

# DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

## Academic years 2023-2024 to 2027-28

### Retention, Tenure and Promotion

#### 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 including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Policies 1328 and 1329 define 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.

**I.1. Definitions:** For the purposes of clarity an expanded list of definitions – extracted from Policy 1328 - can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

**I.2. Department Philosophy and Guidelines:** Candidates will be evaluated for Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service at any organizational level within the university and the community. 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. However, a candidate whose performance during the current review cycle in teaching is unsatisfactory will not receive a positive recommendation.

In addition, the RTP criteria also address the following circumstances: consideration of performance in the area of student advising/mentoring; peer evaluation of teaching performance; 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,

administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution.

Candidates are required to assemble a RTP package that 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.

## **II. PROCEDURES**

### **II.1. Policy No: 1328: RTP Policy and Procedures**

Candidates are referred to Policy No: 1328 for detailed descriptions of RTP procedures.

### **II.2. The Roles of the Department Committee and Chair**

The Department RTP 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, Section 3.1. The committee shall be composed of minimum of three tenured faculty members. The Department Chair will submit a separate Chair's evaluation unless insufficient tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the DRTP Committee. In such cases, the Department Chair will serve on the DRTP Committee and there will be no separate Department Chair evaluation. Non-tenured Department Chairs, or chairs who are candidates for an RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC or to write separate recommendations. All other full-time tenured faculty will be eligible to be members of the DRTP Committee. An annual election will be held by secret ballot to elect the DRTP committee members. All tenured and probationary faculty in the department are eligible to vote. Faculty on Professional Leave With Pay (sabbatical and difference in pay) may participate in committee activities. FERP faculty may participate if elected by a majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty and approved by the president. In the event an insufficient number (minimum of three) of departmental faculty are eligible to serve, the College RTPC, in consultation with the DRTPC, will appoint the additional members from other departments within the College of Science.

No DRTP 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 committee considering promotion or tenure actions. However, tenured candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the committee.

The committee shall elect a chair – annually during spring semester prior to the next year's RTP cycle- who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the Departmental RTP document and Policies 1328 and 1329 are carried out.

**II.2.1 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. Insure that each faculty member has a copy of the current, approved RTP criteria;
- C. Present to the RTP candidates all appropriate RTP forms;
- D. Shall post a copy of the current approved Department RTP document in the Department office or Department's web page;
- E. Provide each RTP candidate a copy of the University RTP Calendar for the current academic year;
- F. 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;
- G. 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; these will be made available to the DRTPC if required;
- H. Schedule, in concert with the RTP candidates, the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance;
- I. Forward peer evaluations and candidates' responses, if any, to the Dean for placement in the appropriate Personnel Action File (PAF);
- J. 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.

**II.2.2 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 name of the DRTP committee Chair to whom signed statements may be submitted;
- C. Evaluating the candidate's request for a RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.

### **II.2.3 Committee Actions**

The committee shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and may deny or approve the requested action.

### **II.2.4 Committee Guidelines**

Decisions must be supported and shall address all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the committee by the candidate. No conditions or contingencies can be attached to the decision.

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

II.2.4.1 Summaries and interpretations of student's evaluations in accordance with Policy 1329 and Policy 1328 Section 3.2;

II.2.4.2 Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy 1328, Section 3.3;

II.2.4.3 Self evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);

II.2.4.4 Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);

II.2.4.5 Material requested from the candidate by the committee including requests for clarification or corrections to any section/part of the RTP package;

II.2.4.6 Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the committee before the submission deadline and subject to the 10 day rebuttal period.

II.2.4.7 The RTP package is the working Personnel Action File (PAF ) for the purposes of RTP evaluation. However, evaluating committees and administrators shall consult the entire PAF for additional relevant materials.

II.2.4.8 Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, and promotion or any other personnel action shall; be based on the Personnel Action File (PAF).

II.2.4.9 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.

**The DRTPC must** also include a discussion of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle (#1328, 7.4D). This would include recommendations at all levels of review.

### **II.3. METHODS OF EVALUATION**

The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria set forth in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless by mutual documented agreement by the candidate, DRTP committee, Dean, University RTP Committee, and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost).

