includes an evaluation of the student and peer evaluations, and activities relating to student advising and/or mentoring. All deficiencies noted in the student and peer evaluations shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, the steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed. Refer to Section 4.4.

5.2.2. Discussion of Scholarly and Creative Activities. This includes, for example, specific citation of all peer-reviewed publications, description of proposals submitted for external funding, dates of attendance of all

professional meetings, and explicit references to all duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, the steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed. Refer to Section 4.5.

- 5.2.3. Discussion of Service to the Department, College, University, and Community/Profession. This includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, the steps taken, or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed. Refer to Section 4.6.
- 5.3. Each candidate is solely responsible for the content of the candidate's RTP package.
- 5.4. It is the intention of the Biological Sciences Department to assist candidates in achieving their RTP goals by making available mentoring and other appropriate help, at the request of the candidate. It is the candidate's choice to utilize these resources. The candidate is solely responsible for reaching the level of achievement necessary for a requested RTP action and for all of the materials contained in the candidate's RTP package.
- 5.5. The candidate initiates all RTP requests. Each candidate will be given written notification from the Office of Faculty Affairs of eligibility for a regularly scheduled RTP action. Candidates contemplating application for an early action should contact the Office of Faculty Affairs to ascertain eligibility.
- 5.6. At all times, the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups.
- 5.7. The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered and make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the DRTPC and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should consider an Appendix to the evaluation package, which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, laboratory manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.). These supplemental materials can be located in the faculty member's office, department office, the dean's office, or the office of the DRTPC chair. Only an index to the Appendix specifying where the supplemental material is located is then included in the RTP package.
- 5.8. The candidate is responsible for including copies of all required student evaluations. Only the results from the approved school student evaluation forms may be used in the RTP package.
- 5.9. Candidates need to work closely with the DRTPC in order to schedule the required number of peer reviews of teaching performance (see Section 3.9.2 in this document). A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond the minimum required. The candidate will provide during a peer review session (or at some other prearranged time) a course syllabus and other relevant teaching materials. Peer reviews must be included and addressed in the candidate's RTP self-evaluation.

6. Criteria for RTP Actions

- 6.1. Criteria for specific RTP actions are discussed below. These criteria do not represent minimum faculty workloads. Faculty workload is determined by the appropriate supervisor and manager as specified by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- 6.2. In order to receive a positive recommendation for an RTP action, the candidate must: (1) meet the standards discussed below under Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service; (2) provide evidence that deficiencies in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, or Service noted in previous RTP packages have been corrected; and (3) perform at a satisfactory level in all aspects of all assignments. For all RTP actions, it is the candidate's responsibility to integrate evidence of activities and accomplishments in each of the three categories. This is done with a careful summary and analysis of the evidence in the self-evaluation section of the candidate's RTP package.
 - 6.2.1. Standards of acceptable performance in each of the three categories are based on several types of evidence. Evaluation of teaching performance is based on student evaluations, peer evaluations, signed student and

faculty input, and additional activities and accomplishments listed in Appendix B. Evaluation of scholarly and creative activities is based on authoring of peer-reviewed publications, submission of a proposal for external funding, inclusion of undergraduate and/or graduate students in research, and documentation of additional activities listed in Appendix C. Evaluation of service activities is based on documentation of activities listed in Appendix D. Candidates may meet the standards in each category with different combinations of activities and accomplishments. However, failure to meet the standards in any of the three categories may result in a negative recommendation on an action by the DRTPC. Detailed requirements for specific actions are described in Sections 7 through 11.

- 6.2.2. It is expected that candidates will address all deficiencies noted in student evaluations, peer evaluations, and evaluations at all levels of the RTP review process as long as suggested actions are consistent with the requirements of the Biological Sciences Department RTP document. Failure to correct deficiencies noted during previous RTP cycles may result in a negative recommendation on an action by the DRTPC.
- 6.2.3. Failure to perform in a satisfactory manner in the three categories stated above, as documented by evidence in the PAF and/or RTP package, may result in a negative recommendation on an action by the DRTPC.

7. Criteria for Reappointment

7.1. Teaching (Also refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix B)

- 7.1.1. A candidate for reappointment is expected to exhibit effective teaching or an improving level of effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation of activities from the list in Appendix B. Although the candidate is expected to average a minimum of 9 WTU taught per year during the review period, the DRTPC recognizes that this may not always be possible because of approved assigned time for professional or service activities. In some cases, candidates may teach only one or two courses during a given year because of assigned time and the specific teaching needs of the department.
- 7.1.2. All candidates for reappointment must have required percentages of responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined within or above the range specified in Table 1 (7.1.3), although other forms of evidence of teaching excellence will be considered if the minimum percentages are not achieved. All candidates must also address all peer evaluations conducted during the review period, as described in Section 7.1.4. The candidate shall include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of signed student or faculty input (7.1.5) and additional teaching-related activities, as described in Section 7.1.6 and listed in Appendix B.
- 7.1.3. Instructional assessment by students (student evaluations). Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the standards for student evaluations described in this section. These standards are for evaluation scores on Questions 9 and 10. Specifically, the percentages of responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories must be calculated so that equal weight is given to each student's responses, independent of enrollment sizes of the courses included in the analysis. To calculate the percentages of responses for Questions 9 and 10, candidates must use the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet that is available on the Biological Sciences Department website; this spreadsheet shall be included in the candidate's RTP document self-evaluation. Each question should be considered individually. Scores on Question 9 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. Scores on Question 10 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. The general expectation for teaching performance is that student evaluation scores should improve as candidates gain experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial standard of 50% or more student responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined for new faculty. The standard increases to 65% or more in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined for faculty seeking reappointment to their final probationary year. Student evaluation scores below these standards specified in Table 1 may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 7.1.4, 7.1.5, and 7.1.6.

