CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

CIVIL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

I.1. PURPOSE

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. This Civil Engineering Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures Document (Department RTP Document) communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the Dean of the College, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Policies No 1329 and 1328 (formerly appendixes 10 and 16, respectively) of the University Manual define university procedures and expectations. The Document supplements but may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over the Document.

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting candidates, providing them the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for candidates to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

I.2. DEFINITIONS

Some of the more important terms used in this document are defined here:

a) *Candidate* refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

b) A *candidate for reappointment* is applying to retain their current rank and tenure status. The candidate *must* use the criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.

c) A *candidate for tenure or promotion* is applying for promotion to a higher rank and/or for tenure. The candidate *may* choose between the criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

d) *Criteria* are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/ procedures.

e) *College RTP Committee (CRTPC)* refers to a group of tenured faculty members in the College of Engineering to monitor the operation of the RTP process in the college, to hear appeals of department RTP actions, and to serve, augmented by the dean as chair and voting member, as the body to rank candidates

f) *Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)* members are full-time tenured faculty members elected by the tenured and probationary faculty.

g) *Peer evaluations of teaching* are evaluations by faculty peers as described in Policy 1328 Section 3.3.

h) *Period of review* is the period of performance under review or evaluation.

i) *Procedures* describe the process that must be followed by RTP candidates to apply for RTP action. RTP candidates *must* comply with the policies and procedures that are in effect at the time of RTP action.

j) *University RTP Committee (URTPC)* refers to a group of faculty members in the University, that monitor the

general operation of the RTP process, ensure compliance with the spirit and intent of this policy, the policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching, and the CBA and take appropriate remedial actions to protect the rights of the candidate, hear appeals of actions taken by the dean, provide advice and assistance on RTP matters to candidates, chairs, deans, DRTPCs, and CRTPCs, request and/or respond to requests to add new supporting material to an RTP package after the closing date, and make its own recommendation on RTP requests made by candidate.

k) *Student evaluations of teaching* are evaluations by students of the candidate's performance and are described in Policy 1328 Section 3.2 and Policy 1329.

The following additional terms are used in this document:

a) *Department RTP Document* refers to this document.
b) *The Department* is the Civil Engineering Department of the College of Engineering at Cal Poly Pomona.
c) *The College* is the College of Engineering at Cal Poly Pomona.
d) *Levels* are the categories that commensurate with the amount of effort and significance of the activity performed.
e) *Indicators* are the activities defined under the various Levels
f) Index is a list of documents included in the RTP package that a candidate provides upon DRTPC's request

I.3. CAL POLY POMONA'S TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL

Teacher-Scholars at Cal Poly Pomona are role models who actively promote life-long intentional learning to our students, are actively engaged in advancing their fields of inquiry, and are committed to blending teaching and scholarship into a single synergistic endeavor that results in a creative integration of the two roles.

Cal Poly Pomona Teacher-Scholars apply knowledge from the frontiers of their disciplines and pedagogical scholarships to the development of their *courses and the curriculum*. Teacher-Scholars:

- Understand current developments in their disciplines, and use this understanding to advance student learning and knowledge.
- Have knowledge of interdisciplinary and discipline-specific pedagogical strategies, apply effective strategies to facilitate learning of a diverse student population, use evidence-based assessment of teaching to improve their pedagogy, and evaluate and analyze their pedagogy.

Cal Poly Pomona Teacher-Scholars engage in the practice of *scholarship*, which is specifically defined by discipline and academic unit, and is broadly construed to include the scholarship of discovery, integration, teaching, application and engagement. While the scholarship of Teacher-Scholars varies widely across disciplines at Cal Poly Pomona, it incorporates essential elements that define scholarship, including research and/or creative work. Teacher-Scholars:

- Make intellectual and/or creative contributions that extend and/or develop new knowledge or creative inquiry, discover, integrate or apply facts, theories, artistic perceptions, or design to practice in their disciplines.
- Produce work that is peer reviewed, critiqued, juried and/or judged congruent with discipline standards, and results in a publication, presentation, creative work or other product disseminated to a wider audience beyond the Cal Poly Pomona community.

Cal Poly Pomona Teacher-Scholars *integrate scholarship and teaching* to create a synthesis greater than both activities. Teacher-Scholars:

- Bring the practice of their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way,
- Promote a community of inquiry in their role as faculty members, and model and encourage academically rigorous scholarship as appropriate to their discipline,

- Foster a climate in which faculty/student scholarly, research, practice, or artistic collaboration can take place by:
  - o enhancing student learning through meaningful experiences at Cal Poly Pomona as appropriate in their discipline through inquiry based classroom, studio, laboratory, practice and field activities that are embedded within the curriculum,
  - o collaborating with students in a culture of learn-by-doing inquiry, discovery, professional practiceand/or creative work through the involvement of students in scholarship outside of regular coursework.

I.4. CIVIL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT STRATETIC OBJECTIVE AND CORE VALUES

The activities of all faculty and staff in the Civil Engineering (CE) Department should be consistent with the CE Department strategic objective and core values, as detailed below.

Civil Engineering Department Strategic Objective:

> "***We excel at delivering an inclusive, practice-oriented, world class***
> ***Civil Engineering education that changes people's lives***".

Core Values:
1. ***People Centered:*** We invest in people and celebrate success.
2. ***Collaborative***: We create an environment of collegiality, ownership, and engagement.
3. ***Forward-Thinking***: We strive to be proactive, creative, and innovative.
4. ***Transparent:*** We are committed to maintaining an environment of open, honest, and inclusive communication
5. ***Bold: We*** value grit, innovation, risk-taking, and learning from challenges.

All faculty members must contribute to achieving the department strategic objective and uphold the core values. The RTP process is where a candidate's contributions are documented, evaluated, and aligned to the criteria.

SECTION II– PROCEDURES

II.1. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE

The composition and selection of the RTP committee shall conform to Policy 1328 Section 1.17 and 3.1.

o   The structure, size, and procedures of the DRTPC shall be determined by the probationary and tenured faculty in the department within limits stipulated in Policy 1328, 3.1C. DRTPC members must be elected by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department via secret ballot.

o   Annual elections by secret ballot **must** be conducted by **March 1** of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election **shall** be by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The DRTPC's term of service **shall** not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC's recommendations have been concluded. (#1328, 3.1D).

o   The DRTPC Chair **shall** be a full-time tenured faculty (#1328, 3.1B).

o   Nontenured department chairs, or chairs who are candidates for a RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC or to write separate recommendations. (#1328, 3.1E).

o   Prior to the election of the DRTPC members, the probationary and tenured faculty members should determine whether the department chair will be a member of the DRTPC or write a separate statement.