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

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

The candidate is evaluated in three areas: **Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service**. Teaching is considered the most important component of a candidate's evaluative qualities.

**II.3.1.** Evaluation of **Teaching** includes the following items:

**II.3.1.1 Pedagogy**

**II.3.1.2 Content**

**II.3.1.3 Organization**

**II.3.2.** Evaluation of **Scholarly and Creative Activity** includes the following items:

**II.3.2.1 Research**

**II.3.2.2 Grants**

**II.3.2.3 Other**

**II.3.3.** Evaluation of **Service** includes the following items:

**II.3.2.4 Department Service**

**II.3.2.5 College Service**

**II.3.2.6 University Service**

### **II.3.2.7 Service To the Profession**

### **II.3.2.8 Community Service**

## **III. CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTIONS**

The committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place 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 recommendations can be given. This posting will take place within one (1) 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 date and time posted on the solicitation of such comments. Signed student comments should include Bronco ID number.

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. The candidate has ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the DRTPC's recommendation to either accept the committee's recommendation or appeal the DRTPC action to the CRTPC in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.1 of Policy 1328. In addition to, or in lieu of a formal appeal to the CRTPC, the candidate may submit, within ten (10) calendar days, a response or rebuttal statement to the DRTPC's recommendation to be included in his/her RTP package. 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 along with notification 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. 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.

The student evaluation policy shall be uniformly enforced for all candidates. Formal student evaluations are required by the Department of all faculty (part-time, probationary and tenured) for all classes taught. Supervisory classes; e.g., GSC 4610, etc. are not to be evaluated. The results of the evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. The approved procedures for carrying out these evaluations can be found in Policy 1328 and Section III.1.1.1 and Appendix 2 of this document. Appendices 3 and 4 of this document contain copies of the approved peer evaluation and student evaluation forms, respectively.

The Department requires two peer reviews of teaching performance per year in separate terms, for all Assistant Professors and Associate Professors (Policy 1328, Section 3.3C). Peer evaluation of teaching performance shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught by the candidate. Only peer evaluations conducted during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. See III.1.1.2 below.

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

Appropriate maximum point values have been agreed upon and assigned to each of the component activities within the major categories above. When a faculty member is subject to one of the RTP evaluations, the DRTP committee will assign points germane to the category, based on a professional judgment of the quality of the activity and how well it meets the intent of the given criteria.

The point values assigned by the evaluators as well as the justification for the awarded points will be used to make final recommendations.

For the Reappointment process, points are earned on a yearly basis and minimum criteria are reported as per year values the candidate is expected to achieve. For the Tenure and Promotion processes, the points assigned, in all categories except Teaching, are given as **cumulative** totals for the cycle. An exception is made for Early Promotion or Tenure requests when the candidate can provide data only for a partial cycle. In this case, the points required must have been attained by the time the Early Action is requested.

It is important for the candidate to recognize that this document describes standards of performance. While points must be accumulated in all areas, the goals specified below are considered by the Department to be appropriate levels of performance. It is important to understand that the Department RTP process evaluates and makes judgments of the candidate overall. The evaluators recognize under certain circumstances the candidate could earn point values less than the stated minimum in a particular category and still be recommended for the subject action except as specified below. This would be justifiable if point values in the other categories are above those normally required. A hypothetical case might be a candidate who writes and receives a major grant in his or her field. During the period of active grant-funded research it is possible that his or her university service may be less than the norm, yet the candidate could receive a positive recommendation. However, under no circumstances will positive recommendations for requested actions be made if the candidate's *teaching points* fall below the specified minimum.

The Geological Sciences Department requires that a candidate for Tenure or Promotion attain a specified *average* of teaching points for the pertinent RTP action. However, the Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) also recognizes that it is equally important for a candidate to show progressive improvement or continued excellence in teaching skills as demonstrated by the quality of yearly evaluations during the RTP cycles.

