

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**

**RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA**

Academic Years 2023-2024 through 2027-2028

	Page
Section I – Introduction	2
I.1.    Definitions	2
I.2.    Department Philosophy	
Section II – Procedures	4
II.1.   Policy No: 1328 (Formerly Appendix 16) Summary	4
II.2.   Department RTP Procedures	4
II.3.   Student Evaluation of Teaching	7
II.4.   Peer Evaluation of Teaching	7
II.5.   Candidates on Leave or Serving in Administrative or Governance Positions	8
Section III – Criteria for RTP Action	10
III.1.  Elements of Performance and Evaluation	10
III.2.  Criteria for Reappointment	14
III.3.  Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	14
III.4.  Criteria for Promotion Professor	15
III.5.  Criteria for Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor	16
III.6.  Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor	16
APPENDIX A.    Student Evaluation Questionnaire and Procedure Statements	19
APPENDIX B.    Peer Evaluation Questionnaire	20
APPENDIX C.    Alternative Weighting Contract Form	21

## Section I – Introduction

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. The Department RTP Criteria 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. University policies include the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), Policy No 1328 of the University (formerly Appendix 16) and Appendix 10 of the University Manual defines university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and, in particular, what they must achieve in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

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.1. DEFINITIONS

Policy No 1328 of the University (Formerly Appendix 16) provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

- A. **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- B. The **Department RTP Committee** (DRTPC) shall consist of full-time, tenured and Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty (Section 1.17). The membership size for a DRTPC shall be: three (3) to seven (7) for departments with ten (10) or fewer full-time faculty eligible to serve, five (5) to nine (9) for departments with eleven (11) to seventeen (17) full-time tenured faculty eligible to serve, seven (7) to fifteen (15) for departments with eighteen (18) or more full-time faculty eligible to serve. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members (see also Policy No 1328 section 3.1).
- C. **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16). 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. Adoption of the Department RTP Document, describing the criteria and procedures, shall be accomplished by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in that department. The department chair shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy of the approved Department RTP Document. RTP evaluations at all levels, including deans and other administrative levels, shall apply the approved department RTP criteria.(see also Policy No 1328 Section 2.0)
- D. A **probationary year** of service includes consecutive terms of an academic year. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.
- E. A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.
- F. A **probationary faculty unit employee** shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time he/she is considered for tenure. The promotion of a tenured faculty unit employee shall normally be

effective the beginning of the sixth (6th) year after appointment to his/her current academic rank/classification. In such cases, the performance review for promotion shall take place during the year preceding the effective date of the promotion. This provision shall not apply if the faculty unit employee requests in writing that he/she not be considered. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**. (see also Policy No 1328 Section 2.0)

- G. **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities, and university service.
- H. **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by Appendix 10 of the University Manual and the CBA.
- I. **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabus & other teaching materials, and a written report.
- J. **Performance review** is defined by policy 1328, section 7.3 as an “actionable” evaluation process conducted by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), dean, URTPC, and Provost that “results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure and/or promotion” (see also CBA 15.38). Only through a performance review can a candidate apply for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
- K. **Periodic evaluation** is a non-actionable abbreviated review process defined by policy 1328, section 7.3 as “an intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the DRTPC, Department Chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and Dean,” which “does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions.”
- L. A **candidate for reappointment** must use the Department RTP criteria in effect at the time of the candidate’s initial probationary appointment. *Current* procedures and policies apply.
- M. A **candidate for tenure or promotion** 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.

## I.2. DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY

- A. This document fulfills all requirements for directing candidates seeking reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department. It incorporates Appendix 10 and Policy No 1328 of the University Manual, and the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, and documents incorporated therein. No other documents and criteria are applicable.
- B. The Department of Geography and Anthropology hopes that a hiring decision will lead to a tenure decision. Thus, the RTP process should be viewed as a collaborative effort in which the department is as motivated as the candidate to see the candidate move through the tenure and promotion process. Candidates will receive constructive feedback throughout their probationary years. It is expected that candidates will either show consistently good performance or will show steady progress toward successful tenure. In other words, if a candidate shows good performance early in the period, it is expected that they will continue to perform well and continue to show reasonable forward progress from their good early performance; if the department identifies some areas that need to be improved early in a candidate’s career, it is expected that they will address these areas in a corrective manner within a reasonable time frame. In the RTP document candidates should develop a professional plan stating goals consistent with their abilities, interests, department missions and goals, and the DRTPC criteria. This will be used to help guide candidates in areas they want to pursue and assist the DRTPC in evaluating the degree to which candidates are making progress towards their stated goals. Of course, such goals can change over time, and candidates are free to revise their professional plans in consultation with the DRTPC.
- C. Candidates are evaluated for teaching performance, service at any level within the university and the community, and professional development/scholarly activity. In evaluating a candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion the review groups will consider these evaluation areas in light of

the candidate's reappointment level, past performance, and improvement. A candidate lacking in any one area will not receive a positive recommendation.