The Department RTP Chair shall perform the following duties:

Fall Semester:

o   Meets with all new probationary faculty to explain the RTP process, and to provide them with a copy of the Department RTP Document.

o   Assists candidates in understanding expectations and preparing packages.

o   Leads the committee members to plan the review process.

Throughout the year:

o   Maintains department RTP records, including peer evaluations, for all faculty subject to current or future RTP actions

o   Manages the day-to-day committee activities

o   Represents the committee in communications with the candidate, the CRTPC, the URTPC, and the university administration

o   Schedules peer evaluations

The committee's duties include the following:

o   Determine the best process to conduct the review of the candidates' portfolios. However, before the review starts, the CE RTPC should share with the tenured and tenure track faculty the process to be used.

o   Fulfill their committee responsibilities with appropriate diligence and timeliness.

o   Maintain confidentiality on all committee deliberations and on the candidate submittals.

o   Conduct committee business and produce reports consistent with university, college, and department policies and regulations.

The RTP package is the working Personnel Action File (PAF) for the purposes of RTP evaluation. However, evaluating committees and department Chair should consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials. (#1328, 1.5). Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, or promotion or any other personnel action **shall** be based on the PAF. (CBA 15.12c)

The committee, in their evaluation of the candidate's request, shall take into account information from the following sources:

o   Summaries and interpretations of student evaluation of teaching in accordance with Policy 1329, Policy 1328 Section 3.2, and the University Manual Section 305;
o   Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy 1328, Section 3.3. and the University Manual section 305;
o   Self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);
o   Information provided in the Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP)
o   Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);
o   Material requested from the candidate by the committee which include requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package;
o   Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the committee before the closing date.
o   Other information as appropriate for the review and permitted under university regulations.

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. (CBA 15.12d).

II.2. FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

This section describes the different evaluation requirements to be included in the RTP package as per Policy 1328 and 1329.

II.2.1. REQUIREMENTS FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Candidates shall conform with requirements of Policy 1328, Section 7.4. The RTP package should include the items listed in Section 7.4 for either a "performance review" or a "periodic evaluation".

II.2.2. REQUIRED EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND ADVISING

This section describes the four different types of evaluation documents to be conducted per Policy 1328 and 1329.

II.2.2.1. S T U D E N T   C O U R S E EVALUATIONS

Student course evaluations shall be conducted on line in accordance with Policy 1329 of the University manual. The following include Department procedures for administering of course evaluations:

1.   Faculty should take an active role in encouraging students to complete evaluations. According to Senate Policy 1329, for face to face and synchronous remote classes, faculty shall set aside at least 15 minutes for students to complete the evaluations during class between the period set by the University.
2.   Faculty should explain the importance of the evaluations and briefly describe changes made in response to previous student evaluations.
     If students complete the online evaluation in the classroom the faculty candidate should leave the room during that period of time.

   Student Questionnaires

The probationary and tenured faculty of each department or equivalent unit **shall** design the instruments for official

student evaluation. Instruments appropriate to the content, method of instruction, and learning objectives of the course **shall** be designed by the department. Therefore, there can be more than one instrument used for official student evaluation in a department. Departments are encouraged to ensure that evaluation instruments are reliable and valid for the purpose of collecting data for summative evaluation of faculty. The Faculty Center for Professional Development can provide resources and consultation to this end and faculty are urged to contact the center when developing evaluation instruments. (#1329, 3.2.1)

1. The instruments **shall** *not* provide for written student comments. (#1329, 3.2.3)
2. Administration of student evaluations **shall** ensure anonymity of the students participating in the evaluation process. (#1329, E)
3. Departmental procedures **shall** include safeguards which preclude tampering or other activities which may invalidate the results of the evaluation. (#1329, F)
4. Refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of Policy #1329 for additional information on student evaluation

The University will make the results electronically available to faculty. Once this review is completed, an electronic copy will be kept in the candidate's personnel action file (PAF).

II.2.2.2. OUT-OF-CLASS   EVALUATIONS

Out of Class Evaluation Comments shall conform to Policy 1329 Section 2.0. Each year the RTP Committee shall post a notice outside of the department's office send an announcement to the department faculty, staff, and students, as well as to the university community listing the faculty being considered in the RTP process and their requested actions. This notice shall solicit written comments from members of the campus community regarding the candidate's performance. Such notices shall be posted for a period of at least two weeks, with a submittal deadline at least three weeks before the DRTPC's deadline for completing their work.

o Deadline for student evaluation via comments should be at least 10 days before the deadline for RTP package.
o The only professional manner to solicit student opinion on teaching performance for the purpose of peer review is by posting a public announcement, or by publication of such, or by some other means designed to reach students collectively, not individually. (#1329, 1.1).
o At any time, a student may submit a letter/petition expressing his/her opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter/petition **must** be signed and addressed either to the chair of the department or to the chair of DRTPC. The letter/petition **must** include the Bronco Identification Number, and student signature. The department chair/chair of the DRTPC **must** provide the faculty member with copies of such letters/petitions. The faculty member **shall** be allowed at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal. (#1329, 2.0).
o Comments received after an RTP cycle deadline would be taken into consideration in the next evaluation cycle; however, they still need to be given to the faculty member right away and provide the opportunity for rebuttal. Both documents would go to the PAF and considered in the next cycle.