Existing university policy allows candidates to apply for *early actions* (Policy 1328, Section 2.6). Requests for Early Actions are not treated as routine personnel matters. Although allowed under the regulations governing RTP matters, requests for actions in advance of the normal cycle(s) will be entertained only under the most exceptional circumstances. Candidates for early actions must document ***exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications in all areas of evaluation.***

### **III.1.1. Teaching**

**A maximum of 30 points may be earned per year for teaching.** Three avenues will be used to evaluate the candidate's teaching. These are: 1) student evaluations (both formal course evaluations and signed, written comments), 2) classroom visitations by Department faculty, and 3) self evaluation. In each of the three areas immediately above up to 30 points may be assigned. A weighted average using percentages specified in each of the sections below is then calculated with a 30 point maximum award (as above).

**III.1.1.1. Student evaluations** - Formal student evaluations are required by the Department of all faculty (part-time, probationary and tenured) for all classes taught (See procedures outlined in Policy 1329 and Appendix 2 of this document). Supervisory classes; e.g., GSC 4610, etc. are not to be evaluated. Separate evaluations are conducted for lecture-lab combination courses taught by one instructor. Separate evaluations will be conducted per instructor for co-taught courses. In addition, students are permitted to submit signed written comments on faculty performance to the Department Chair in accordance with the guidelines established in Policy 1329, Section 2.0. Written comments, if signed by the student, will be evaluated by the DRTP committee. **(45% of Teaching points).**

Course evaluations are administered online through the Canvas system following University guidelines. The following information should be announced to the students participating in the evaluations:

- a. No written comments on class evaluation forms can be considered by the RTP committee. No form of student identification is permitted on course evaluation forms.
- b. The evaluations will not be available to the evaluated faculty member until after final course grades have been submitted.

Candidates are responsible for including summaries of all courses evaluated during the RTP cycle in the Appendix of their RTP document. The DRTP committee will examine those summaries and award the pertinent points. The procedure for awarding points is as follows:

- For each course an average will be computed for Questions 1-7. See Appendix 2 for the different evaluation forms applicable to the time period from Fall 2013 through now.
- Points will be awarded relative to the calculated averages:
  - [1.00-1.25] = 4 points
  - (1.25-1.50] = 3.75 points
  - (1.50-1.75] = 3.5 points



- (1.75-2.00] = 3.25 points
- (2.00-.2.25] = 3 points
- (2.25-.2.50] = 2.75 points
- (2.50-2.75] = 2.5 points
- (2.75-3.00] = 2.25 points
- (3.00-3.50] = 2 points
- (3.50-4.00] = 1 point
- (4.00-5.00] = 0 points
- These points will then be summed (maximum would be number of classes times 4 points) and normalized to account for 45% of the teaching points.

**III.1.1.2. Peer Evaluations** - Peer evaluation shall include classroom visits and a review of course syllabus and relevant course materials. Candidate classroom visits must be scheduled at least 5 working days in advance (CBA Section 15.14) unless the candidate agrees to other arrangements. A minimum of two peer reviews per year, in different terms, is required (Policy 1328, Section 3.3C). It is the responsibility of the DRTP Chair to ensure that appropriate evaluations are scheduled. In the event a candidate teaches upper division courses, all efforts should be made to have one of the two required visitations be to an upper division class.

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. In the case of asynchronous online courses, the evaluation will be conducted for a specific lecture or laboratory learning module that is mutually agreeable to the faculty member and evaluator.

A written summary of the classroom visit shall be placed in the candidate's PAF within two (2) weeks of the class visit (see Policy 1329, Section 3.3 of the University Manual). A copy of the summary will also be given to the candidate. The candidate has a right to respond in writing to the peer evaluation within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the evaluation. Any Geological Sciences Department faculty member may make classroom visitations to evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness. Comments should address the criteria outlined below. Teaching points are to be awarded in accordance with these guidelines. Peer evaluators may not award more than 30 teaching points to a candidate. Since the evaluation of teaching is as much a qualitative process as a quantitative one, written comments can make useful additional contributions to the DRTPC summaries of teaching effectiveness. **(50% of Teaching points).**

Peer evaluators will utilize the form from Appendix 3 of this document. The categories of evaluation and points to be awarded will be discussed below. There will be eight areas of evaluation and points will be awarded in seven of these areas as Very Good (4pts), Good (3pts), Satisfactory (2pts), Poor (1pt) and Very Poor (0pts). These are the same evaluation ratings utilized for student evaluations. The eighth category (Advising/Guidance and Career Planning) can only receive ratings of Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0). While it is not the purpose of this document to dictate the assignment of points by peer evaluators the following criteria should be kept in mind for each rating category:

**Very Good:** The candidate should exceed the expectations the of peer evaluator. He/she should clearly demonstrate outstanding effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content.