- D. In addition to teaching, scholarly activity, and service, the criteria also address the following circumstances: provision for the evaluation of faculty serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties; provision for evaluation of faculty serving in academic governance; and consideration of the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, or visiting professor/scholar at another institution.
- E. Reappointment means that the candidate is re-applying for the next probationary year. Reappointment, beyond the second year, is not automatic and must be requested. If the initial appointment allowed for one- or two-years credit, then application for reappointment must take place at the beginning of the last year of the initial appointment period. Successful candidates will be reappointed to the next probationary year. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their first or second probationary year will be terminated effective with the end of the current academic year. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their third, fourth, or fifth year will be granted reappointment with terminal year.
- F. Tenure is the status conferred on the candidate by the University which grants continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Tenure is requested at the beginning of the sixth probationary year or earlier if the candidate seeks early tenure. Candidates successful in obtaining tenure will be reappointed with tenure. Failure to obtain tenure at the end of the sixth probationary year results in the granting of reappointment to terminal year.
- G. Promotion means the candidate seeks a change in rank commensurate with accomplishments deserving merit and recognition. The candidate is eligible for regular promotion if he/she has four years in his/her current rank and may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. The candidate is eligible for early promotion if he/she has less than four years in his/her current rank and may apply at the beginning of any RTP cycle. Candidates successful in obtaining a promotion will be in the new rank beginning the next academic year.
- H. Candidates are required to assemble an RTP package which documents accomplishments and makes a positive case for the requested action. In preparation of this package and before submittal, the candidate is invited to seek counsel from the Department RTP Committee regarding the preparation of the RTP package.

## **Section II – Procedures**

### **II.1. POLICY NO 1328 SUMMARY**

Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) describes RTP procedures in complete detail. A summary is provided here.

### **II.2. DEPARTMENT RTP PROCEDURES**

#### **A. Department RTP Committee**

1. The Department RTP Committee (committee) is responsible for ensuring the integrity of the RTP process within the Department. The committee structure and function shall conform to Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16), Section 3.1 of the University Manual.
2. The committee shall consist of full time, tenured faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty and, if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the department, faculty members participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). FERP participants must be employed through the entire academic year and such participation must be approved in advance by the President. The committee(s) will consist of three members, all tenured and of higher rank than candidates in cases that include action.

The chair of the DRTPC committee will be elected by the elected members.

If too few faculty members are available to form a committee for all or some aspect of a committee's work, the committee shall consult with the College RTP committee and name faculty members from outside the Department to supplement the committee.

3. The committee shall be elected by secret ballot by March 1 of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The committee's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the committee's recommendations have been concluded. After the election of the committee, the Department Chair will notify the Dean of the composition of the committee.
4. The Department Chair will serve on the committee unless he/she is untenured or for any other reason ineligible to serve.
5. No committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Also, in promotion considerations, the committee members must have higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Tenured candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any promotion or tenure actions considered by the committee. However, tenured candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the committee.
6. Faculty on Professional Leave with Pay (sabbatical and difference in pay) may participate in committee activities. Faculty, who know in advance that they will, during one term or more, be unavailable or ineligible should not be nominees for the committee.
7. The committee shall elect a chair by vote among the elected members who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the Departmental RTP document and Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual are carried out. The Department RTP Chair shall perform the following duties:
  - a) Give written notice to each candidate who is eligible for a regular RTP action;
  - b) Post electronically and in department hallways notice of RTP action including directions and deadlines for submission of student comments;
  - c) Present to the RTP candidates all appropriate forms;
  - d) Provide each RTP candidate a copy of the University RTP Calendar for the current academic year;
  - e) Provide a copy of the Department RTP Document to each RTP candidate and to new faculty who will need the document for preparation of their RTP package the following academic year;
  - f) Schedule, in cooperation with the RTP candidates and other faculty, the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance;
  - g) Be the official custodian of the candidate's RTP package between the submission of the package to the committee by the candidate and forwarding of the package to the Dean. In this period, the committee chair and only the committee chair shall be responsible for any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.
8. The committee's duties include the following:
  - a) Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to Department and University policy;
  - b) Soliciting input from students by publicizing names of candidates for RTP action and names to whom signed statements may be submitted;
  - c) Evaluation of a candidate's request for an RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.

- d) Identify and provide materials relating to evaluation required by campus policy but not accessible to the faculty member under review. Any such materials shall be placed in the faculty member under review's RTP package.
9. The committee shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions for each of the candidate's requests for action:
    - a) Reappointment to next probationary year,
    - b) Reappointment with tenure/promotion,
    - c) Reappointment with early tenure,
    - d) Promotion to requested rank,
    - e) Early promotion to requested rank,
    - f) Termination (available for candidates currently in first or second probationary year),
    - g) Reappointment with terminal year (available for candidates in either third, fourth, fifth or sixth probationary year),
    - h) Deny promotion (candidate remains in current rank).
    - i) Deny early promotion (reappointment to the next probationary year is the result).
    - j) Deny early tenure (reappointment to the next probationary year is the result).
  10. Decisions must be supported and shall address all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the committee by the candidate or requested by the committee from the candidate. No conditions or contingencies can be attached to the decision.
 

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

    - a) Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations in accordance with Appendix 10 and Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) Section 1.8 of the University Manual;
    - b) Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16), Section 3.2 of the University Manual;
    - c) Self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements and discussions on progress made on recommendations for improvements in the previous cycles);
    - d) Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);
    - e) 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;
    - f) Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the committee before the closing date.