II.2.2.3. PEER EVALUATIONS

The protocol and execution of Peer Evaluations shall conform to Policy 1328, Section 3.3. All tenured civil engineering faculty of higher rank than the candidate being evaluated and all FERP faculty who are teaching during the semester of the review are eligible to conduct peer evaluations, even if they are not members of the DRTPC. Based upon Policy 1328 Section 3.3(A) the CE Department requires the following policies and procedures in addition to Policy 1328 Sections 3.3 (A-F):

1. The DRTPC chair shall assign tenured faculty to conduct peer evaluations for all faculty eligible for RTP action(s) in the current year or in future years no later than the end of the second week of Fall semester.
2. The evaluator shall observe the class for a minimum of 50 minutes.
3. The evaluator shall complete and sign the most current version of the Department's Peer Evaluation Form. An optional signed letter by the evaluator may also be attached. If the candidate does not receive the form within two weeks of the class visit they should bring this to the attention of the DRTPC chair.
4. The candidate shall review and sign the form and any initial attachments, retain a copy for their own records and return the originals to the DRTPC chair within ten (10) working days of receiving the evaluation. This signature signifies receipt of the completed evaluation. The candidate has the right to respond in writing to the peer-evaluation within ten (10) working days of receiving the evaluation, and any such response shall be given to the DRTPC chair along with the form.
   The DRTPC chair shall file the original documents through the Dean to the candidate's personnel action file (PAF). If the candidate submitted a response to the evaluation, then the DRTPC chair shall provide a copy of this response to the faculty peer evaluator.
5. A minimum of two peer evaluations **shall** be conducted each academic year. Peer evaluations **shall** reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught (#1328, 3.3C).
6. The DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and that a copy of each written evaluation is submitted to the faculty member within two weeks of the class visit. (#1328, 3.3C).
7. The individual faculty unit employee being evaluated **shall** be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. There **shall** be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (CBA 15.14). Per policy #1328, 3.3A, all specific procedures and forms for peer evaluation of teaching are listed in this CE RTP criteria).

II.2.2.4. EVALUATIONS OF STUDENT ADVISING

Student advising and mentoring is recognized as an important part of the candidate's teaching responsibilities. The DRTP Committee shall consider the performance of the candidate in the area of student advising and mentoring (See Policy 1328, Section 2.1). Evidence for effective advising includes, but not limited to participating in the group advising sessions, attending university or college of engineering advising training workshops, and developing innovative advising activities.

The candidate shall describe and provide details of their student advising and mentoring activities by addressing:

1. How they effectively assist students in meeting graduation requirement by taking the right sequence of courses, assisting students subject to probation, applying the knowledge/policies learned in the advising training, advising awards, advise their master projects and theses, etc.

   How as an advisor of a student organization, they help students participate and success in various competitions and how they assist student in career matters.

Evidence of the advising activities should be mentioned, and details provided. Index should include list of documents

to be made available to DRTPC upon request (Policy 1328, Section 1.5).

II.3. DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE

The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in the appropriate edition of this document, all applicable university policies, and in the candidate's appointment letter (See Policy 1328 Section 2.3).

The deliberations of the committee shall remain confidential (1328 Section 1.10). Each committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the committee. The committee shall not assign any of its duties to any other group or individual.

The intent of this document is to provide criteria that will guide RTP candidates acquiring the experience and skills necessary to succeed as a member of the Civil Engineering faculty and to harmoniously contribute to the mission and vision of the Department.

Recognizing the primary importance of teaching and the maintenance of appropriate academic standards (Policy 1328 Section 2.1), RTP candidates should strive to become effective teachers, advisors, mentors and role models for our students. As stated in the Department strategic objective, we excel at delivering an inclusive, practice-oriented, world class Civil Engineering education that changes people's lives. At the same time, candidates should become effective in the other two major areas of an academic career which are scholarly activities and service. Minimum requirements have been established to ensure that RTP candidates participate at a minimum level in all three areas mentioned. The minimum requirements are more stringent for teaching and advising to reflect our commitment to student learning and instruction.

Finally, RTP candidates should pay close attention to the official comments and recommendations of the Department RTP Committee which will review the candidate's performance yearly. The intent is twofold:
- To identify areas of a candidate's performance that needs improvement. RTP candidates are expected to consciously address and demonstrate improvement in such areas.
- To guide the RTP candidates in their progress towards tenure and promotion in a manner that will serve the interests of the department as whole rather than individual interests which may not be consistent with the needs, priorities, and strategic objective of the Department.

II.4. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The candidate initiates all RTP requests, and shall prepare and submit a self-evaluation of performance in accordance with requirements and deadlines set forth and communicated by Academic Affairs.

The candidate shall identify and describe in adequate details all materials to be considered in their performance review. Supplementary documents, such as publications, reports, proposals, etc., may be cited, but copies of these documents shall not be included in the submittal. However, the candidate shall include an index of such documents and make them available upon request (Policy 1328, Section 1.5). The candidate should provide complete details of publications, grants, training, committees' service contributions, etc.

The candidate is responsible for making sure that the minimum number of course student evaluations are completed. The candidate also is responsible for including copies of all student course evaluations summaries and peer reviews in their submittal.

The candidate is responsible for including and addressing comments made by the peer reviewers, the CE RTPC, Dean, and URTPC in the previous cycle, when applicable.

The candidate is responsible for preparing the Statement of Teaching Performance. The statement should demonstrate how the candidate's activities have been integrated and have led them to achieve teaching excellence. The Statement of Teaching Performance should integrate all elements that define teaching excellence and demonstrate the progress achieved during the review period.

II.5. SPECIAL CASES

This section covers candidates and future candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also Policy 1328, section 2.1).

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, and the official University email address will be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

Candidates who are being considered for a positions inside or outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations (in terms of performance measures) during the time they are in such position. At the time that a faculty member decides to assume both faculty and administrative/other positions, a memorandum shall be written that sets forth the 12-month expectations of the candidate. The process should be initiated during academic year and with at least two months before the position is accepted. This process should be initiated by the faculty candidate, and it is their responsibility to request an initial meeting with the DRTPC to clarify the expectations for retention and promotion. With the information gathered at the meeting with the DRTPC, the initial draft of the memorandum should be prepared by the candidate where all the details (number of units of assigned time, length of the administrative appointment, etc.) of the position should be notified to the DRTPC.

The Department may articulate expectations for these exceptional situations in the Department RTP Criteria document. If these exceptions are not addressed in the Department criteria, then the candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing an interpretation of the Department criteria in light of the special circumstances.

The CE RTPC will finalize the memorandum and will meet with the candidate for clarification of performance measures' expectations, and to correct errors of fact. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the Dean, URTPC Chair, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs before the candidate leaves their full-time duties in the department. If the memorandum is approved all the faculty of the department should be notified. The faculty candidate should include a copy of the memorandum as part of their package in the following RTP actions.

II.6. PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The criteria described in this document intentionally provide some flexibility in the specific activities and accomplishments required to satisfy each criterion. Thus, to some degree, each candidate may chart an individual path that emphasizes his or her strengths and interests. However, this flexibility can create some uncertainty regarding the specific activities and accomplishments required to satisfy the requirements for an RTP action.