**Good:** The candidate meets the expectations of the evaluator. He/she should be an effective classroom teacher and be able to convey the material to the students in a manner they can comprehend. Good should be taken as the minimum standard all GSC instructors strive for. For the evaluator, a “good” instructor must be up to the standards you would set for your own courses.

**Satisfactory:** A satisfactory rating should be given when the candidate is adequately addressing the evaluation criteria, but where there is room for improvement. Peer evaluators should use the comments section of the form to suggest improvements to the candidate’s performance.

**Poor:** A poor rating implies that the RTP candidate has serious deficiencies that require immediate attention and/or mitigation. These shortcomings should be addressed by the evaluator with suggestions for improvement. The DRPT Committee will monitor the candidate to make sure corrective actions are undertaken. Consistently poor ratings are unacceptable for promotion and tenure.

**Very Poor:** A rating of “very poor” implies that the candidate’s efforts are unacceptable. This rating is reserved for the most egregious, unprofessional conduct. A documented history of very poor ratings will jeopardize reappointment, tenure and promotion.

The following areas will be addressed by peer evaluators utilizing the form from Appendix 3 of this document.

**III.1.1.2.1. Instructor Preparation** – evaluate the instructor’s preparation for the class. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.2 Organization** - organization and logical development of lecture topics, clarity of presentation. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.3. Effectiveness of Communication** – how well are the concepts communicated to the students, is there interest and comprehension. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.4. Enthusiasm** – does the instructor effectively engage the students and project overall enthusiasm for the course material. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.5. Knowledge of Subject**– does the candidate display a breadth of knowledge and answer student questions effectively. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.6. Teaching Innovation**– how well does the candidate incorporate technology and innovative teaching techniques into the course. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.7. Student Participation**– do the students participate freely, ask questions and display interest and engagement in the material. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

**III.1.1.2.8. Advising/Guidance and Career Planning** – these are areas that are best evaluated informally with students before and after the formal class meeting; such as does the instructor offer advice and assistance with homework assignments and career-related decisions. **(Because the opportunities to access these criteria are limited, please utilize only the ratings of Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0)).**

**III.1.1.3. Self-evaluation** - The candidate must include a self-evaluation. In the self-evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references, item by item, to the Department RTP criteria. If the candidate is requesting reappointment then there must be clear and explicit evidence that there is progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the evaluation shall explicitly discuss teaching, scholarly activities and university service. See Section II.3. (5% of Teaching points).

### **III.1.2. Scholarly and Creative Activity**

To guide the RTP candidate in the area of Scholarly and Creative Activity, below are general criteria, listed in order of importance, the DRTP committee consider when awarding points for relevant activities:

**Originality of research** – Does each publication represent an original “new” concept? Is the research a continuation of an ongoing effort? Does the research demonstrate a broad knowledge of an interdisciplinary nature?

**Technical merit** – What level of the scientific community is the research intended for? What level of technical detail and analysis is involved? How large a contribution does the research make to the scientific world?

**Contribution to the geological sciences** – Does the contribution advance geoscience knowledge? Is the contribution broad or narrowly focused?

**Involvement of students** – Are students co-authors of research papers? Are students active participants in the research effort? Was outside financial support provided to students?

**Significance to the general academic community and residents of California** – (For general interest research with a broad base of community application) Did the research contribute to the general academic community? Did the research stimulate interest and/or participation by faculty and students in other disciplines? Did the research significantly improve the welfare of California residents?

The maximum points listed below are per research activity (such as a presentation, proposal submission or abstract), unless otherwise stated.