#### B. Procedures

1. The Department Chair shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy of the current, approved RTP criteria, and shall post a copy of the current approved Department RTP document in the Department commons room. The Department Chair will also retain copies of past, approved RTP criteria for the purposes of evaluating candidates who choose to be evaluated by criteria which were current at the time of the candidate's initial appointment. Copies of these past RTP documents shall be made available to the committee and faculty.
2. The committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place(s) near the Department office, of the names of candidates requesting a RTP action, the type of request made, and the name of the individual to whom signed comments or recommendation can be given. This posting will take place within one week of notification of the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request a RTP action. Signed comments will be accepted up to the time the committee starts

its evaluation of the candidate's request.

3. The committee will make its evaluation of the candidate's request in writing on University approved forms. The chair of the committee will review with the candidate the results of the committee's evaluation, including comments on the progress made on recommendations for improvements in the previous cycles. The candidate will then be given the opportunity to either accept the committee's recommendation, or to submit within ten (10) calendar days either a response/rebuttal or request a reconsideration (Section 1.6, Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) of the University Manual). If the candidate does not acknowledge the recommendations of the committee, the Department Chair shall forward the RTP package to the next level of review and document the fact that the candidate was told of the committee's evaluation and recommendation and refused to acknowledge them. The request for reconsideration of the committee's recommendation must address only the issues raised by the committee. It is important for the candidate to realize that new evidence can be introduced at this stage. The committee cannot refuse a request for reconsideration.

In the request for reconsideration, the candidate must clearly deal with each issue raised by the committee and show how the facts clearly show that the original opinion of the candidate must be sustained, and where the committee was in error when it examined the same or related facts. Brevity and clarity are encouraged since this request for reconsideration will become part of the RTP package and be examined by the committee and other review groups.

If the committee does not act favorably upon the candidate's request for reconsideration, the candidate has (10) calendar days, from the receipt of notification, to appeal to the College RTP Committee. Appeal is not obligatory. The candidate is advised to consult Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16), of the University Manual and the CBA. In addition to, or in lieu of a formal appeal to the College RTP Committee, the candidate may submit a response or rebuttal statement to the committee's final recommendation to be included in the RTP package.

4. The Department Chair, if not a member of the committee, may make a separate recommendation which will be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. The candidate will receive a copy of the Department Chair's recommendation when the original is incorporated into the RTP package.

C.

### **II.3. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

There are two avenues by which students may submit their opinion of teaching performance: in-class evaluation, and out-of-class evaluation comments.

#### **A. Out-of-Class Evaluation Comments**

At any time, a student may submit a letter expressing his/her opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter must be signed and addressed to either the department chair or the DRTPC chair. The faculty person will be provided with a copy of each letter and will be allowed ten days for a rebuttal (more details see Appendix 10 section 2.0)

#### **B. In-Class Evaluations**

In-class evaluations are those administered to an assembled class using the approved department evaluation instrument. The approved instrument is attached to this document (see appendix). Currently, the CBA and the university policy require that student evaluations be conducted for all courses taught. If this policy changes in the future, the department will re-establish its in-class evaluation policy.

1. The results of the evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. The results of all evaluations conducted during a review period must be included in the candidates RTP submission.

2. The student evaluation policy shall be uniformly enforced for all candidates. If the committee or Department do not enforce the student evaluation policy, for whatever reason, then the candidate is responsible.
3. Analysis of the results of in-class evaluations is the exclusive responsibility of the DRTP Committee. The analysis shall consist of a numerical summary of the evaluation(s) and an interpretation of the results prepared by the committee.
4. Each probationary faculty member shall conduct a self-evaluation of teaching for each academic year while on probation. This evaluation will include an analysis of information obtained from the student evaluations and how it influenced future instruction, as one metric of evaluation and form for reflection. The self-evaluation shall include a description of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and how that was reflected in the courses taught. The probationary faculty member will also address any recommendations and suggestions made during the previous review cycle regarding instructional performance.

#### **II.4. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

- A. All probationary and tenured faculty through the rank of associate professor are required to have peer evaluations conducted in at least one course per term in at least two different terms per academic year. The peer evaluation of teaching performance shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught by the candidate.
- B. Peer evaluation of teaching shall include classroom visits and a review of course syllabus and related material.
- C. The faculty peer conducting the review will provide the candidate with a written evaluation summary using the approved department form (see appendix) within two weeks of the classroom visit. A copy of the evaluation shall also be placed in the candidate's PAF within two weeks of the class visit.
- D. Only peer evaluations conducted either prior to or during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. Exceptions may be allowed if the candidate does not have the minimum number of evaluations.
- E. Candidates shall request evaluation by a higher-ranking peer, in the same discipline if possible. Pre-evaluation meetings are encouraged, to discuss areas where the candidate may want attention directed towards or may have concerns about. The classroom observer ('evaluator') will email the person being evaluated ('evaluated') and ask for four things: a. a range of different dates/times/modules for when appropriate to evaluate a class; b. a copy of the syllabus; c. what the instructor hopes to achieve in that session/module/meeting; and d. A range of dates to have an informal, post-visit conversation to discuss the results of the evaluation. A post-evaluation meeting is encouraged as well, to go over the evaluation and de-brief. To avoid miscommunication on the evaluation, the two faculty should calendar a post-visit conversation. This also helps the evaluated from shelving the comments and not seriously reflecting upon how to improve their teaching. If there is enough time, both faculty members can look over the syllabus or other course materials together, to allow the evaluator to ask questions about those materials. While still being honest, the post-visit conversation is a specific opportunity to offer encouragement and specific coaching to the evaluated, with the hopes of expanding and improving pedagogy.
- F. For in-person/hybrid/synchronous classes, the evaluator should plan to attend the entire class session. For asynchronous, the evaluator should observe one module/unit/week of the class. Regardless of mode of instruction, the evaluation should focus on the peer evaluation rubric items.
- G. Each probationary faculty member shall conduct a self-evaluation of teaching for each academic