Table 1. Minimum range of Strongly Agree and Agree responses for student evaluations during probationary years.

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

NOTE: Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must have a cumulative percentage of student responses for questions 9 and 10 in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined within or above the range of 60-70%, with 70% as the departmental expectation (see Sections 8.1.2 and 8.1.3 in this document). Therefore, meeting the minimum ranges of Strongly Agree and Agree responses stipulated in Table 1 for reappointments may not be sufficient to meet the requirements set forth for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor as stipulated in Sections 8.1.2 and 8.1.3. It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that when applying for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor that the **cumulative** instructional assessment by students shall meet the criteria set forth in Sections 8.1.2 and 8.1.3.

- 7.1.4. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the review period. In addition, candidates must document those weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous RTP cycles have been corrected (6.2.2).
- 7.1.5. Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.
- 7.1.6. Additional activities and accomplishments, as listed in Appendix B, including integration of teaching and scholarship, are considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness. The DRTPC will consider these additional evidence and activities heavily for candidates whose student evaluation scores are below or at the low end of the ranges specified in Table 1.

7.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities (Also refer to Section 4.5 and Appendix C)

- 7.2.1. The candidate must have made progress toward establishing a program of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by documented evidence of accomplishments in several of the categories listed in Appendix C, particularly from self-described high impact activities, such as those demarcated in Appendix C.
- 7.2.2. Although there are no specific requirements for scholarly and creative activities for each probationary year, the DRTPC recommends the following schedule of activities to prepare candidates for tenure and promotion. By the end of the third probationary year, candidates are expected to have submitted at least one proposal for external funding, to be conducting research, and to be active in at least one of the other categories listed in Appendix C. In later probationary years, candidates are expected to obtain grants and/or to continue seeking external funding for research, to involve students in their research, to submit at least one manuscript for publication, and to be active in one or more of the other categories listed in Appendix C, which includes integration of scholarship and teaching. Throughout the probationary period, the candidate should be engaged in scholarly and creative activities that will make it possible to meet the requirements for tenure and promotion (8.2.1). For publications used for meeting publication requirements, candidates must provide proof of publication (publication pdf uploaded and submitted with the packet as supplemental material). For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication but have not been published yet, candidates must provide

direct evidence (a pdf of the acceptance letter or equivalent in their uploaded supplemental material) at the time of RTP package submission to demonstrate that manuscripts used for meeting publication requirements have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC.

7.3. Service (Also refer to Section 4.6 and Appendix D)

- 7.3.1. Candidates in their first two years of employment are not expected to participate in great deal of service activities. By the end of the third probationary year, candidates are expected to increase participation in academic governance including membership on at least two department, college, university, or community/professional committees or task forces. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.
- 7.3.2. Candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in short-term activities and events such as student orientation and advising, faculty retreats, and community outreach events as appropriate. Candidates will document their contributions in these activities as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package.
- 7.3.3. Documentation of additional service activities, such as those listed in Appendix D, will be considered by the DRTPC and may substitute for a minor deficiency in one of the requirements listed above.

8. Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

8.1. Teaching (Also refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix B)

- 8.1.1. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is evaluated based on accumulative performance in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service during all previous years of employment at Cal Poly Pomona, excluding service years. Accomplishments made during a service year(s) cannot be used to meet criteria. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is expected to exhibit effectiveness in teaching as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the candidate. Although the candidate is expected to average a minimum of 9 WTU taught per year during the review period, the DRTPC recognizes that this may not always be possible because of assigned time for professional or service activities. In some cases, candidates may teach only one or two courses during a given year because of approved assigned time and the specific needs of the department.
- 8.1.2. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must have percentages of Strongly Agree and Agree scores combined within or above the range specified in 8.1.3. All candidates must also address all peer evaluations conducted during the review period, as described in 8.1.4. The DRTPC will consider additional evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of signed student and faculty input (8.1.5) and/or additional teaching-related activities, as described in Section 8.1.6 and listed in Appendix B.
- 8.1.3. Instructional assessment by students (student evaluations). Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the following standards for student evaluation scores on Questions 9 and 10. Each question should be considered individually. To calculate the percentages of responses for Questions 9 and 10, candidates must use the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet that is available on the Biological Sciences Department website, as described in Section 7.1.3. Scores on Question 9 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. Scores on Question 10 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period.. The departmental expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive 70% responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 8.1.4, 8.1.5, and 8.1.6. A candidate has the option to drop evaluation scores for ONE course from the review period with the percent of favorable

student responses being calculated from the remaining courses taught. The course omitted should be noted on the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet but scores from this course do not need to be reported.

- 8.1.4. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period. In addition, candidates must document those weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected (6.2.2).
- 8.1.5. Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.
- 8.1.6. Additional activities and accomplishments, as listed in Appendix B, including integration of teaching and scholarship, may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, provided that student evaluation scores are within the range specified in 8.1.3. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of additional activities and accomplishments, particularly self-described higher impact activities, such as those listed in Appendix B, for candidates whose student evaluation scores are below department expectations, as described in Section 8.1.3.