Therefore, all faculty who are subject to RTP actions shall develop and maintain a personal professional development

plan (PPDP) that outlines the specific activities and accomplishment they intend to pursue in order to satisfy the requirements for retention, tenure and promotion. The purpose of this plan is to provide a more formal means of soliciting and receiving feedback from the DRTPC and the Dean of the College of Engineering, and thus reduce the potential for misunderstandings and differences in expectations. However, the PPDP is not a contract, and failure to complete the items in the plan is not grounds for denial of a requested RTP action. Ultimately, the basis for reviewing such requests is the criteria outlined in this document.

A complete PPDP shall be included with each year's submittal and updated from previous submittals as appropriate. The length of the PPDP is left to the discretion of the candidate and it should include a brief reflection of the progress done during the period under review

SECTION III – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION

In this section, performance measures are first described broadly in accordance with the department's strategic objective and core values. Then, specific criteria for each RTP action are detailed based on these measures.

III.1. PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The candidate will be evaluated using the three different performance measures listed below.

- Teaching, advising, mentorship and other direct student contact activities.
- Research, scholarly, and professional development.
- Service to the department, college, university, greater community, and professional societies and organizations.

Sections III.1.1 through III.1.3 list activities, achievements, and products that can be used to evaluate the candidate development in each of the three performance measures. It is recognized that the three performance measures listed above are synergistic and in no way exclude each other. In their self-evaluation of performance, candidates should list activities, achievements, evaluation results or products of their research and scholarly work only once, in the category they find most appropriate. Candidates should also indicate where the activities they included, best commensurate to the various levels described below.

III.1.1. TEACHING ADVISING, MENTORSHIP AND OTHER DIRECT STUDENT CONTACT ACTIVITIES

As a primarily undergraduate teaching institution, Cal Poly Pomona strives for all faculty to achieve teaching excellence in an inclusive learning environment. To support faculty with this, endeavor the Civil Engineering department has adopted a teaching and learning model that is based on five different overarching themes:

1. **Discipline competence and discovery:** actively engaging in pedagogical training (trainee and/or trainer), engaging in the pursuit of knowledge of disciplinary content and pedagogical methods with measurable performance.
2. **Assessment and self-reflection:** Evaluating the effectiveness of instructional methods, objectives, and/or student learning outcomes with the goal of learning from and improving on one's own teaching in order to improve student achievement of learning outcomes.
3. **Innovation and application: Implementing** appropriate experimentation and/or innovative strategies in order to improve student learning and foster interest in the subject matter. Engaging with the scholarship of teaching and learning as a means to develop and/or implement innovative techniques and pedagogies.
4. **Interdisciplinary and integration**: Collaborating, integrating, and drawing conclusions across disciplines that intersect with the faculty member's area of expertise so as to enhance student learning.
5. **Polytechnic inclusive learning environment**: Using on-campus resources to develop accessible instruction materials, applying high impact practices, using cross-disciplinary collaborations and continuous development, to promote and establish a Polytechnic inclusive learning environment inside and outside the classroom.

The criteria to evaluate Teaching Advising, Mentorship And Other Direct Student Contact Activities has three elements, which should be addressed in context of the Teaching and Learning Model, which are (A) Teaching and advising competency, (B) Teaching and advising development and application, (C) Teaching effectiveness and advising effectiveness. The sections below detail the various activities pertinent to each of the three elements.

A. **Teaching and Advising Competency:**
   A summary of the training and development in the pedagogical and advising areas for the period of the review should be prepared and provided by the candidate. Examples of activities appropriate for this category are:
   1. Certifications obtained
   2. Courses and seminars attended

3. Pedagogical or advising tools and strategies learned
4. Participation in special projects/workshops
5. Any other substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to teaching and advising competency

B. **Teaching and Advising Development and Application**
The candidate should provide information regarding high impact practices/interventions adopted from the training/workshops attended and how they were used to develop their teaching-learning activities further. Examples of performance measures appropriate for this category are:
1. Development of new courses for the curriculum (including various delivery modes like hybrid, Hyflex, etc.).
2. Improvement and update existing courses.
3. Implementation of innovations in student learning (e.g., inquiry-based learning, service learning, alternative delivery methods) as appropriate to the subject matter.
4. Integration of appropriate technologies in support of effective teaching and learning.
5. Participate in team teaching.
6. Teaching a variety of catalogue courses within their technical area, as well as contributing to the department service courses, per department needs and group plans.
7. Teaching graduate catalogue courses in their area of expertise (if the technical area includes a graduate program), per department needs and group plans.
8. Teaching special studies classes.
9. Development and presentation of non-credit or for-credit courses, seminars, or workshops.
10. Scholarly work aimed at facilitating student learning such as textbooks, laboratory manuals, software applications, online training materials and other media (e.g. web sites, videos, animations, photographs), especially those materials that are adopted by other universities.
11. Participation in teaching learning communities, teaching workshops, peer coaching, mentoring, or teaching brown bags.
12. Measuring value of teaching innovations as shown through outcome assessment, survey, examination, or other methodology.
13. Successful implementation of accessible materials and tools (like increasing the Ally scores above 85%), development of activities/actions that promote Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the classroom environment or applied by students as part of the engineering practice.
14. Serving as thesis or project advisor for graduate students.
15. Advising senior projects.
16. Developing and implementing new advising strategies.
17. Student achievements for activities performed under the candidate's mentorship
18. Application of knowledge acquired through participation in seminars, workshops, certification programs or conferences.
19. Involvement in a leadership/mentorship capacity in student clubs, organizations, and other student activities.
20. Letters, awards and recognitions received for excellence in teaching, academic advising, mentorship and other direct student contact activities.
21. Any other substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to teaching development and application

C. **Teaching Effectiveness and Advising Effectiveness**
Teaching effectiveness will be measured by analysis of various evaluation instruments. Measures include:
1. **Student evaluations of teaching and grade distribution.** Report of the scores of course teaching evaluations for each course taught. Candidates should include longitudinal progress in each course taught more than once, the longitudinal progress for all averages for all courses taught (during the period under review) and a summary of all the courses average and standard deviation scores during the period under review, as indicated in policy 1328. Candidates should reflect on how the efforts conducted to improve student learning are tied and/or are reflected in the student course evaluations

and grade distribution. Teaching evaluations should be classified according to the program level (I.e., freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate). The course enrollment and the University delivery mode (synchronous, in person hybrid, Hyflex, etc.) should also be specified.