**III.1.2.1 Research** - To be considered in the RTP evaluation process, research activities must manifest themselves as one of the following. Non-first author status results in the points awarded being halved.

**III.1.2.1.1.** Publication of results of research in refereed journal.

**Maximum points = 18.**

**III.1.2.1.2.** Oral presentation with accompanying published abstract at any acceptable professional organization.

**Maximum points = 6.**

**III.1.2.1.3.** Poster presentation at one of the above organizations.

**Maximum points = 6.**

**III.1.2.1.4.** Published abstract with no oral presentation. Candidate must provide an explanation of why no presentation accompanied the abstract.

**Maximum points = 4.**

**III.1.2.1.5.** Publication of results of research in a non- refereed scientific journal.

**Maximum points = 9.**

**III.1.2.1.6.** Publication of results of research in a popular medium.

**Maximum points = 5.**

**III.1.2.1.7.** Continuing research without publication. Candidate should include a timeline for completion of research and an outline of the research goals.

**Maximum points = 5.**

**III.1.2.1.8.** Research supervision. List all projects that are being or have been supervised during the evaluation cycle.

**Points = 2 per completed thesis; 1 per completed presentation (for which points have not already been awarded in III.1.2.1.1-III.1.2.1.7); 1 maximum per significant supervised research activity.**

### **III.1.2.2. Grants**

**III.1.2.2.1.** Grant proposal submission. In general, points will be awarded on the basis of the nature of the grant request and the agency to which the proposal was submitted. Non lead PI status results in the points awarded being halved

**Maximum points = 6.**

**III.1.2.2.2.** Successful receipt of grant for equipment and/or research. Add to points for submission of proposal. Points awarded on the size of the grant (no specific dollar amount can be provided, but to obtain the maximum would necessitate receiving a multi-million dollar grant).

**Maximum points = 36.**

**III.1.2.3. Other Activities** - Some activities of the Geological Sciences faculty may not fit into the categories above. Points can also be earned in the following performance areas:

**III.1.2.3.1** Consulting activities. Point values based on the size and complexity of the consulting job.

**Maximum points = 8**

**III.1.2.3.2.** Publishing specialty-related textbooks. More points would be awarded for an advanced text and fewer for lab manuals or study guides.

**Maximum points = 15.**

**III.1.2.3.3.** Participation in teacher workshops and teacher retraining activities.

**Maximum points = 4.**

**III.1.2.3.4.** Other professional activities not covered by any of the above sub-categories.

**Maximums to be determined by the evaluators.**

### **III.1.3 Service**

**III.1.3.1 Department Service** – Points as indicated below are per academic year of service unless otherwise stated.

**III.1.3.1.1.** Service as Department Chair. (The position of Department Chair is not a full-time appointment and therefore points awarded are less than those for other departments.)

**Points = 9.**

**III.1.3.1.2.** Schedule coordinator.

**Points = 4.**

**III.1.3.1.3.** Department RTP Committee Chair.

**Points = 5.**

**III.1.3.1.4.** RTP Committee member.

**Points = 3.**

**III.1.3.1.5.** Curriculum Coordinator.

**Points = 5.**

**III.1.3.1.6.** Advisor to any ASI chartered club.

**Points = 3.**

**III.1.3.1.7.** Student Academic Advising and Mentoring. One point per 5 students.

**Maximum points per year = 5.**

**III.1.3.1.8.** Curriculum/Class Development.

**Maximum points = 6 per class.**

Points will only be awarded for the following activities (updating of existing class materials, syllabi or lab manuals, and first time teaching of a class, etc. are considered part of regular teaching duties):

3 points: the candidate significantly modifies the extended course outline of an existing class; this extended course outline is approved by the department and the University; the candidate teaches the modified class

6 points: the candidate develops an extended course outline for a completely new class; this extended course outline is approved by the department and the University; the candidate teaches the new class

Evaluators may choose to award part of the point values if only some of the listed activities have been accomplished during the period under consideration or if the work represents a collaborative effort.

