

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

**NUTRITION AND FOOD SCIENCE DEPARTMENT**

**Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria**

**2023-24 – 2027-28 AY**

# NFS DRTP CRITERIA

## Table of Contents

<b>SECTION I – INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
I.1. DEFINITIONS.....	4
I.2. DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY .....	6
<b>SECTION II - PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>6</b>
II.1. ELECTION OF DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE.....	6
II.2. ELECTION OF DRTP COMMITTEE CHAIR.....	7
II.3. DUTIES OF DRTP COMMITTEE CHAIR .....	7
II.4. DUTIES OF DRTP COMMITTEE .....	8
II.5. DUTIES OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR .....	10
II.6. CANDIDATE’S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	10
II.7. MATERIALS USED FOR EVALUATION .....	12
II.8. EVALUATION OF FACULTY WITH LEAVES .....	12
<b>SECTION III - CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
III.1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.....	14
III.2. Criteria for Reappointment .....	15
III.3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.....	17
III.4. Criteria for Early Tenure or Early Promotion to Associate Professor .....	18
III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor .....	18
III.6. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor .....	20
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>APPENDIX I.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix II.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX III .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix IV.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix V.....</b>	<b>36</b>

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

### SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion process is a critically important faculty responsibility. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the President (or designee) 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 \(CBA\)](#) (can be found via [CPP Faculty Affairs Office website](#), titled as “CBA [Article 15 Evaluation](#)) and [Policy #1328](#) and [Policy #1329](#) of the University Manual. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes the first precedence and university policies take the second precedence over departmental policies.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. The document with the criteria is permanently posted online at a department web page available to tenure-track/tenured faculty. This document can be made available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and what they must achieve to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidates are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate a model of the department faculty colleague to which the candidate should aspire.

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.

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

### ***I.1. DEFINITIONS***

[Policy #1328](#) provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures for both the candidate and DRTPC to follow, with the understanding that in case of disagreement [Policy #1328](#) will supersede the DRTP criteria. The candidates are responsible for ensuring that they use the appropriate criteria documents.

- a) *Candidate* refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- b) *Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)* members are full-time tenured faculty members elected by the tenured and probationary faculty.
- c) *College RTP Committee (CRTPC)* refers to a group of tenured faculty members in the College of Agriculture that review and assess a candidate's appeal.
- d) *Criteria* are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve 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/her designee (see also Policy#1328).

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- e) *Procedures* describe the process that must be followed by RTP candidates to apply for RTP action. RTP candidates must comply with the policies and procedures that are in effect at the time of RTP action.
- A probationary year of service is any two semesters in a period of three consecutive semesters. 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 regarding professional activities, and university service (see section III.3.304 of this DRTP document).
  - Student evaluation of teaching is governed by [Policy #1329](#), Student Evaluation of Teaching, of the [University Academic Manual](#).
  - Peer evaluation of teaching is the responsibility of the DRTP Committee and includes a classroom visit (for in-person modality), a synchronous online teaching session visit, an asynchronous online course evaluation, and full access and review of the course shell, review of courses syllabi & other teaching materials. The Department Chair and other department tenured faculty, as determined by the DRTP Committee may assist the DRTP Committee in conducting peer teaching observations. Tenured faculty members will conduct all peer observations of teaching.
- f) *A candidate for reappointment* is applying to retain their current rank and tenure status. The candidate must use the criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.
- g) *A candidate for tenure or promotion* is applying for promotion to a higher rank and/or for tenure. The candidate may choose between the criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

### ***I.2. DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY***

The activities of all faculty and staff in the Nutrition and Food Science Department should be consistent with the following mission and vision statements of this Department, which are in line with [University Strategic Plan](#) (2017-2025) and [Academic Master Plan](#) (AY 2018-19 to AY 2022-23), including [six value statements](#) and eight elements of [inclusive polytechnic identity](#).

<https://www.cpp.edu/aboutcpp/calpolypomona-overview/mission-and-values.shtml>

**NFS Department Mission statement:** Using a learn-by-doing approach, the Nutrition and Food Science Department prepares students for careers in nutrition, health, and food science and technology in an inclusive, creative, and innovative environment.

**NFS Department Vision Statement:** “to be a nationally recognized center of excellence in producing nutrition and food science leaders as well as creating and disseminating knowledge in collaboration with alumni, community, government, and industry.”

Candidates will be evaluated for teaching performance, scholarly and creative activity, service at any level within the university and service to the community and to professional organizations. In evaluating a candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion the review groups will consider these evaluation areas considering the candidate’s reappointment level, past performance, and improvement. Additionally, the criteria also address performance regarding student advising/mentoring.

There are also provisions in the criteria for the evaluation of faculty serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, provisions 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 (See Section II.4).

## **SECTION II - PROCEDURES**

[Policy #1328](#) describes RTP procedures in complete detail. The functions and responsibilities of the candidate, the Department RTP Committee, the College RTP Committee, the Dean, the University RTP Committee, and the Provost are described in this policy. It is recommended the candidate review the policy each review period when preparing their packet.