8.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities (Also refer to Section 4.5 and Appendix C)

- 8.2.1. The successful candidate must have established a program of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by: (1) authoring of two or more peer-reviewed publications (8.2.2), (2) submission of at least one proposal for external funding (8.2.3), (3) involvement of undergraduate and/or graduate students in active research (8.2.4.), and (4) other accomplishments while employed at Cal Poly Pomona in scholarly and creative activities such as those listed in Appendix C (8.2.5).
- 8.2.2. The Biological Sciences Department believes that scholarly publications are the best single form of evidence of professional activity. Publication is the expected culmination of scientific endeavors and represents a synthesis of many different scholarly and creative activities. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor are therefore required to author two reputable, nationally peer-reviewed publications with the following stipulations:
 - Manuscripts must have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC to meet this requirement.
 - One publication may be based on work done before arriving at Cal Poly Pomona if it was written after the candidate was employed at Cal Poly Pomona.
 - At least one publication should be based on empirical research conducted at Cal Poly Pomona.
 - At least one publication should include either the candidate or one of the candidate's students as first author, corresponding author, or last author (when numerous authors are included) as an indicator of heavy involvement in the publication.

Qualifying publications include books and book chapters as well as journal articles; review articles as well as research articles; and pedagogical as well as discipline-based works. It is the responsibility of the candidate to describe in their self-evaluation for each publication: a) where the work was completed (including, for example, data collection, data analyses, writing), b) the level of the candidate's involvement in the publication, as well as if any students were involved (as authors or otherwise), and c) the journal impact and appropriateness in the field, including the journal's Impact Factor, if available.

For publications used for meeting publication requirements, candidates must provide proof of publication (publication pdf uploaded and submitted with the packet as supplemental material). For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication but have not been published yet, candidates must provide direct evidence (a pdf of the acceptance letter or equivalent in their uploaded supplemental material) at the time of RTP package submission to demonstrate that manuscripts used for meeting publication requirements have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC.

- 8.2.3. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor are required to submit at least one proposal for external funding for at least \$10,000, although the candidate is not required to have secured that funding. External funding includes funding from government agencies, non-profit organizations, corporations, and similar sources (e.g. NFS, NIH, Sea Grant), as well as CSU-wide programs (e.g. ARI, CSUPERB, COAST). External funding does not include campus programs (CPP Teacher Scholar, SPICE). The candidate is responsible for describing the proposal, including source of funding, funding amount requested, collaborators, and status of the proposal.
- 8.2.4. Involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research and mentoring of these research students are vital to the department goals and missions. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must describe, in the self-evaluation, student involvement in research activities during the evaluation period, including: student co-authors on papers; students as authors/co-authors on presentations at scientific meetings or other venues; scholarships, grant, or other awards received by students related to research activities; the number of graduate students mentored and the students' status (e.g. new, passed proposal, graduated); the number of undergraduate students mentored, including level of involvement/mentorship); and the number of graduate students thesis committees served on. A candidate is required to have evidence of at least one of the following during their period of review: a student as co-author on a publication, a graduate student under direct supervision who has graduated, or a student as author on a presentation at a scientific conference.
- 8.2.5. Additional activities and accomplishments, such as those listed in Appendix C, including integration of scholarship and teaching, will be considered as further evidence of scholarly and creative activity. Although it is understood that a candidate who has met the publication requirement will have engaged in several of these activities, it is the candidate's responsibility to document these activities in the self-evaluation portion of the RTP package.
- 8.2.6. To help communicate research activities with the department, college, and students, a candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall give at least one research seminar during the weekly Biological Sciences Department Seminar Series. The seminar should be given within a year prior to applying for action and arranged well in advance with the faculty member in charge of scheduling seminars.

8.3. Service (Also refer to Section 4.6 and Appendix D)

- 8.3.1. Candidates are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic governance, including membership on at least three qualifying department, college, university, and/or community/professional committees or task forces. At least two of these committees must be at the department, college, or university level with service of at least a semester being required. Community/Professional services include only higher impact activities, such as leadership positions in scientific organizations or editorial positions for a scientific journal. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. Candidates are recommended to summarize in a table the type of service category, committee name, duration of service, the contribution provided by the candidate to the committee, and estimated weekly commitment of time to the committee. The DRTPC will consider the time commitment and impact of committees in their evaluation. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.
- 8.3.2. Candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in short-term activities and events, such as student orientation and advising, faculty retreats, and community outreach events as appropriate. Candidates will document their contributions in these activities as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package.
- 8.3.3. Documentation of additional service activities, such as those listed in Appendix D, will be considered by the DRTPC and may substitute for a deficiency in one of the requirements listed above.
- 8.3.4. The candidate's service activities should indicate effective participation and the ability and willingness to assume a leadership role as a tenured faculty member.

9. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

9.1. Teaching (Also refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix B)

- 9.1.1. A candidate for promotion to Professor is evaluated based on accumulative performance in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service at Cal Poly Pomona, excluding service years, since the candidate submitted their application for promotion to Associate Professor. Accomplishments made during a service year(s) cannot be used to meet criteria. A candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to exhibit effectiveness in teaching, and to have made significant contributions to the departmental curriculum such as innovations in existing courses or the development of new courses. Although the candidate is expected to average a minimum of 9 WTU taught per year during the review period, the DRTPC recognizes that this may not always be possible because of assigned time for professional or service activities. In some cases, candidates may teach only one or two courses during a given year because of approved assigned time and the specific teaching needs of the department.
- 9.1.2. All candidates for promotion to Professor must have percentages of Strongly Agree and Agree scores combined within or above the range specified in 9.1.3. All candidates must also address all peer evaluations conducted during the review period, as described in 9.1.4. The DRTPC will consider additional evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of signed student and faculty input (9.1.5) and/or additional teaching-related activities, as described in Section 9.1.6 and listed in Appendix B.
- 9.1.3. Instructional assessment by students (student evaluations). Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the following standards for student evaluation scores on Questions 9 and 10. Each question should be considered individually. To calculate the percentages of responses for Questions 9 and 10, candidates must use the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet that is available on the Biological Sciences Department website, as described in Section 7.1.3. Scores on Question 9 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. Scores on Question 10 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for promotion to Professor will receive 75% responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 9.1.4, 9.1.5, and 9.1.6. A candidate has the option to drop evaluation scores for ONE course from the review period with the percent of favorable student responses being calculated from the remaining courses taught. The course omitted should be noted on the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet but scores from this course do not need to be reported.
- 9.1.4. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period. In addition, candidates must document those weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years of the review period have been corrected (6.2.2).
- 9.1.5. Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.
- 9.1.6. Additional activities and accomplishments, as listed in Appendix B, including integration of teaching and scholarship, may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, provided that student evaluation scores are within the range specified in 9.1.3. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of additional activities, particularly those listed in Appendix B as higher impact activities, and accomplishments for candidates whose student evaluation scores are below department expectations, as described in Section 9.1.3.

9.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities (Also refer to Section 4.5 and Appendix C)

- 9.2.1. The successful candidate must have established a program of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by: (1) authoring of peer-reviewed publications (9.2.2), (2) submission of at least one proposal for external funding (9.2.3), (3) involvement of undergraduate and/or graduate students in active research (9.2.4.), and (4) other accomplishments while employed at Cal Poly Pomona in scholarly and creative activities such as those listed in Appendix C (9.2.5). The candidate should also communicate research activities with the department by giving a departmental seminar (9.2.6)
- 9.2.2. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have maintained an active research program resulting in two or more reputable, nationally peer-reviewed publications since the candidate submitted their application for promotion to Associate Professor with the following stipulations:
- Manuscripts must have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC to meet this requirement.
 - One qualifying publication may be based on previously unpublished work conducted while the candidate was an Assistant Professor at Cal Poly Pomona, provided that publication was not used as one of the two required for promotion to Associate Professor.
 - At least one publication should be based on empirical research conducted since the candidate submitted their application for promotion to Associate Professor.
 - At least one publication should include either the candidate or one of the candidate's students as first author, corresponding author, or last author (when numerous authors are included) as an indicator of heavy involvement in the publication.

Qualifying publications include books and book chapters as well as journal articles; review articles as well as research articles; and pedagogical as well as discipline-based works. It is the responsibility of the candidate to describe in the self-evaluation for each publication: a) where the work was completed (including, for example, data collection, data analyses, writing), b) the level of the candidate's involvement in the publication, as well as if any students were involved (as authors or otherwise), and c) the journal impact and appropriateness in the field, including the journal's Impact Factor, if available.

For publications used for meeting publication requirements, candidates must provide proof of publication (publication pdf uploaded and submitted with the packet as supplemental material). For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication but have not been published yet, candidates must provide direct evidence (a pdf of the acceptance letter or equivalent in their uploaded supplemental material) at the time of RTP package submission to demonstrate that manuscripts used for meeting publication requirements have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC.

- 9.2.3. Candidates for promotion to Professor are required to submit at least one proposal for external funding for at least \$10,000, although the candidate is not required to have secured that funding. External funding includes grants from government agencies, non-profit organizations, corporations, and similar sources (e.g. NFS, NIH, Sea Grant), as well as CSU-wide programs (e.g. ARI, CSUPERB, COAST). External funding does not include campus programs (CPP Teacher Scholar, SPICE). A candidate is not required to submit one proposal for external funding if they have secured external funding as an Assistant Professor with funding carrying over for at least two years of their time as Associate Professor. The candidate is responsible for describing the proposal, including source of funding, funding amount requested, collaborators, and status of the proposal, or the funding secured that carried over during their time as Associate Professor.
- 9.2.4. Involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research and mentoring of these research students are vital to the department goals and missions. Candidates for promotion to Professor must describe, in the self-evaluation, student involvement in research activities during the evaluation period, including: student co-authors on papers; students as authors/co-authors on presentations at scientific meetings or other venues; scholarships, grant, or other awards received by students related to research activities; the number of graduate students mentored and their status (e.g. new, passed proposal, graduated); the number of undergraduate students mentored, including level of involvement/mentorship); and the number of graduate students thesis committees served on. A candidate is required to have evidence of at least one of the following during their period of review: a student as co-author on a publication, a graduate student under direct supervision who has graduated, or a student as author on a presentation at a scientific conference.

- 9.2.5. The DRTPC recognizes that some candidates for promotion to Professor may not have met the publication requirement because of involvement in other valuable professional activities. Therefore, additional activities and accomplishments, such as those listed in Appendix C, including integration of scholarship and teaching, will be considered as evidence of scholarly and creative activity. All candidates are required to document these activities in the self-evaluation portion of the RTP package. For candidates who have not met the publication requirement, it will be necessary to document substantial activity in several of the categories in Appendix C.
- 9.2.6. To help communicate research activities with the department, college, and students, a candidate for promotion to Professor shall give a research seminar during the weekly Biological Sciences Department Seminar Series. The seminar should be given within a year prior to applying for action and arranged well in advance with the faculty member in charge of scheduling seminars.