year while on probation. This evaluation will include an analysis of information obtained from peer evaluations and how they influenced future instruction, as one metric of evaluation and form for reflection. The self-evaluation shall include a description of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and how that was reflected in the courses taught, The probationary faculty member will also address any recommendations and suggestions made during the previous review cycle regarding instructional performance.

## **II.5. CANDIDATES ON LEAVE OR SERVING IN ADMINISTRATIVE OR GOVERNANCE POSITIONS**

Candidates and Future Candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also Policy No 1328, section 1).

- A. 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 electronic transmission, and must provide contact information to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.
- B. Individuals who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. 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. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the dean, URTPC chair, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.
- C. Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment:
  1. For promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses in accord with the current CBA contract taking into account any release time granted since the last promotion. At least 3 WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 24 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
  2. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 9 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 9 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department. At least 6 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
  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 or promotion in the Department.
  4. Faculty serving an administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.
  5. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving an administrative assignment without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.
  6. Faculty serving an administrative role in another department or unit must be aware that their role in the department is of primary importance. This will be evidenced by prioritizing teaching and service in the department.
- D. Faculty Serving in Academic Governance:
  1. For promotion, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught Department courses in accord with the current CBA contract taking into account any release time granted since the last promotion. At least 3

WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 24 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in academic governance and with release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 9 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 9 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department. At least 6 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

2. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving in academic governance assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
3. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their academic governance duties.
4. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of the DRTPC, Dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

#### E. Faculty on Approved Leave

1. Faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President 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 next several paragraphs apply. If the approved leave is without pay from the University then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate is inactive ("the clock has stopped") and the next several paragraphs do not apply.
2. For promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at this University, Department courses in accord with the current CBA contract taking into account any release time granted since the last promotion. At least 3 WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 24 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.
3. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 9 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 9 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department at this University. At least 6 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.
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 standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department. Research and scholarly activity done at another institution, whether 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 or creative activity.
5. Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirement specified in the Departmental criteria for the requested RTP action. Visitation to another institution does not relieve the candidate of the service requirement at this University.
6. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving on approved leave without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any

deviation from the above requirements.

#### F. Alternative Weighting Contract

A candidate for retention, tenure or promotion is generally evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Teaching is usually considered the most important component of the candidate's evaluative qualities. Scholarship and service are then ranked next and equal to one another in importance. The normal weighting for evaluation in the three areas is 50% for teaching and 25% each for scholarship and service. However, under special circumstances (for example, where a candidate has performed significant duties outside the department or has been on professional leave for a significant portion of the evaluation period or has had significant released time for other assigned duties) the candidate in consultation with the committee may elect to alter the normal 50/25/25 balance.

A candidate who wishes a deviation from the normal weighting must notify the committee chair in writing, by filling in the proposed weighting on the Department approved "Alternative Weighting Contract" form (see attached) no later than the end of the second week of the Fall term of the of the academic year in which the evaluation process is to take place. An explanation as to why the requested alternative weighting would be appropriate should be included with the form. The committee will then evaluate the request and notify the candidate as to whether or not alternative weighting is justified.

##### 1. Evaluation of Candidates with Alternative Weighting

Committee members shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package with attention to the alternative weighting factors using the approved form. See appendix.

##### 2. The Academic Governance component of a candidate's RTP package shall be addressed in the candidate's self-evaluation. The candidate should identify how their service enhances their instructional and/or scholarly activities by one or more of the following:

- a) how their activities provide opportunities to work outside their department or discipline to bring additional perspective to their subject material;
- b) how their service affords other faculty and/or administrators the benefit of their unique experiences and perspective;
- c) how their experience expands opportunities for their department, college, or discipline to participate in broader academic activities;
- d) how their service may bring additional instructional or material benefits to their department or discipline.

### Section III – Criteria for RTP Action

#### III.1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION

##### A. Departmental Evaluation of Candidate

1. The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless stated in writing, to the agreement of the candidate, the committee, the University RTP Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
2. Candidates for tenure or promotion may use either the Departmental RTP criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus or the Departmental RTP criteria in effect in the year the candidate requests action. If a candidate requests simultaneous consideration for both promotion and tenure, the candidate must select a single set of criteria. Once the evaluation process has started, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the candidate.
3. In promotion considerations, committee members must have a higher academic rank than the candidate. Candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure review committees.