Although weights given to measures of student teaching evaluations may vary for individual situations, they will not solely be considered for the evaluation of teaching performance and their consideration will be integrated with other elements of teaching effectiveness included in the RTP packet. As such, the choice of a numeric value to define "Good teaching" is subject to the difficulty of the course material and the curricular level of the course (sophomore vs. junior etc.). Therefore, rather than dictate an appropriate value as a "baseline of excellence", faculty should use the student evaluation of teaching scores to make an integrated statement, along with other data, on teaching effectiveness in any given period. Given that CPP is a primarily teaching institution, the lack of addressing concerns suggested by low student teaching evaluation's scores over a two-year period or for tenure and/or promotion applications, along with lack of progress on other metrics of teaching effectiveness, may trigger a "below expectation" rating leading to an overall unsatisfactory evaluation. It is recommended that faculty raise the bar for all measures of teaching effectiveness for upper-level, and discipline-specific courses. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a statement of teaching performance supporting evidence.

2. **Peer evaluation.** Candidate should describe what measures were taken in response to the comments provided in the peer evaluations. Candidate should include all the copies of the peer evaluations conducted during the review period.

3. **Assessment of course educational outcomes.** These are based on specific milestones, rubrics and/or course assessment tools and reports. Candidates will determine what tools or methods are best to assess the educational outcomes.

4. **Standardized evaluations.** Standardized University evaluation forms and other course-based student assessment of instruction including course and class exit surveys. If the CPP Office of Assessment and Program Review, the College of Engineering or other CSU entity have conducted assessment in courses taught by the candidate, candidates could use the results of such assessments as supporting evidence in their teaching effectiveness statement.

5. **External measures.** Other supporting evidence in the statement of teaching effectiveness are objective measurement of student attainment of learning outcomes such as the Fundamentals of Engineering examination, LEED certification tests, employer evaluations of internship and/or coop experiences, receiving clear national or international recognition or awards as an educator, etc.

As part of the self-reflection, applicants should include a Statement of Teaching Performance. In the Statement of Teaching Performance candidates should focus on integrating qualitative and quantitative measures of the work developed for classroom and outside the classroom instruction, and the results of the different evaluations. All five elements that define teaching effectiveness should be integrated to discuss and demonstrate the candidate's progress achieved during the review period. Thus, assessment of the student course evaluations, course grade distribution, peer evaluations, and other evaluations, should be used to demonstrate the achievement of the performance measures. Other activities related to student advising and/or mentoring should also be included. Examples of performance measures appropriate for this category include but are not limited to those listed in Section III.I.I, Part B, Teaching Development and Application.

A faculty member's Teaching, advising and mentorship activities shall be rated as **"Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Below Expectations".** To guide the candidates and the DRTPC committee members, below are definitions of the three ratings:

  "Exceeds Expectations" – Exemplary, clear, and thoughtful Statement of Teaching Performance and self-assessment of teaching, by addressing the three main elements of teaching, as well as the required

evaluations detailed in Section II.2.2. as follows:

(a) Teaching and Advising Competency should include a summary of the development in the teaching area for the period of the review. The narrative should include two activities demonstrating competency from the Section III.1.1, Part A.

(b) Teaching and Advising Development and Application should show evidence of teaching and advising development activities. This should include at least three activities from Section III.1.1, Part B.

(c) Teaching Effectiveness and Advising Effectiveness should provide evidence of the efficacy and progress of teaching and advising using results from various evaluations. This should include the student evaluations of teaching with average course rating of "Good" to "Very Good" with an average course rating below 1.5), evaluation of grade distribution, "Very Good" peer evaluations, and additional evaluations as listed in Section III.1.1, Part C.

"Meets Expectations" - Clear and thoughtful Statement of Teaching Performance and self-assessment of teaching by addressing three main elements, as well as the required evaluations detailed in Section II.2.2. as follows:

(a) Teaching Competency should include a summary of the development in the teaching area for the period of the review. The narrative should include at least one activity demonstrating competency from Section III.1.1, Part A.

(b) Teaching and Advising Development and Application should show evidence of teaching and advising development activities. This should include at least two activities from Section III.1.1, Part.

(c)
　　Teaching Effectiveness and Advising Effectiveness should provide evidence of the efficacy and progress of teaching and advising using results from various evaluations. This should include at least quantitative measure such as evaluations of teaching rating of "Good" to "Very Good" with an average course rating below 2.0, evaluation of grade distribution, "Good" peer evaluations. Please refer to Section III.1.1, Part C for details.

"Below Expectations" – the evidence presented shows lack of improvement based on evaluation results and feedback. Incomplete and inadequate self-assessment of teaching not addressing thoroughly the three main aspects listed above, as well as a faculty course average rating of above 3 for courses taught during the review period. An RTP package that doesn't or inadequately addresses poor rankings on student course evaluations, or feedback provided by the CE RTPC, Dean, or URTPC will fall in this category.

As a guide for the candidates while preparing their RTP package, the following samples are attached to Appendix XX of this CE RTP document

1. Sample of a Statement of Teaching Performance
2. Samples for assessment conducted in the classroom
3. Samples for reporting scores of course teaching evaluation
4. Samples for reporting student grade distribution

III.1.2. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Candidates should describe the products of their research, scholarly, and professional development activities. The following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several "hierarchical" indicators of performance. Indicators have three levels (Level I, Level II and Level II) that are classified according to the significance of the work done by the candidates. Candidates should exercise best judgment in describing all details to better explain the activity performed, such as specific citation of all peer reviewed publications, names of all authors (PI's and Co-PI's), dates of presentation at professional meetings and other scholarly activities including grants and contracts, and explicit references to all duties and assignments in professional organizations.

Level I

1. Externally funded grants/contracts ($50K or more) as Principal Investigator or Co-PI (include name of project, funding agency, overall project scope of work, names of all PIs/co-PIs, total project amount, candidate's amount, role on project, candidate's amount, role on project, contribution in proposal writing, area of contribution to the project.)

2. Published peer-reviewed publication of original work in one's technical area of expertise (include all authors, date of publication, journal name, year, volume, pages, etc.)