**III.1.3.1.9.** Any other recognized Department-based committee requiring participation in regular meetings.  
**Maximum points = 3\***

**III.1.3.1.10.** Other Department Service not covered by any of the above sub-categories.  
**Maximums to be determined by the evaluators.**

### **III.1.3.2 College Service.**

**III.1.3.2.a.** College RTP Committee.  
**Points = 3\*.**

**III.1.3.2.b.** College Curriculum Committee.  
**Points = 3\*.**

**III.1.3.2.c.** Any other recognized College-based committee.  
**Maximum points = 3\*.**

**III.1.3.2.d.** Other College Service not covered by any of the above sub-categories.  
**Maximums to be determined by the evaluators.**

**\* Double assigned numerical weight if Chair.**

### **III.1.3.3 University Service**

**III.1.3.3.a.** URTP Committee.  
**Points = 5\*.**

**III.1.3.3.b.** Academic Senator.  
**Points = 5.**

**III.1.3.3.c.** Any regular University standing committees.  
**Maximum points = 3\*.**

**III.1.3.3.d.** Any ad hoc committee requiring participation at regular meetings.

**Maximum points = 3\*.**

**III.1.3.3.e.** Service-learning activities; supervision or instruction of service-learning courses

**Maximum points = 2.**

**III.1.3.3.f.** Other University Service not covered by any of the above sub-categories; including committee work efforts beyond normal/typical time commitment.

**Maximums to be determined by the evaluators.**

**\*Double assigned numerical weight if Chair.**

#### **III.1.3.4. Service to the Profession**

**III.1.3.4a.** Chairing sessions at professional meetings.

**Points = 2 per session.**

**III.1.3.4b.** Membership on regional or national advisory boards/committees.

**Points = 2 per membership.**

**III.1.3.4c.** Peer review of nationally recognized scientific journal article.

**Points = 1 per review.**

**III.1.3.4d.** Peer review of nationally competitive grant proposal.

**Points = 1 per review.**

#### **III.1.3.5. Community Service**

Non-specialty related. The Department encourages faculty to be good citizens. Service to the community clearly benefits all involved. However, community service must not be done in lieu of or as substitute for Department, College or University duties. A faculty member may demonstrate service to the community by assuming leadership roles in any of a number of various civic groups or functions. Examples are: service clubs, youth activities and organizations, and any activity resulting in media exposure; e.g. invited lectures, newspaper or radio interviews. These activities should reflect favorably upon Cal Poly and increase public awareness of the University and whenever possible focus attention upon the activities of the Department. **(1 point per function to a maximum of 5 points per year).**



### **III.2. Specifications for Qualifying for Reappointment**

The candidate may request reappointment during the probationary period. While candidate evaluation commences immediately, there is no need for the candidate to prepare a formal RTP package during their first year.

**III.2.1. Third – Sixth Year Reappointment** (Note: point totals required for Tenure are higher)

Teaching - 20 points per year (average over the evaluation period)

Scholarly and Creative Activity – 25 points per year (average)

Service - 20 points per year (average)

### **III.3. Specifications for Qualifying for Tenure**

The probationary candidate applies for tenure during sixth year.

Teaching - 22 points per year (average)

Scholarly and Creative Activity (S&CA) - 150 points total for the evaluation period

Service - 120 points total for the evaluation period

*A total of 270 points for both categories (S&CA and Service) will be acceptable if either falls below the minimum. In such cases a subminimum of 80 points for Service is required.*

### **III.4. Specifications for Qualifying for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Request for promotion to Associate Professor is made after the candidate reaches Assistant Professor rank. A faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time they apply for tenure.

Teaching - 22 points per year (average)

Scholarly and Creative Activity (S&CA) - 150 points total for the evaluation period

Service - 120 points total for the evaluation period

*A total of 270 points for both categories (S&CA and Service) will be acceptable if either value falls below the minimum. In such cases a subminimum of 80 points for Service is required.*

### **III.5. Specifications for Qualifying for Promotion to Full Professor**

Request for promotion to Full Professor is made after the candidate reaches Associate Professor rank. Once tenured, a faculty member is eligible for a subsequent promotion after having served four years in the current rank.