9.3. Service (Also refer to Section 4.6 and Appendix D)

- 9.3.1. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic and community/professional governance, including membership on at least three qualifying committees or task forces. Service must consist of one departmental committee and one college or university committee; the third may include departmental, college, university, or community/professional services. Community/Professional services include only higher impact activities, such as leadership positions in scientific organizations or editorial positions for a scientific journal. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. Candidates are recommended to summarize in a table the type of service category, committee name, duration of service, the contribution provided by the candidate to the committee, and estimated weekly commitment of time to the committee. The DRTPC will consider the time commitment and impact of committees in their evaluation. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.
- 9.3.2. Candidates must have served as chair of at least one of the departmental, college, or university committees or task forces during the review period.
- 9.3.3. Candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in short-term activities and events such as student orientation and advising, faculty retreats, and community outreach events as appropriate. Candidates will document their contributions in these activities as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package.
- 9.3.4. Documentation of additional service activities, such as those listed in Appendix D, will be considered by the DRTPC and may substitute for a deficiency in one of the requirements listed above.
- 9.3.5. The candidate's service activities should indicate effective participation and leadership.

10. Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate seeking early action shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position. Exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and created activities and service to the university and profession shall be demonstrated, in addition to satisfying all the requirements for regular tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor (Section 8). The candidate must satisfy the following requirements, which supersede the corresponding requirements for regular tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

- 10.1. In addition to the requirements outlined in Section 8.1, a candidate will be considered for early tenure and/or promotion when instructional assessment by students meet the requirements of 10.1.1., which supersede 8.1.3.
- 10.1.1. Instructional assessment by students (student evaluations). Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the following standards for student evaluation scores on Questions 9 and 10.. Each question should be considered individually. To calculate the percentages of responses for Questions 9 and 10, candidates must use the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet that is available on the Biological Sciences Department website, as described in Section 7.1.3. Scores on Question 9 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students

from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. Scores on Question 10 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive at least 90% responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined. Scores slightly below this minimum will be considered depending on the candidate's description of their engagement in additional higher impact teaching activities, such as those listed with an "*" in Appendix B. The value and time commitment of any activities listed by the candidate should be described in detail in their self-evaluation. A candidate has the option to drop evaluation scores for ONE course from the review period with the percent of favorable student responses being calculated from the remaining courses taught. The course omitted should be noted on the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet but scores from this course do not need to be reported.

10.2. In addition to the requirements outlined in Section 8.2, a candidate will be considered for early tenure and/or promotion when scholarly publications meet the requirements of 10.2.1, which supersede 8.2.2.

10.2.1. The Biological Sciences Department believes that scholarly publications are the best single form of evidence of professional activity. Publication is the expected culmination of scientific endeavors and represents a synthesis of many different scholarly and creative activities. Candidates for early tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor are therefore required to author at least four reputable, nationally peer-reviewed publications, with the following stipulations:

- Manuscripts must have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC to meet this requirement.
- One publication may be based on work done before arriving at Cal Poly Pomona if it was written after the candidate was employed at Cal Poly Pomona.
- At least one publication should be based on empirical research conducted at Cal Poly Pomona.
- At least one publication based on research at Cal Poly Pomona should include either the candidate or one of the candidate's students as first author, corresponding author, or last author (when numerous authors are included) as an indicator of heavy involvement in the publication.
- One of the four publication requirements can be fulfilled with securing of a major external grant, defined as any grant or total of multiple external grants, regardless of duration, resulting in greater than \$100,000 (direct and indirect funds) coming to Cal Poly Pomona; this major grant must have been secured as an Assistant Professor. A grant cannot be used to replace the other stipulated publication requirements, such as having at least one publication be based on empirical work conducted while employed at Cal Poly Pomona and having at least one publication include either the candidate or one of the candidate's students as first author, corresponding author, or last author (when numerous authors are included).

For publications used for meeting publication requirements, candidates must provide proof of publication (publication pdf uploaded and submitted with the packet as supplemental material). For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication but have not been published yet, candidates must provide direct evidence (a pdf of the acceptance letter or equivalent in their uploaded supplemental material) at the time of RTP package submission to demonstrate that manuscripts used for meeting publication requirements have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC.

10.3. In addition to the requirements outlined in Section 8.3, a candidate will be considered for early tenure and/or promotion when service record meets the requirements of 10.3.1, which supersede 8.3.1.

10.3.1. Candidates are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic governance, including membership on at least three qualifying department, qualifying committees or task forces, with at least two of these being department, college, or university committees; the third committee or task force can include campus or community/professional service. Community/Professional services include only higher impact activities, such as leadership positions in scientific organizations or editorial positions for a scientific journal. In addition, the candidate must have served as chair of at least one of the department, college, or university committees or task forces. Written documentation of the candidate's contributions on committees and task forces must be provided in the candidate's self-evaluation and/or by signed faculty input to the RTP package. Candidates are

recommended to summarize in a table the type of service category, committee name, duration of service, the contribution provided by the candidate to the committee, and estimated weekly commitment of time to the committee. The DRTPC will consider the time commitment and impact of committees in their evaluation. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.

11. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor

The candidate seeking early action shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position. Exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and created activities and service to the university and profession shall be demonstrated, in addition to satisfying all the requirements for regular promotion to Professor (Section 9). The candidate must satisfy the following requirements, which supersede the corresponding requirements for regular promotion to Professor.

11.1. In addition to the requirements outlined in Section 9.1, a candidate will be considered for early promotion when instructional assessment by students meet the requirements of 11.1.1., which supersede 9.1.3.

11.1.1. Instructional assessment by students (student evaluations). Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the following standards for student evaluation scores on Questions 9 and 10. Each question should be considered individually. To calculate the percentages of responses for Questions 9 and 10, candidates must use the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet that is available on the Biological Sciences Department website, as described in Section 7.1.3. Scores on Question 9 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. Scores on Question 10 will be calculated on favorable responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined, cumulative across all students from SET evaluations included in the RTP packet for the review period. The departmental expectation is that candidates for early promotion to Professor will receive at least 90% responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories combined. Scores slightly below this minimum will be considered depending on the candidate's description of their engagement in additional higher impact teaching activities, such as those listed with an "*" in Appendix B. The value and time commitment of any activities listed by the candidate should be described in detail in their self-evaluation. A candidate has the option to drop evaluation scores for ONE course from the review period with the percent of favorable student responses being calculated from the remaining courses taught. The course omitted should be noted on the cumulative student evaluations analysis spreadsheet but scores from this course do not need to be reported.

11.2. In addition to the requirements outlined in Section 9.2, a candidate will be considered for early promotion when scholarly publications meet the requirements of 11.2.1, which supersede 9.2.2.

11.2.1. Candidates for early promotion to Professor are required to author at least four reputable, nationally peer-reviewed publications since the candidate submitted their application for promotion to Associate Professor with the following stipulations:

- Manuscripts must have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC to meet this requirement.
- One publication may be based on work done while the candidate was an Assistant Professor at Cal Poly Pomona, provided that publication was not used as one of the two required for promotion to Associate Professor.
- At least one publication should be based on empirical research since the candidate submitted their application for promotion to Associate Professor.
- At least one publication should include either the candidate or one of the candidate's students as first author, corresponding author, or last author (when numerous authors are included) as an indicator of heavy involvement in the publication.
- One of the four publication requirements can be fulfilled with securing of a major external grant, defined as any grant or total of multiple external grants, regardless of duration, resulting in greater than \$100,000 (direct and indirect funds) coming to Cal Poly Pomona; this major grant must have been secured as an Associate Professor. A grant cannot be used to replace the other stipulated publication requirements, such as having at least one publication be based on empirical work conducted while employed at Cal Poly Pomona and having at least one publication include either the

candidate or one of the candidate's students as first author, corresponding author, or last author (when numerous authors are included).

For publications used for meeting publication requirements, candidates must provide proof of publication (publication pdf uploaded and submitted with the packet as supplemental material). For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication but have not been published yet, candidates must provide direct evidence (a pdf of the acceptance letter or equivalent in their uploaded supplemental material) at the time of RTP package submission to demonstrate that manuscripts used for meeting publication requirements have been accepted for publication prior to the deadline for the submission of the RTP package to the DRTPC.

11.3. In addition to the requirements outlined in Section 9.3, a candidate will be considered for early tenure and/or promotion when service record meets the requirements of 11.3.1, which supersede 9.3.1 and 9.3.2.

11.3.1. Candidates for early promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic and community/professional governance, including membership on at least six qualifying committees or task forces. Service must consist of at least three being department committees and two being college or university committees; the sixth committee or task force can include campus or community/professional service. Community/Professional services include only higher impact activities, such as leadership positions in scientific organizations or editorial positions for a scientific journal. In addition, the candidate must have served as chair of at least two of the department, college, or university committees or task forces. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. Candidates are recommended to summarize in a table the type of service category, committee name, duration of service, the contribution provided by the candidate to the committee, and estimated weekly commitment of time to the committee. The DRTPC will consider the time commitment and impact of committees in their evaluation. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.

12. Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave

12.1. The DRTPC must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the university, and visiting professor/scholarship at another institution. Faculty on leave shall be evaluated using the above stated criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity and service with suitable modification listed below.

12.2. Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by email. Alternative electronic means of transmission are acceptable provided signatures appear on all necessary pages. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

12.3. Individuals who accept positions outside of the Biological Sciences Department while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand the department's expectations during the time they are away. The department may articulate expectations for these exceptional situations in the RTP document. If these exceptions are not explicitly and individually addressed in the department criteria, then the candidate and the DRTPC must commit to writing an interpretation of the department criteria in light of the special circumstances. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the department chair, the Dean of the College of Science, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

12.4. Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment

12.4.1. For tenure and/or promotion actions, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught courses given by the Biological Sciences Department equivalent of 24 WTUs since appointment or the last promotion. At least 2 WTUs shall be taught within the year preceding the candidate's request. All student evaluation summaries for every section of every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package.

12.4.2. For reappointment actions, the candidate serving an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 6 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 6 WTUs must be for courses given by the Biological Sciences

Department. All student evaluation summaries for every section of every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package.