3. Papers published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings (include all authors, date of publication, conference name, year, etc.) in one's technical area of expertise including educational research

4. Journal or Special Issues Editors

5. Achieving Fellow status in the American Society of Civil Engineers or in other comparable professional societies.

6. Relevant professional practice that is challenging, unusual, or a precedent-setting project.

7. Obtaining additional professional licenses and certifications beyond that required for tenure. Licenses issued by state licensing boards are especially valued,

8. Active engagement in continuing education, such as participation in short courses, gaining proficiency in new software, expanding one's technical knowledge, etc. This includes completion of appropriate non- credit or for-credit university coursework or short courses.

9. Serving as expert witness in legal matters.

10. Receiving clear national or international recognition as a leader. Examples would include being invited as a keynote speaker in a major conference such as those sponsored by ASCE or comparable organization, receiving a national award from ASCE, or other comparable accomplishments.

11. Receiving the outstanding Provost's awards for excellence in scholarly and creative activities, or receiving another Cal Poly Pomona award of similar caliber. Awards issued by entities outside the university could be considered if sufficiently noteworthy.

12. Any substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to this level.

Level II

1. Externally funded grants/contracts (less than $50k) as Principal Investigator or Co-PI (describe name of project, funding agency, overall project scope of work, names of all PIs/co-PIs, total project amount, candidate's amount, role on project, contribution in proposal writing, area of contribution to the project)

2. Externally submitted/under review/ not awarded grants or contracts as Principal Investigator or Co-PI (describe name of project, funding agency, overall project scope of work, names of all PIs/co-PIs, total project amount, candidate's amount, role on project, contribution in proposal writing, area of contribution to the project)

3. Internally funded research grants

4. Submitted or under review peer-reviewed publication of original work in one's technical area of expertise (include all authors, date of publication, journal/conference name, year, volume, pages, etc.)

5. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings

6. Papers published in non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings

7. Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)

8. Published book reviews

9. Non-peer reviewed articles or books

10. Manuscripts revised based on reviewer feedback and are under second review

11. Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)

12. Any substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to this level.

Level III

1. Published peer-reviewed abstracts

2. Seminars/Workshops/Training: Name of the training, date, benefit.

3. Attendance of conferences/workshops in education or technical area

4. Research in progress, such as unfunded research project collaborations that just started and papers in progress.
5. Any substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to this level.

A faculty member's research, scholarly and professional development activities shall be rated as "**Exceeds Expectations", "Good", "Below Expectations".** To guide the candidates and the DRTPC committee members, below are definitions of the three ratings:

"Exceed Expectations" - appropriate rating when a faculty member has five or more indicators in Level I (with Indicator 2 being one of them), five or more indicators in Level II, and at least two indicators in Level III, thus surpassing the requirements for a rating of "good."

"Meets Expectations" -   appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least three indicators in Level I (with Indicator 2 being one of them), five indicators in Level II, and at least two indicators in Level III.

" Below Expectations" - appropriate rating when a probationary faculty member in year two or year three is not making clear progress toward reaching the standard for a rating of 'Good" as described above.

Indicators in Level I will suffice the requirements for Level II and Level III. Indicators in Level II will suffice the requirements from Level III.

III.1.3. SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

Candidates should describe their service activities at the various levels mentioned below. The following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several "hierarchical" indicators of performance. Indicators have three levels (Level I, Level II and Level II, Level IV?) that are classified according to the significance of the work done by the candidates. Candidates should exercise best judgment in describing all details to better explain the significance of the activity performed, such as contribution to the committee, leading a subgroup on a task, duties, and assignments. List is not comprehensive and candidates are not expected to engage in all the activities implied.

Level I

1. Service to professional societies by being an officer, chairing committees or task forces, or other leadership activities.
2. Chairing Department, College, or University committees.
3. Representing the university at CSU-level events, such as being a senator and effectively carrying out the associated duties and responsibilities
4. Planning and implementing improvements in classroom and laboratory facilities and capabilities (includes equipment, furniture, software, etc.) that extend beyond one's single course.
5. Chair Ad-hoc committees that address urgent and critical issues, and heavily contribute to the department strategic objective and core values
6. Establishing MOUs, partnerships, or other agreements that result in significant in-kind or consistent funding to the department as a result of cultivating relationships with donors
7. Active involvement and leadership in professional associations or CPP established programs of outreach and recruitment activities for K-12, community college students, and other audiences.
8. Pro-bono engineering service to community or non-profit organizations.
9. Service on engineering-related advisory or governing boards
10. Elected or appointed to work on public policy matters related to engineering
11. Teaching short courses, seminars, and other similar activities directed toward practicing professionals.
12. Being named as the outstanding advisor for the College of Engineering, receiving the outstanding Provost's awards for excellence in service or other awards of similar caliber whether internally or by entities outside the university.

13. Program planner or session organizer at professional conferences
14. Any substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to this level.

Level II

1. Being a laboratory coordinator, and effectively carrying out the associated duties and responsibilities.
2. Leading a task/subcommittee as part of Department, College, University committees, or the University Senate committees
3. Chair of Ad Hoc Department Committees
4. Representing the university at CSU-level events.
5. Service to professional societies. Being an active member and effectively carrying out the associated duties and responsibilities
6. Reviewer of professional journals/conference papers/books
7. Workshop/seminar coordinator
8. Active participation in outreach and recruitment activities for K-12, community college students and other audiences.
9. Establishing connections with potential donors that secure funding to the university.
10. Any substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to this level.

Level III

1. Being a member of Department, College, or University committees.
2. Being a course coordinator and effectively carrying out the associated duties and responsibilities.
3. Membership in professional organizations for at least one year
4. Participating in university-wide assessments.
5. Attendance and active participation in department meetings
6. Participation in commencement, open house, project symposium day, and other special events at Department, College and University level.
7. Featured media interviews that promote the Civil Engineering Department.
8. Volunteer in one time academic/service activities.
9. Service on public or private school boards or advisory committees
10. Any substantiated activities the candidate deems relevant to this level.

Service activities not directly related to engineering or education are commendable but have little or no bearing on RTP evaluations. Examples include: volunteer coaching in a youth athletics program, serving as an officer or volunteer in a church or other religious organization, serving as a volunteer or board member of a charitable organization, such as the Red Cross, and

A faculty member's service activities shall be rated as **"Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", or "Below Expectations".** A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be used in the case when tenure or promotion are not granted. To guide the candidates and the DRTPC committee members, below are definitions of the three ratings:

"Exceeds Expectations" - appropriate rating when a faculty member has three or more indicators in Level I, four or more indicators in Level II , and five or more indicators in Level III.