Teaching - 24 points per year (average)

Scholarly and Creative Activity (S&CA) - 175 points total for the evaluation period

Service - 130 points total for the evaluation period

*A total of 305 points for both categories (S&CA and Service) will be acceptable if either value falls below the minimum. In such cases a subminimum of 80 points for Service is required.*

### **III.6. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Tenure**

Requests for early tenure shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective date of this action (Policy 1328, Section 2.6). Criteria for early tenure shall place emphasis on teaching and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. DRTPC recommendations shall include material relating specifically to the approved department RTP criteria. Early tenure is awarded in only the most exceptional cases.

Teaching - 26 points per year (average)

Scholarly and Creative Activity (S&CA) - 180 points total for the evaluation period

Service - 120 points total for the evaluation period

*To apply for Early Tenure the minimum must be attained in both categories (S&CA and Service).*

**III.7. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Promotion** - Requests for early promotion shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective date of this action (Policy 1328, Section 2.6). Criteria for early promotion shall place emphasis on teaching and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. DRTPC recommendations shall include material relating specifically to the approved department RTP criteria. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for early promotion.

#### **III.7.1. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Promotion to Associate Professor**

Teaching - 26 points per year (average)

Scholarly and Creative Activity - 180 points total for the evaluation period

Service - 120 points total for the evaluation period

#### **III.7.2. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Promotion to Professor**

Teaching - 26 points per year (average)

Scholarly and Creative Activity - 200 points total for the evaluation period

Service - 130 points total for the evaluation period

#### **IV. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES**

All RTP requests are initiated by the candidate. If the candidate is eligible for an RTP action, then there will be written notification from the DRTP Chair. The candidate must respond that either there will or will not be a request for consideration. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then the candidate must notify the committee chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action.

At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups.

The candidate must include a self evaluation. In the self evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references, item by item, to the Department RTP criteria. If the candidate is requesting reappointment then there must be clear and explicit evidence that there is progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the 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 the student and peer evaluation shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken and progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- B. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities - This includes citations of publications, dates of attendance of professional meetings, reference to grant submittals and duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken and progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- C. Discussion of service to the University, College, Department and community - This includes 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 and progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.

**All candidates must** discuss progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle (#1328, 7.4C). This would include recommendations at all levels of review.

The period of time covered by the self evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the previous cycle. 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.

The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the committee and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should consider an Appendix to the evaluation package, which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.). These supplemental materials are to be located in the Department office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the 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 by the candidate on his/her own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is prohibited. This does not mean that the candidate cannot use other methods of evaluation for self-improvement. Signed student letters and Department-approved student evaluation forms and the results from the use of these forms can be included in the RTP package.

The candidate must work closely with the Department faculty and DRTP Chair to schedule the minimum number of peer reviews of teaching performance. The minimum number of peer reviews is two, in different terms. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those carried out by the committee. All peer review documentation must be included in the RTP package. The candidate should have ready during the peer review session (or at some other prearranged time) a course syllabus and other relevant teaching materials. Policy 1328, Section 3.3 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on peer review of teaching performance.

## **V. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members**

Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty members not under consideration for promotion shall be conducted by a department committee of full-time tenured faculty members elected by the probationary and tenured members of the department. This committee may be the RTP committee, a subcommittee of the RTP committee, or a separate committee. Each department shall develop criteria and procedures to be used for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty members, which shall be submitted to the dean or director for approval no later than March 15.

Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated at intervals of no greater than five years. Participants in the faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are not required to undergo evaluation unless and evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator. Evaluations shall be conducted during the spring semester and reported on the appropriate pages of the university faculty performance review form (Appendix 27A). For those with teaching responsibilities, consideration shall include student evaluations of teaching performance. The evaluation of the tenured faculty member shall terminate at the college dean/director's level.

The faculty member being evaluated shall receive a copy of the reports of the department committee and the dean/director and shall meet with both parties to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for improvement.

A copy of the reports of the peer committee and the appropriate administrator shall be placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File in conformance with standard procedure for introducing material to a Personnel Action File.

## **VI. Evaluation of Faculty in an Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave**

**VI.1** The committee must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution. Faculty on leave shall be evaluated using the above stated criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity and service with suitable modifications listed below.