- 12.4.3. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure in the department.
- 12.4.4. Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by completion of their administrative duties.
- 12.4.5. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty serving an administrative assignment without the written consent of the department chair, the Dean of the College of Science, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

12.5. Faculty on Approved Leave

- 12.5.1. Only faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the president (or designee) of the university are on approved leave. Normally, this is with pay from this university and thus, for tenure track candidates, the probationary status is still active and the following paragraphs in this section apply. If the approved leave is professional leave of absence without pay from the university, then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate may remain active for a maximum of one year, in which case the following paragraphs in this section would apply during that period. If the approved leave is personal leave of absence without pay, then whether or not the probationary status of the tenure-track candidate is inactive ("the clock has stopped") will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the president (or designee) of the university. In cases where the probationary status of the candidate becomes inactive the following paragraphs in this section do not apply.
- 12.5.2. For tenure and/or promotion actions, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 24 WTUs in the Biological Sciences Department since appointment or their last promotion. At least 2 WTUs shall be in the year preceding the candidate's request. Student evaluations for every section of every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this university.
- 12.5.3. For reappointment actions, the candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 6 WTUs in the Biological Sciences Department at Cal Poly Pomona for the academic year prior to the candidate's leave. Student evaluations for every section of every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package.
- 12.5.4. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity and shall be held to the same standards as any other candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion in the department. Research and scholarly activity done at another institution, whether done alone or in collaboration with others, can be examined by the committee for the purposes of fulfilling the department's criteria in the area of scholarly activity.
- 12.5.5. Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirements specified in the department criteria for the requested RTP action. There shall be evidence of service to the profession and/or the community.
- 12.5.6. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty on approved leave without the written consent of the DRTPC, the department chair, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. However, if any of these requirements conflict with provisions or interpretation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the latter shall govern.

12.6. Faculty Serving in Academic Governance

- 12.6.1. For tenure and/or promotion actions, faculty serving in academic governance on release time equivalent to half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught courses equivalent of 24 WTUs since appointment or the last promotion. At least 2 WTUs shall be in the year preceding the candidate's request. Student evaluations for every section of every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package.
- 12.6.2. For reappointment actions, the candidate serving in academic governance and on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 6 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 6 WTUs must be for courses given by the department. Student evaluations for every section of every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package.
- 12.6.3. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving in academic governance and on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall provide evidence of scholarly activity and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion in the department.
- 12.6.4. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by completing their academic governance duties.
- 12.6.5. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of the department chair, the Dean of the College of Science, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

13. RTP Document Changes

- 13.1. The DRTPC shall, at least once every five years, review the RTP document and draft proposed revisions. These revisions shall include, but not be restricted to, any changes necessary to bring the document into conformity with the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement and Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual. Any revisions must be presented to the tenured and probationary faculty for ratification by 1 March.
- 13.2. The Draft RTP document will be reported to all the tenured and probationary faculty members of the department. Adoption of the department RTP document shall be accomplished by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in the Biological Sciences Department. Following departmental approval, the draft document will be forwarded to the dean and College RTP Committee no later than the date specified in Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual.
- 13.3. The department chair shall post a copy of the current approved department RTP document on the department website and shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy prior to the beginning of the evaluation process. There shall be no changes in criteria or procedures used to evaluate a faculty member during the evaluation process.

Appendix A: Instructional Assessment by Students: Procedure for Administering Assessment Forms

- A.1 Student evaluation of teaching shall be conducted according to the guidelines established in Policy No. 1329 of the University Manual (https://www.cpp.edu/academic-manual/1300-1399-academic-personnel-policies/1325-1349/policy_1329_student_evaluation_of_teaching1.pdf). Evaluations must be conducted between the start of the 13th week and the end of the 15th week of the academic semester.
- A.2 At least 10 minutes before the end of the class meeting, identify one or two student volunteers to distribute and collect the Student Evaluation Forms. In lieu of using students, the instructor may request that the evaluation be conducted by a faculty colleague or graduate teaching associate. Provide the student volunteers with the envelope containing the Student Evaluation Forms.
- A.3 Ask the student volunteers to collect the completed forms and place them in the envelope and require that both students immediately deliver the envelope to the Biological Sciences Department office (Building 8, Room 119). If the Biological Sciences Department office door is locked, the student volunteers should place the envelope containing the Instructional Assessment Forms in the Biological Sciences Department Drop Box, which is located directly across the hall from the office door. Under no circumstances should the students hold on to the forms with the intention of submitting the forms the next business day (or later).
- A.4 The following statement should be read to the class: *“This is an instructor evaluation. Your thoughtful response to the questions on the form will assist in improving the quality of instruction. After completing the questionnaire, return the forms to the person conducting the evaluation.”* **The instructor must then leave the room.**
- A.5 If an instructor wishes, a separate sheet may be provided for written comments. Written comments may be completed after students have submitted the Student Evaluation Form. Students may sign their comments.
- A.6 If there are two or more instructors in the course, it is essential that students understand the evaluation is for a single instructor, and that the instructor’s name must be written at the top of the form. It is recommended that evaluations be administered as close to an instructor’s last participation in the course as possible.
- A.7 Students should be reminded that the instructor will not be given the results of the assessment until after grades are turned in.
- A.8 Immediately after class, the completed forms should be submitted in a sealed envelope (provided by the instructor) to the Biological Sciences Department office (8-119), or placed in the designated drop box outside of the office. Separate envelopes should be used for Instructional Assessment Forms and for written comments.
- A.9 The department-approved form for Student Evaluation is on file in the Biological Sciences Department.

Appendix B: Other Supporting Evidence for Quality of Teaching.

The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category include, but are not limited to, the activities below. Those items likely considered as higher impact activities are indicated with an “*” but the value and time commitment of any activities listed by the candidate should be described in their self-evaluation.