4. The deliberations of the committee shall remain confidential. 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.
5. It is the clear expectation of the department that candidates for advancement (promotion, tenure) present cogent evidence of sustained contributions in all three of the areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) using concise and efficient language and structure in the narrative. Successful candidates will have met a number of the criteria in each section (B 1-3) during each probationary year, culminating in a clearly demonstrated pattern of appropriately developed and increasingly significant or mature contributions to each area.

#### B. Criteria of Evaluation

1. The candidate is evaluated in three areas; teaching, scholarship, and service. Teaching is considered the most important component of a candidate's evaluative qualities. Scholarship and service are ranked next and equal to one another in importance. Generally, the committee will weigh a candidate's qualifications for the proposed action on the basis of 50% for teaching and 25% each for scholarship and service. However, under special circumstances (for example, where a candidate has performed significant duties outside the department or has been on professional leave for a significant portion of the evaluation period) the relative weighting may be altered from the normal 50/25/25 balance. Under any such special circumstances, particularly where a deviation of more than 10% from the norm in any key area is requested, it shall be the candidate's responsibility to develop, in consultation with the committee, reasonable means by which the committee can evaluate the candidate's accomplishments during the evaluation period. The process for requesting a deviation from normal weighting entails preparing an "evaluation contract" with the committee. The procedures and form for preparing this contract are described in Appendix C of this document.

#### C. Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Effective teaching can be demonstrated in many ways. The following list includes a variety of qualities that are important to effective teaching. The candidate may wish to address some of these qualities in demonstrating his/her teaching accomplishments, using concise and efficient language and structure in the narrative. The candidate should not feel constrained by this list. Other qualities may be appropriately addressed as well.

1. Examination of peer and student evaluations. Candidates are required to examine in detail the results of their peer and student evaluations conducted during the evaluation period and comment upon them in the RTP package (for frequency of peer evaluations, see II.4.A). Likewise, the committee in their recommendation shall examine the candidate's evaluations.
  - a. Knowledge of subject matter
  - b. Organization
  - c. Delivery
  - d. Interaction with Students
  - e. Instructional Materials
  - f. Incorporation of appropriate technology in the classroom
  - g. Knowledge and use of various methods of evaluating student achievement
2. Demonstrated effective student advising, including meeting with students, keeping up to date on academic policies and attending student advising workshops.
3. Student mentoring as indicated by active participation in student activities, professional student organizations, and advising individual student projects.
4. Development/improvement of lecture or laboratory course materials (e.g., podcast creation and delivery, hands-on activity, etc.).
5. Active participation in curriculum development involving the creation of new courses or

- substantial revision of existing courses.
- 6. Teaching/preparing courses new to the candidate.
- 7. Directing independent studies or senior projects.
- 8. Guest lecturing at another institution (please include a discussion of what was the nature of the presentation).
- 9. If appropriate to the courses offered, the development and delivery of service learning/PolyX/Honors components (e.g. podcast creation and delivery).
- 11. Appropriate attention in course syllabi and evaluation to assessing learning outcomes.
- 12. Active advising and participation in the preparation of teachers, demonstrated by advising, mentoring, course offerings, and the like.

D. Criteria for evaluation of scholarly activity:

Scholarly activity can be demonstrated in several ways. The following list includes a variety of activities that can be important in demonstrating scholarship and is meant as a guide to possible scholarly activities. It is in no way meant to be exhaustive and candidates should seek clarification with the DRTPC. The candidate should address in his/her self-evaluation, using concise and efficient language and structure in the narrative, as many of the following as apply. The Department will assess the overall quality of the candidate's work, while also taking account the quantity of publications. The minimum research profile typical of those successfully achieving tenure and promotion in the Department should be the equivalent of three scholarly works (see below for equivalent value quantification, in no particular order).

1. Publication(s) in peer reviewed journals. Other professional articles published or in preparation.
2. Textbook or monograph authorship
3. Creative and non-traditional scholarly works (for example, museum exhibit curation, research-based artwork, research-based documentaries, etc.)
4. Service as a reviewer or abstractor for articles, manuscripts, or books in recognized peer reviewed journals or publications.
5. Professional editorships, publisher's advisory panels, etc., appropriate to the candidate's specialty.
6. Active, on-going research in the candidate's discipline.
7. Applications for external funding for scholarly activities. Candidates should address the success of any such applications (or lack thereof).
8. Professional consultancies in the candidate's specialty area.
9. Active membership in professional organizations as demonstrated by service as an officer, on committees, chairing sessions, presenting papers, poster-boards, etc.
10. Presentation of seminars at this University, at other institutions, or professional organizations.
11. Attendance at workshops or seminars directly related the candidate's area of specialty.
12. Completion of additional course work appropriate to the candidate's area of specialty.
13. Incorporation of research into course development.
14. Invitations to, and participation in, relevant research or other scholarly activities at another institution.
15. Professional consultancies in the candidate's specialty area

The following equivalencies are suggested and not exhaustive:

1. Peer-reviewed journal article = 1 scholarly work
2. Text or monograph authorship = 3 scholarly works
3. Co-authored book based on original research or textbook = 2 scholarly works
4. Authored or co-authored edited book = 2 scholarly works