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 must provide email addresses to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. Electronic means of transmission are acceptable providing signatures appear on all necessary pages. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

### **VI.2 Faculty Serving in an Administrative Assignment:**

- A. For promotion, faculty serving in an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses equivalent of 24 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 2 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 21 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- B. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 8 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 8 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department. At least 5 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- C. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving in 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.
- D. Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.

- E. 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 (Provost) shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

### **VI.3 Faculty Serving in Academic Governance:**

- A. For promotion, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught Geology Department courses equivalent of 24 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 2 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 21 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- B. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in academic governance and having release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 8 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 8 WTUs must be for courses given by the Geology Department. At least 5 of the WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- C. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving in academic governance 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.
- D. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their academic governance duties.
- E. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

### **VI.4 Faculty On Approved Leave**

- A. 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 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.

- B. For promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at Cal Poly Pomona, Geology Department courses equivalent of 24 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 2 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 21 of the WTUs 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.
- C. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 8 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 8 WTUs must be for courses given by the Department at this University. At least 5 of the WTUs 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 Cal Poly Pomona.
- D. 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.
- E. 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 Cal Poly Pomona.
- F. 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.

## Appendix 1

**Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.

**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 is granted for one or two years credit, then reappointment must take place at the beginning of the last year of the initial appointment period. Candidates successful in obtaining reappointment 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 granted termination effective at the end of the current academic year. Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their third, fourth, fifth year will be granted reappointment with terminal year.

**Tenure** is a status conferred on the candidate by the University granting 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.

**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.

**RTP Committee members** must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave with pay (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only participate on reappointment cases – may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. (see also Policy 1328 sections 305.114, 305.300, 305.400, 305.500).

**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. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his designee. (see also Policy 1328 section 305.200)

**A probationary year** of service is any two semesters in a period of three consecutive semesters, including summer. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.

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.

A faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is eligible for a subsequent promotion after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for early promotion.

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.



*Student evaluation of teaching is governed by Policy 1329 of the University Manual.*

*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.*

*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.*

*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.*

## APPENDIX 2

### STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

All student evaluations are conducted online per University guidelines using an applicable Learning management System (e.g., Canvas). Students will receive multiple automated reminders complete an evaluation for each enrolled course

**Below are the evaluation questions utilized by the department since Fall 2015. The same evaluation questions are used for in -person, hybrid, and online class modalities :**

- 

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1.1	Instructor presented class material in an organized manner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Instructor explained concepts and work assignments clearly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Instructor responded well to questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	Exams and quizzes were representative of the subject matter presented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5	Instructor provided useful feedback on student work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6	Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7	I gained meaningful geoscience knowledge and/or skills in this class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

• **APPENDIX 3**

**California State Polytechnic University  
Geological Sciences Department**

**Class Visitation Report**

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator Signatory Date \_\_\_\_\_

Quarter and Year \_\_\_\_\_ Candidate Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Classroom Visit \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Candidate Reading \_\_\_\_\_

	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very Poor</i>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Instructor Preparation</b>						
<b>Organization</b>						
<b>Effectiveness of Communication</b>						
<b>Enthusiasm</b>						
<b>Knowledge of Subject</b>						
<b>Teaching Innovation</b>						
<b>Student Participation</b>						
<b>Advising/Guidance and Career Planning</b>	N/A	N/A				
<b>Total Points:</b>						

Point Assignments 4 = Very Good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor, 0 = Very poor

**Comments (attach additional pages as necessary)**

Evaluators please attach suggestions for improvement for any/all Satisfactory/Poor/Very Poor ratings, with exception of the "Advising/Guidance and Career Planning" evaluation category. For Poor and Very Poor ratings please specify areas that need immediate attention. For Very Good ratings, evaluator's comments are encouraged as they may be incorporated in the DRTP summary evaluation of teaching.

**Additional Comments**

Any evaluation of syllabus, projects, homework not covered during your actual class visitation. These DO NOT require point values or ratings, but will be examined by the DRTP Committee when making RTP decisions.