### ***II.1. ELECTION OF DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE***

The DRTP Committee shall consist of three (3), five (5) or seven (7) full time, tenured faculty members elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. Faculty participating in FERP may participate following University policy (Section 3.1 of [Policy #1328](#)).

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

The DRTP Committee shall be elected by secret ballot before the end of the Spring semester 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. If there are not enough department faculty of appropriate rank, the department faculty will nominate candidates from other departments in related disciplines prior to the election.

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 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.

Faculty on Professional Leave with Pay (sabbatical or difference in pay) may not participate in Department Committee activities unless approved by the Professional Leave Committee and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Faculty, who know in advance that they will, during one semester or more, be unavailable or ineligible, cannot be nominees for the Committee.

### ***II.2. ELECTION OF DRTP COMMITTEE CHAIR***

The Committee shall elect a Chair who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the DRTP criteria document and [Policy #1328](#) of the University Manual are carried out.

### ***II.3. DUTIES OF DRTP COMMITTEE CHAIR***

The DRTP Chair shall perform the following duties:

Fall semester:

1. Ensures that candidates have information they need: including information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests.
2. Assists candidates in understanding expectations for preparing packages.
3. Informs Faculty Affairs of requests.
4. Ensures that packages are complete.
5. 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.
6. Provide the department recommendation to the candidate.

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

Throughout the year:

1. Ensure that peer observations are scheduled and conducted in two different courses if possible and preferably in two different semesters according to Department and University policy for all faculty members who will be a candidate for RTP action in the future. Ensure that reports are provided to candidates in a timely manner.
2. The DRTP Committee Chair will make proper arrangements for peer observations by consultation with the other members of the committee.

### ***II.4. DUTIES OF DRTP COMMITTEE***

The DRTP 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 ten (10) calendar days 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 due date of the RTP package. Signed comments by students must also include the student's Bronco ID number. The candidate will have ten (10) calendar days to provide a response, if desired, to these comments. The DRTP Committee will meet after all responses are received.

The Committee's duties include the following:

The DRTP Committee is responsible for ensuring the integrity of the RTP process within the Department. The Committee structure and function shall conform to [Policy #1328](#), Section 3.1 of the University Manual.

- A. Announcing Candidates Requesting DRTP Action, and approved DRTP criteria is to be used to evaluate candidate's performance.
- B. Peer Observations
  1. A member of the DRTP Committee or a designated tenured faculty member will contact the candidate and arrange for a mutually acceptable time(s) for the peer observations. A faculty member of a higher rank than the candidate must conduct peer observations.
  2. DRTP Committee members will submit, to the DRTP Committee Chair, a narrative description of observations, using one of the Department's approved Peer Observation Forms (see Appendix of NFS DRTP Criteria).

The DRTP Committee shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions for each of the candidate's request for action:

- A. Reappointment to next probationary year(s),
- B. Reappointment with tenure,
- C. Reappointment with early tenure,



## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- 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,
- I. Deny early promotion,
- J. Deny early tenure.

Decisions must be supported and shall address all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the DRTP Committee by the candidate or requested by the DRTP Committee.

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

1. An updated curriculum vitae.
2. Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations in accordance with Policies [1328,1329](#) and [Article 15](#) of the CBA;
3. Summaries and interpretations of peer observations of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with [Policy #1328](#) and [Article 15](#) of the University Manual and CBA respectively.
4. Self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);
5. Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package).
6. Material requested from the candidate by the DRTP Committee that includes requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package.
7. Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the DRTP Committee before the closing date.

The DRTP Committee will make its evaluation of the candidate's request in writing on University approved forms. The DRTP Committee will review with the candidate the results of the Committee's evaluation. The candidate will then be given the opportunity to either accept the Committee's recommendation, or to submit within ten (10) working days either a response/rebuttal or request reconsideration ([Policy #1328](#)). 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.

In the request for reconsideration, the candidate must clearly deal with each issue raised by the Committee 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.

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

The candidate has ten (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 #1328](#). 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.

### ***II.5. DUTIES OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR***

The Department Chair shall ensure that each faculty member has access to the approved DRTP criteria. A copy of the current approved DRTP document shall be maintained in the Nutrition and Food Science Department office and available online. 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. An archive of these past DRTP documents shall be made available to the Committee and faculty online.

The Department Chair must conduct a separate evaluation if the Department Chair is not elected to the DRTP Committee. The Chair's evaluation will be based on the DRTP Criteria (i.e., class visitation, evaluation of class material, etc.). The chair cannot write a separate evaluation for candidates at the same or higher rank.

When the Department Chair makes a separate recommendation, that recommendation will be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. The Chair and the DRTPC write their recommendation independently and without consulting each other. The candidate will receive a copy of the Department Chair's recommendation.

### ***II.6. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES***

The candidate initiates all RTP requests. The candidate must inform the DRTPC Chair in writing that there will or will not be a request for a regular or early action.

At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups. Prior to the final decisions, ONLY candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (CBA 14.7). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

The period 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 or two years in the cases where two-year appointments were made; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; promotion and tenure evaluations on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position.