5. Authored or co-authored book chapter (in non-variety press) = 1 scholarly work
6. Authored chapter in a book co-edited or edited by yourself (in a non-variety press) = 1 scholarly work
7. Two published pieces specific to discipline in encyclopedias, newspapers, academic blog posts, including book reviews = 1 scholarly work
8. Grant application submitted to external funder. Candidates should address the success of any such applications (or lack thereof). = 2 scholarly works
9. Two grants submitted to competitive internal funders for research or teaching. Candidates should address the success of any such applications (or lack thereof) = up to 1 scholarly work
10. Consultancy contracts = up to 1 scholarly work
11. Guest editor of a referred international, national, or regional journal = 1 scholarly work
12. Three publications/presentations of public scholarship (in non-peer-reviewed venues) = 1 scholarly work
13. Service as a reviewer or abstractor for articles, manuscripts, or books in recognized peer reviewed journals or publications.
14. Two submitted articles/chapters currently under review = 1 scholarly work

Timing and Pace of Publication: The Department will assess the candidate's overall intellectual work and publishing trajectory. It is understood that the output of scholarly productivity may vary widely from year to year, which is why works currently under review can also count towards tenure and promotion. Overall, the candidate's record should represent a pattern indicative of a career of continual accomplishment.

E. Criteria for evaluation of service:

Service to the Department, the College, and the University are considered important aspects of a faculty member's responsibilities. Appropriate service to the community is also important. Candidates should address any service activities from the following list that they have participated in using concise and efficient language and structure in the narrative. Any other appropriate service activities may also be addressed.

1. Department, College or University standing committees.
2. Service on the Academic Senate.
3. Department, College, or University administrative assignments.
4. Service as an advisor to an ASI recognized student organization.
5. Active participation in the recruitment of new faculty.
6. Active participation in the recruitment of new students for the Department.
7. Course coordinator for a multi-sectioned course.
8. Presentations to schools, civic groups, etc.
9. Active member of a Department, College, or University ad hoc committee.
10. The candidate is active in community or service work.
11. Participation in Departmental, College or University advancement activities.
12. Participation in learning outcome assessment activities at department, college and university levels.

F. Candidate's Responsibilities

1. All RTP requests are initiated by the candidate. Candidates eligible for an RTP action will be notified by the DRTP committee chair. The candidate must respond that either there will or will not be a request for consideration.
2. At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of his/her request through the various review groups. The candidate can withdraw the request, without prejudice, at any level of review.

3. In the self-evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. If the candidate is requesting reappointment then there must be clear and explicit evidence that progress has been made toward the successful attainment of tenure. Each self-evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:
  - a) 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 student or peer evaluation should be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken, or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
  - b) Discussion of scholarly and creative activities. This includes specific citation of all peer reviewed publications, dates of attendance at professional meetings, and explicit reference to duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities should be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken, or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
  - c) Discussion of service to the University, College, Department, and community. 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, steps taken, or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
  - d) The candidate should establish attainable short and long-term goals in each evaluative area. The candidate should address in these goals suggestions or problems in previous Departmental Evaluations of the Candidate. There should be a brief discussion regarding how the goals are to be met. In the next RTP cycle, the candidate should address progress toward achieving established short or long-term goals. The candidate should seek advice from other faculty, administrators, etc. in generating his/her goals. The committee shall provide appropriate feedback to the candidate goals and accomplishments in their recommendation.
4. The period of time covered by the self-evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; tenure on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position.
5. The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered by the committee and make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personal Action File (PAF). If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate may attach an appendix to his/her evaluation package that contains a listing of original materials (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.) available to the committee. These supplemental materials can then be located in the faculty member's office or the Department office.
6. Candidates are responsible for making sure that the minimum number of student and peer evaluations have been conducted for their classes. Appendix 10 and the CBA articulate policy and procedures on student evaluations of teaching performance. Nothing other than the Department approved student and peer evaluation forms and the results from the use of these forms should be included in the candidate's RTP package. The only professional means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in faculty performance review is to reach students collectively, not individually. Any solicitation of individual students by the candidate on his/her own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is unprofessional and is prohibited.

### **III.2. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT**

A probationary faculty member must apply for reappointment during an RTP cycle if the previous

reappointment letter (or initial appointment letter) specifies that the term of (re)appointment expires at the end of the current academic year. The only exception is the case of a probationary faculty member in the sixth probationary year, who must apply for tenure. Candidates for reappointment are expected to meet all of the following criteria. Any areas of deficiency should be clearly explained.