Courses

- Course syllabi and supplemental course material, such as lecture outlines, handouts, etc.
- Developing and offering a new course*
- Significantly revising an existing course*
- Contributing to course development related to the mission of the department*
- Incorporating innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching that enhance student learning*
- Developing novel curricular materials including multimedia or computer-based materials*
- Incorporating information from workshops or professional meetings into classroom instruction
- Developing new teaching methodologies to replace or supplement existing teaching methods*

Improving pedagogical techniques

- Attending professional development seminars/workshops to enhance teaching and learning*
- Observing teaching by other instructors and incorporating active learning techniques
- Collaborating with a mentor to improve teaching performance
- Incorporating assessment techniques into teaching

Assessment of teaching and learning activities

- Assessing novel curricular materials
- Assessing teaching and learning techniques

Enhancement of educational experiences for students

- Tutoring students
- Holding review sessions

Integration of teaching and scholarship in the classroom

- Expanding learning opportunities beyond the classroom, such as field trips, meetings, and website development*
- Developing and offering supervisory courses for graduate and undergraduate students
- Incorporating course activities that enhance student contact with professionals in related fields*

Teaching at other institutions

- Giving guest lectures at other universities or schools
- Visiting professorship

Service-learning activities, honors course participation, and contributions to the training of teachers

Any other activity that enhances teaching or improves learning.

Appendix C: Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities

The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category include, but are not limited to, the activities below. Those items likely considered to be evidence of higher impact activities are indicated with an “*” but the value and time commitment of any activities listed by the candidate should be described in their self-evaluation.

Grants and contracts

- Research grants*
- Student training grants*
- Equipment grants*
- Teaching/education grants*

Research

- Conducting research in specialty area
- Involving students in research training*
- Participating in research at another institution
- Working with mentor to improve research productivity

Publications

- Professional publications (refereed and/or non-refereed specified)*
- Authoring or editing books and/or chapters of books appropriate to the candidate’s specialty*
- Other publications: software, instructional materials, manuals, popular articles, web pages, etc.*
- Co-authoring of publications and presentations with students*
- Authorship of documents, reports, etc. pertinent to the department, college, or university*

Presentations

- Oral presentations to professional societies, symposia, workshops*
- Poster presentations at professional societies, symposia, workshops*
- Presenting seminar on research activities

Professional organizations

- Organizing meetings or events associated with professional organizations*
- Chairing sessions at professional meetings
- Attending professional meetings
- Holding office, leadership roles or contributions to a professional organization*

Professional services

- Consulting work in some area of the biological sciences*
- Consulting work in other areas of expertise (e.g., computer technology, web page construction)*

Professional training

- A relevant certification, designation or license
- Attending special research techniques training workshop
- Attending grant-writing, web page or technology development workshop

Peer review

- Serving as reviewer for peer-reviewed journal or similar publication
- Serving as ad hoc reviewer or on review panel for grant proposals*
- Serving on review or selection committee to review candidates for fellowships and awards*
- Peer review of faculty teaching

Leadership role in organizing activities, meetings or events

- Organizing activities, events or meetings for a professional society or organization*
- Organizing activities, events or meetings for the Biological Sciences Department
- Organizing activities, events or meetings for the College of Science or the university

Participation in scholarly and creative activities and events

- Attending certain departmental, college or university activities or events
- Attending conferences, symposia, workshops, seminars and science fairs

Honors, awards and recognition of candidate's contributions to science

- Election to honor societies*
- Receipt of professional awards*
- Invitations to speak at other institutions or at professional society meetings*
- Number of citations of the candidate's work in other author's peer-reviewed works or books

Integration of scholarship and teaching

Directing undergraduate research, senior projects and theses*
Directing graduate research and theses*
Sponsoring student presentations at local research days and at professional meetings
Serving on graduate student thesis committees
Incorporating information from workshops or professional meetings into research training
Publishing in a peer-reviewed journal the results of assessment of teaching and learning*
Presenting the results of assessment of teaching and learning at professional meetings*
Any other scholarly activity that enhances professional development.

Appendix D: Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University and Community/Profession

The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category include, but are not limited to, the activities below.

Service to students

- Service as an academic advisor to students
- Service as an advisor or sponsor to a student club
- Assisting in placing students in graduate or professional schools, internships or other job opportunities
- Participating in the recruitment of new students for the department

Service to Biological Sciences Department

- Participating on department committees and task forces
- Chairing department committees
- Contributing to course or curriculum development related to the mission of the department
- Authoring and receiving education, training, or equipment grants that benefit the department*
- Participating in department fund raising activities
- Organizing or participating in service activities such as career fairs, or career days
- Organizing or participating in department functions and activities
- Collaborating with a mentor to improve service performance
- Serving as a mentor to new faculty
- Participating in the recruitment of new faculty
- Coordinating a multi-sectioned course
- Regularly attending department meetings
- Internship Coordinator

Service to College of Science

- Serving on or chairing of College committees
- Organizing or participating in College functions and activities

Service to Cal Poly Pomona University

- Serving on or chairing of university committees
- Organizing or participating in university functions and activities
- Service on the Academic Senate
- Service on administrative assignment for the university

Service to Community/Profession

- Working closely with professional organizations and nearby schools offering outreach programs
- Representing the department through speaking engagements at colleges, schools, clubs and other organizations

Any other activities that provide service to the students, the Biological Sciences Department, College of Science, Cal Poly Pomona University, or community.