"Meets Expectations" - appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least two indicators in Level I, three or more indicators in Level II, and five or more indicators in Level III.

"Below Expectations" - appropriate rating when a second or third year faculty member is not on track to meet the standards for a rating of either "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations".

Indicators in Level I will suffice the requirements for Level II and Level III. Indicators in Level II will suffice the requirements from Level III.

III.2. CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION

Candidates for RTP action will be evaluated per the criteria in Sections III.2.1 through III.2.8, as applicable, and the following:

- The material presented in the candidate's RTP submittal
- Signed comments received by the committee in the course of the RTP process
- Conformance with the criteria for the RTP action being requested, including the rating requirements
- Evidence of growth and potential for continued growth
- Documents in the candidate's personnel action file
- Department records of teaching and advising, research, scholarly and professional development activities, and service.

III.2.1. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

As assistant professors develop experience teaching and advising at CPP, they will engage in learning and applying methods to assess the teaching and learning process in their classrooms and outside of the classroom. Implementation of the in and outside-classroom assessment should show how the faculty member has used the process to identify areas for improvement and how the results have led to develop their instructional and advising performance consistently and effectively, following the guidelines in section III.1.1. Progress made in research, scholarly and professional development should follow the guidelines in section III.1.2. Service activities to the department, college, university and community should abide the guidelines in section III.1.3.

Candidates should demonstrate clear and consistent progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure (III.2.3.) and promotion to associate professor (III.2.5.). There must be sufficient improvement in previously identified areas of weakness, and the activities during the evaluation period must be such that there is reasonable expectation of satisfying the requirements for tenure and promotion in a timely fashion. This means achieving a rating of "Exceed Expectations", "Good", or "Below Expectations" in the three performance measures, for 2nd and 3rd year faculty. Fourth year faculty must receive a rating of "Good" or "Exceed expectations" relative to their progress in all three performance measures towards meeting tenure requirements.

Action	Year	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.1)
Reappointment	**2** **3**	Exceed Expectations/Good/ Below Expectations	Exceed Expectations/Good/ Below Expectations	Exceed Expectations/Good/ Below Expectations	Meet
	4	Good/ Exceed Expectations	Good/ Exceed Expectations	Good/ Exceed Expectations	Meet

The DRTPC will review candidates under "performance review" or "periodic evaluation" (Policy 1328, Section 7). RTP packages for candidates under "periodic evaluation" should include all the information in the period since the previous application.

III.2.2. CRITERIA FOR RETENTION AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Demonstrate clear and consistent progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure (III.2.3.) and promotion to professor (III.2.7.). There must be sufficient improvement in previously identified areas of weakness, and the activities during the evaluation period must be such that there is reasonable expectation of satisfying the requirements for tenure and promotion in a timely fashion.

III.2.3. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Candidates for tenure should prepare their RTP package following the guidelines in section III.1 and must meet all the following expectations:
   a) Satisfaction of all requirements for promotion to associate professor (III.2.5), if the candidate is currently at the assistant professor level.
   b) Completion of 6 years of full-time service in the Civil Engineering Department at Cal Poly Pomona, less any service credit granted at the time of the initial appointment. This requirement must be satisfied

before the effective date of tenure (i.e. by the end of the academic year in which the application is submitted).

c) Rated at least as "Good" in teaching in the last two consecutive years, as well as completing Indicators 6 and 7 under the "Teaching and Advising Development and Application" List in Section III.1.1.

d) Published at least one (1) peer reviewed paper per year of service at CPP, with 2 being journal papers.

e) Securing, and demonstrating effective performance as Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Co-Principal Investigator, for at least two funded projects (internal or external).

f) Completing the following Indicators under Section III.1.3:

- Indicator 1 under Level I
- Indicator 1 under Level II or Indicator 2 under Level III
- Three activities representing Indicator 1 under Level III
- Indicator 3 under Level III

g) Completion of all other requirements outlined in the initial appointment letter.

h) A positive recommendation which would require the following minimum DRTPC ratings:

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.5)
Tenure	Exceed Expectations	Good	Good	Meet
OR				
Tenure	Good	Exceed Expectations	Good	Meet

According to criteria III.2.3.(a), assistant professors must concurrently apply for and be granted promotion to associate professor in order to obtain tenure, which implicitly requires satisfying the teaching, scholarly and service requirements for promotion.

A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be used in the case when tenure is not granted. An untenured associate professor could conceivably receive tenure but not be concurrently promoted to professor.

III.2.4. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE

Candidates for early tenure should prepare their RTP package following the guidelines in section III.1 and must meet all the following expectations:

a) Satisfaction of all the requirements for tenure (III.2.3) other than the 6-year service requirement.

b) Satisfaction of all requirements for promotion to associate professor (III.2.5) or professor (III.2.7), as applicable.

c) Completion of at least four (4) years of full-time tenure-track service in the Department. This requirement must be satisfied before the effective date of tenure (i.e. by the end of the academic year in which the application is submitted).

d) Published at least 9 peer reviewed papers (including conference and journal publications) before the early tenure application, at least 4 of which being journal papers.

e) Securing and demonstrating effective performance as Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Co-Principal Investigator of at least three different funded projects, with one being external as PI.

f) Being licensed as a Professional Engineer or Land Surveyor in the United States as appropriate for one's specialty and teaching assignments, no later than the date of application for promotion to professor. If licensed in California, this would consist of being either a licensed civil engineer or a licensed land surveyor. In other states, comparable licenses, including licensed environmental engineer, are acceptable.

g) International, national, and/or regional recognition or awards in engineering education or the candidates'
    area of technical expertise.

h) A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings:

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.3.)	Criteria (III.2.5.)
Early Tenure	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations	Meet Expectations	Meet	Meet

Candidates should clearly demonstrate a record of accomplishments as described in Policy 1328, section 2.6., which are exceptional and well beyond those required for promotion and tenure, as depicted by the criteria listed above. It is the responsibility of the candidate to organize the information and provide details to demonstrate that the ranking of "Exceed expectations" is met.