- A. The candidate must have satisfactory student and peer evaluations of teaching performance. The candidate must also have addressed deficiencies identified in previous student evaluations or peer reviews.
- B. The Department encourages faculty to apply appropriate, available technology to classroom situations, and to develop and use various methodologies to present course content and evaluate teaching effectiveness. Where appropriate, the candidate should provide evidence of accomplishments in these course development areas.
- C. Candidates are expected to keep regular office hours and meet appointments.
- D. The Department requires that all full-time, probationary and tenured faculty participate in student advising and fairly divide up the advising assignments. Candidates should provide evidence that their student advising activities are comparable to other faculty in the Department.
- E. The candidate must show evidence of active research and successful efforts aimed toward publication of the results of that research (done alone or in collaboration with others) in peer reviewed journals or other appropriate publications. Scholarly research should be an ongoing activity. Candidates should provide evidence of such on-going research activities.
- F. The Department expects faculty members, where possible, to apply for external funding for their scholarly endeavors. The candidate should show evidence of efforts toward obtaining such outside funding and address the success (or lack thereof) of those efforts.
- G. The candidate should provide evidence that he/she has participated in service activities such as committee or academic governance work at the Department, College or University level. The Department encourages candidates for reappointment, however, to devote most of their energies toward teaching and scholarly activities.
- H. If at the time of initial appointment the candidate does not have the terminal degree for his/her area of specialty, the candidate shall possess the terminal degree by the time the candidate applies for his/her third probationary year.
- I. The candidate should provide evidence that satisfactory progress has been made toward attaining tenure. The Department expects candidates to establish attainable short and long-term goals in all evaluative areas, and address their progress toward achieving those goals in their RTP package. The Department's purpose in expecting candidates to establish such goals is to assist them in developing an individualized plan which when realized will make a strong case for the granting of tenure.

### **III.3. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

- A. Requests for tenure and promotion to associate professor are possible only when a probationary faculty member has begun the last year of the probationary period. The requests are obligatory in this case.
- B. Teaching ability and scholarly activities are the primary considerations for granting tenure and promotion to associate professor. A candidate for tenure is expected to exhibit consistent effectiveness in and mastery of his/her teaching. Any significant deficiencies in previous evaluations for reappointment by the committee shall have been corrected by this time. Short-term goals in the area of teaching should have been met and there should be evidence that long term goals are either completed or have reached a satisfactory level of completion.



- C. The candidate shall have provided evidence of achievement of short-term scholarly goals and of continuous progress toward longer-term objectives. Research or scholarly activity shall have progressed to the point that the candidate has successfully produced at least three scholarly works or their equivalent since the previous action (see above); or has successfully obtained sufficient external funding to support a significant research program in a satisfactory manner.
- D. Evaluation of the service component requires demonstration of committee activity at the Department, College, or University level. In addition, the evidence should clearly indicate that the candidate will continue efforts in service.

#### **III.4. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

- A. A request for promotion to Professor is never obligatory. The request for promotion to Professor will be considered only if the candidate has served four years in rank of Associate Professor. The candidate may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. Furthermore, promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.
- B. Teaching ability, scholarly activities and a record of service are the primary considerations for granting promotion to Professor. A candidate for Professor is expected to exhibit consistent effectiveness in and mastery of his/her teaching and to have no deficiencies which may have been mentioned in previous evaluations. Previous short-term goals in teaching will have been met, and new short-term goals are established and clearly communicated in the RTP package. Long-term goals are either completed or have reached a satisfactory level of completion, and new long-term goals are established and clearly communicated in the RTP package.
- C. In the area of teaching, the candidate has assumed a leadership role in the maintenance and further development of at least two courses offered by the Department. At least one of these courses should be a core course.
- D. Professional development and evaluations provide evidence of achievement of short-term goals and of continuous progress toward longer-term objectives. Research or scholarly activity has progressed to the point that the candidate has accomplished an appropriate publication record in his/her disciplinary area demonstrated by a minimum of three scholarly works (or their equivalent) since the previous action, and/or has obtained sufficient external funding to support an ongoing research program with demonstrated potential for dissemination of the findings in an appropriate peer reviewed forum. In addition, the candidate has provided clear evidence that previous short-term goals in research or scholarly activity have been completed, previous long-term goals have been either completed or have reached a satisfactory stage of completion, and new and meaningful short- and long-term goals have been established and are clearly communicated in the RTP package.
- E. Evaluation of the service component requires evidence of completion of significant committee activity at all levels within the University – the Department, College and University. In addition, the evidence presented by the candidate should clearly indicate that the candidate will continue efforts in service.

#### **III.5. CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE AND EARLY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

- A. Requests for early tenure and early promotion to associate professor are never obligatory. Policy No 1328, Section 2.6, of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early tenure and early promotion to associate professor must have completed two years of full-time service at Cal Poly Pomona before the effective date of early tenure. Thus, a faculty member's application for early tenure and early promotion to associate professor can occur no earlier than the second year on campus.
- B. Early tenure and early promotion to associate professor may be recommended prior to the end of the normally required six-year probationary period in very exceptional cases. In addition to meeting

the criteria established for regular tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate shall satisfy the following additional requirements as delineated below:

1. Exceptional teaching performance as demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following types of evidence: obtaining student and peer evaluation scores consistently stronger than the department average, playing a leading role in teaching and developing courses in a particular subject area in the curriculum, using distinctly innovative teaching techniques that demonstrate careful crafting of courses, excellent student mentoring as indicated by student scholarly work presentations/publications/community engagements beyond the classroom.
  2. Exceptional accomplishments in scholarly activities as evidenced by substantial publication, or two scholarly works more than required for regular action and/or significant external funding.
  3. Exceptional professional service related to the candidate's area of expertise. Exceptional professional administrative service in the candidate's area of expertise may be provided to the University, College, or Department, or to scholarly organizations, government or the community at large. Documented and active service on Department, College, and University committees is required as well as participating exceptionally actively in professionally-related public service.
- C. The candidate should provide one to three names of professional peers whose major appointments are outside Cal Poly Pomona and who may speak in support of the candidate's contribution to the field. Letters of recommendation will be solicited from them by the DRTPC. Letters of recommendation from professional peers at Cal Poly Pomona, but with tenure homes or staff appointments outside the candidate's department may optionally also be included.
- D. Requests for early tenure will not be considered unless the candidate has completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position within the Department.