III.2.5. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should prepare their RTP package following the guidelines in section III.1 and must meet all the following expectations:

a) Satisfy all the expectations for retention for tenure (Section III.2.3).
b) Rated at least as "Good" in teaching in the last two consecutive years, as well as completing indicators 6 and 7 under the "Teaching and Advising Development and Application" List.
c) Published at least 1-peer reviewed paper per year of service at CPP, with 2 being journal papers.
d) Securing and demonstrating effective performance as Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Co-Principal Investigator for at least two funded projects (internal or external).
e) Completing the following Indicators under Section III.1.3:
    - Indicator 1 under Level I
    - Indicator 1 under Level II <u>or</u> Indicator 2 under Level III
    - Three activities representing Indicator 1 under Level III
    - Indicator 3 under Level III
f) Completion of all other requirements outlined in the initial appointment letter.
g) A positive recommendation requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings:

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.3)
Promotion to Associate Professor	Exceed Expectations	Good	Good	Meet
OR				
Promotion to Associate Professor	Good	Exceed Expectations	Good	Meet

Candidates should demonstrate continuous improvement in areas identified as needing improvement by the DRTPC in their official reviews of the candidate's RTP packages. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should provide a plan for their development towards Full Professors using the guidelines in Section III.1.

III.2.6. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Candidates for early promotion to Associate Professor should prepare their RTP package following the guidelines in section III.1 and must meet all the following expectations:

a) Must satisfy all the requirements for promotion to associate professor as described in section III.2.5 and

Section II.2.4.
   b) Completed at least four years of service as assistant professor
   c) Rated as "Exceeds Expectations" in all performance measures, including teaching; research scholarly and professional development activities: and service activities.
   d) Published at least 9 peer reviewed papers (including conference and journal publications) before the early tenure application, at least 4 of which being journal papers.
   e) Securing and demonstrating e effective performance as Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Co-Principal Investigator of at least three different funded projects, with one being external as PI.
   f) International, national and/or regional recognition or awards in engineering education or the candidates' area of technical expertise.*
   g) A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings:

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.4.)	Criteria (III.2.5.)
Early Promotion to Associate Professor	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations	Meet	Meet

Candidates must clearly demonstrate a record of accomplishments as described in Policy 1328, section 2.6., which are exceptional and well beyond those required for promotion and tenure, as depicted by the criteria listed. In addition, promotion to associate professor cannot precede tenure, so candidates for early promotion must also satisfy the requirements for early tenure.

III.2.7. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

To prepare their RTP packages candidates should follow the teaching excellence, advising and mentoring guidelines in Section III.1.1. Progress made in research, scholarly and professional development should follow the guidelines in Section III.1.2. The service activities to the department, college, university and community should abide the guidelines in Section III.1.3. RTP package should clearly demonstrate continuous improvement in areas identified as needing improvement by the DRTPC in their official reviews of the previous period of evaluation. The decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record of sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all performance measures.

In addition, candidates must meet all the following expectations:
   a) Satisfaction of the expectations for reappointment for tenure (Section III.2.3), and demonstrate sound evidence of leadership in the service and teaching and/or research/scholarly performance measures.
   b) A minimum of 6 years of service as tenure-track or tenured faculty member of the department, of which a minimum of four years as service as associate professor in the department. These requirements must be satisfied before the effective date of tenure (i.e. by the end of the academic year in which the application is submitted).
   c) Rated at least as "Good" in teaching in the last two consecutive years, as well as completing indicators 6 and 7, and indicators 14, or 15, or 17 under the "Teaching and Advising Development and Application" List.
   d) Published at least 1-peer reviewed paper per year of service at CPP, with 3 being (specify type of) journal papers (with at least one being a first author).
   e) Securing and demonstrating effective performance as Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Co-Principal Investigator of at least two funded projects, with one being external.
   f) Completing indicator 6 under Level 1 in Section III.1.3, and 3 activities representing indicator 4 under Level

3 in Section III.1.3.

Completing the following Indicators under Section III.1.3:

- Indicator 1 under Level I
- Indicator 1 under Level II <u>or</u> Indicator 2 under Level III
- Three activities representing Indicator 1 under Level III
- Indicator 3 under Level III

g) Being licensed as a Professional Engineer or Land Surveyor in the United States as appropriate for one's specialty and teaching assignments, no later than the date of application for promotion to professor. If licensed in California, this would consist of being either a licensed civil engineer or a licensed land surveyor. In other states, comparable licenses, including licensed environmental engineer, are acceptable.

h) A positive recommendation requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings:

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.3)
Promotion to Professor	Exceed Expectations	Good	Good	Meet
OR				
Promotion to Professor	Good	Good	Exceed Expectations	Meet
OR				
Promotion to Professor	Good	Exceed Expectations	Good	Meet

Also, candidates should demonstrate continuous improvement in areas identified as needing improvement by the DRTPC in their official reviews of the candidate's RTP packages.

III.2.8 CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

To prepare their RTP packages candidates should follow the teaching excellence, advising and mentoring guidelines in Section III.1.1. Progress made in research, scholarly and professional development should follow the guidelines in Section III.1.2. The service activities to the department, college, university and community should abide the guidelines in Section III.1.3. In addition, candidates must meet all the following expectations:

a) Satisfaction of all the requirements for promotion to professor as described in Section III.2.7.

b) Must have completed a minimum of four (4) years of service as tenure-track or tenured faculty member of the department, of which at least two years of service as an associate professor in the Department (Policy 1328, Section 2.6). These service times must be completed before the early promotion to professor would take effect (i.e. typically at the end of the academic year during which the request is submitted). Rated as "Exceeds Expectations" in all evaluation categories including teaching, research scholarly and professional development activities, and service activities.

c) Published at least 8 peer reviewed papers (including conference and journal publications) before the early tenure application, at least 4 of which being (specify type of) journal papers (with at least two being a first author).

d) Demonstrate effective performance as Principal Investigator (PI), Program Director, or Co-Principal Investigator of at least three different funded projects, with one being external as PI.

e) International, national, and/or regional recognition or awards in engineering education or the candidates' area of technical expertise.

f) Clearly demonstrate a record of accomplishments as described in Policy 1328, section 2.6., which are exceptional and well beyond those required for promotion and tenure, as depicted by the criteria listed.

g) A positive recommendation normally requires the following minimum DRTPC ratings:

Action	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Criteria (III.2.7.)
Early Promotion to Professor	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations	Good	Meet
OR				
	Exceed Expectations	Good	Exceed Expectations	Meet
OR				
	Good	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations	Meet

In addition, promotion to professor cannot precede tenure, so candidates for early promotion must also satisfy the requirements for early tenure.