### **III.6. CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

- A. A request for early promotion to Professor is never obligatory. Policy No 1328 (formerly Appendix 16), Section 2.6, of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early promotion must have completed two years of full-time service at Cal Poly Pomona at the rank of Associate Professor before the effective date of early promotion. Thus, a faculty member's application for early promotion to Professor can occur no earlier than the second year on campus. Furthermore, early promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.
- B. In addition to meeting the criteria established for regular promotion to Professor, the candidate shall satisfy following additional requirements in teaching and at least one other area (service or scholarly) as delineated below:
1. Exceptional teaching performance as demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following types of evidence: obtaining student and peer evaluation scores consistently above the department average, playing a leading role in teaching and developing courses in a particular subject area in the curriculum, using distinctly innovative teaching techniques that demonstrate careful crafting of courses, excellent student mentoring as indicated by student scholarly work presentations/publications/community engagements beyond the classrooms.
  2. Exceptional accomplishments in scholarly activities exceeding the minimum for regular action as evidenced by substantial publication of three scholarly works more than required for regular action and/or significant external funding.
  3. Exceptional professional administrative service related to the candidate's area of expertise. Exceptional professional service in the candidate's area of expertise may be provided to the University, College or Department, or to scholarly organizations, government or the community at large. Documented and active service on Department, College, and University committees is required as well as participating exceptionally actively in professionally-related public service.
- C. The candidate should provide one to three names of professional peers whose major appointments are outside Cal Poly Pomona. Letters of recommendation will be solicited from them by the

DRTPC. Letters of recommendation from professional peers at Cal Poly Pomona, but with tenure homes or staff appointments outside the candidate's department may optionally also be included.

## **APPENDIX A - Student Evaluation Questionnaire and Procedure Statements**

The following questions will be administered electronically each semester in each class for faculty and lecturers.

Student Evaluation Questionnaire for **GEO/ANT** courses (Beginning Fall 2022)

1. The course goals and learning outcomes were clear.
2. The course content was well-organized and easy to follow.
3. The professor presented course contents effectively.
4. The grading criteria for course assignments were clearly stated.
5. The professor provided timely feedback on assignments and activities.
6. The professor encouraged students to participate in active learning activities.
7. The course assignments and activities furthered my understanding of the course content.
8. The professor was available during posted office hours.
9. The professor supported a diverse, equitable, inclusive, and just learning environment.
10. Overall, the course promoted learning.

### **Scale:**

5 = very good

4 = good

3 = satisfactory

2 = poor

1 = very poor

**APPENDIX B**  
**Peer Evaluation Questionnaire**

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**

**PEER EVALUATION REPORT**

Professor Evaluated	Class Evaluated
Evaluat or	Date of Evaluation

Rate the professor's performance on a scale of 1 - 5 (poor to excellent, 3 = satisfactory) in each of the following areas:

Knowledge of subject matter		Comments
Organization		Comments
Delivery/Communication skills		Comments
Interaction		Comments
Instructional Materials		Comments
Total		Note: A total of less than 15 requires further explanation (see below).

Briefly comment on any areas of unusual ability: Attach and sign additional page(s) if necessary.

Briefly comment on areas where improvement may be in order: Attach and sign additional page(s) if necessary.

Attach and sign additional page(s) if necessary.

I have received and read this evaluation.

Signature of Evaluator	Signature of Professor Evaluated
Date	Date

**APPENDIX C**  
**Alternative Weighting Contract Form**  
 Department of Geography and Anthropology  
**RTP CRITERIA**  
 Variable Weighted Contract

Candidate	
Requested Action	
Evaluator	

	Contracted Weighting Factor (%)	X	Evaluator's Score (Scale of 1 - 5 worst to best)	=	Weighted Score
<b>I. Teaching</b>					
A. Classroom Performance	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
B. Versatility	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
C. Advisement/Mentoring	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
D. Other/Special Circumstances (visiting professorships, etc.)	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Subtotal	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>				<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<b>II. Service</b>					
A. Department (committees, coordinator, scheduling, etc.)	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
B. University (committees, administrative, governance, etc.)	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
C. Community (lectures, committees, consultancies, etc.)	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
D. Other/Special Circumstances	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Subtotal	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>				<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
III. Professional/Scholarly Activities	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Subtotal	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>				<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Totals	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>				<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

In evaluating a candidate, each DRTP Committee member will quantitatively score the candidates accomplishments in each of the contracted areas on a scale of 1-5, (1 being lowest, 5 being highest). The score in each area will then be multiplied by the contracted weighting factor and then added to determine a total weighted score. The total weighted scores determined by all FRTP Committee members will then be averaged. That average score will then be used to determine the candidate's suitability for the requested action as follows:

An average score equal to or greater than 300 is required for reappointment

An average score equal to or greater than 350 is required for tenure or promotion

An average score equal to or greater than 400 is required for early tenure or jump promotion