The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and to make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personal 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

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. Additional support documents, which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, artwork, etc.) could be uploaded in a separate file folder via Interfolio or made available upon the DRTP Committee's request. An index that specifies where the supplemental materials are located is then included in the RTP package.

In the self-evaluation, the candidate must be clear, concise, and relevant when addressing the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The candidate must submit evidence to the DRTP Committee that he/she has fulfilled the RTP criteria. Furthermore, the evaluation shall unequivocally contain the following items:

### **A. Discussion of teaching performance.**

This includes a discussion of the student evaluations and peer observations. A summary table for all courses evaluated including the average scores for all questions per course and the averages per questions throughout all the courses evaluated must be included in the packet by the candidate (see sample table in Appendix 1 of this document). All areas in need of improvement noted in the student evaluations and peer observations shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken, or progress made towards rectifying them must be addressed. In this section the candidate may address other activities related to teaching including adopting new teaching techniques, innovations in courses, developing and teaching a new course, substantial reviews of existing courses, using new technology, etc. The faculty member shall be responsible for identification of materials for review consideration "as well as materials required by campus policy"; the policy states evaluating committees and administrators are responsible for identifying and providing materials relating to evaluation required by campus policy but not accessible to the employee (CBA 15.12a), and copies of added material shall be provided to the faculty member (CBA15.12(b)).

1. Faculty members teaching online are subject to all the rights and conditions set out in CBA Article 15 Evaluation and applicable campus evaluative policies. The collection and use of online course quantitative data for evaluation purposes shall only occur when required in campus evaluation policies and procedures (15.3).
2. The faculty member shall be given at least a 5-day notice that an "online observation, and/or review of online content" is to take place; additional consultation shall occur regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits.

(Optional: Other considerations may include – asking the candidate to provide student grade distributions of the courses taught. Students tend to like professors giving out “easy As.” This is also associated with the “rigor” of the courses/materials taught, but determinations of rigor will only be made in the context of other course materials and peer evaluations and not only upon grade distributions.

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

### **B. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities.**

This includes specific citations (in APA style, or the style that your field uses) of all peer-reviewed publications, dates of attendance of all professional meetings, and explicit reference to all activities listed. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall 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, professional societies, and Community.**

This includes specific roles served on 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.

## ***II.7. MATERIALS USED FOR EVALUATION***

**STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING** – in this section the specific procedures called for in [Policy #1328](#) and [Policy #1329](#) must be followed. These procedures should include the method of administering the department standard evaluation form in classes as well as the method of soliciting input on RTP candidates. The department form should be included in this section or as an appendix (see Appendix II).

The candidate must submit all student evaluation summaries completed since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment, with exceptions allowed by the university.

**PEER OBSERVATIONS OF TEACHING** - in this section the specific procedures called for in [Policy #1328](#) should be outlined (see also [Policy #1329](#), sections 3.2 Student Evaluation of Teaching and 3.3 Peer Evaluation of Teaching).

The DRTP Committee shall delegate tenured faculty the responsibility of visiting classes and reviewing course on Canvas for in-person, synchronous, and asynchronous courses taught by the candidate. Preferably two different classes taught in preferably different semesters will be observed. If a candidate requests more than one class visitation in a semester, all peer observations must be included in the evaluation.

Only peer observations conducted prior to or during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. Exceptions may be allowed by the DRTP Committee if the candidate does not have the minimum number of peer observations.

## ***II.8. EVALUATION OF FACULTY WITH LEAVES***

CANDIDATES AND FUTURE CANDIDATES serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also [Policy #1328](#)).

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

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. The candidate may work with the RTP Committee, Dean, and Faculty Affairs to amend the timeline. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all negotiated and documented deadlines.

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 DRTP Criteria document. If these exceptions are not addressed in the department criteria, then the candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing an interpretation of the department criteria in light of the special circumstances. The Dean, URTPC chair, and Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Faculty Affairs shall approve this memorandum of understanding.

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

- a) The Committee must consider the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, and administrative assignment for the University, or 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. Faculty on approved leave for one semester may submit only one peer-observation for that academic year. Faculty on approved leave for one academic year may not submit any peer-observation for that academic year.

Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment, Academic Governance, or on Approved Leave

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- a) For promotion and tenure, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught at least in 6 WTUs per year since the last RTP action. Any variation can be discussed with DRTPC and will need the Dean's approval.
- b) 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 candidates for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- c) 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 candidates for reappointment or promotion in the Department. The Committee, whether alone or in collaboration with others, can examine research and scholarly activity done at another institution, for the purposes of fulfilling the Department's criteria in the area of scholarly or creative activities.
- d) There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving an administrative assignment without the written consent of DRTP Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean. The Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy and Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

### **SECTION III - CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION**

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

In this section, the department provides an overview of the criteria areas and how accomplishments in each of these areas shall be assessed. The criteria areas must include teaching/advising, professional and scholarly activity, and service to department/ college/university/community and professional societies.

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 Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, Policy, and Academic Affairs.

The candidate is evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Success in teaching performance will be the primary basis for evaluation. Scholarly and creative activity is considered in proportion to the amount of release time the candidate had for these activities over the length of her/his probationary period. The candidate is expected to show meaningful Committee activity at the Department, College, and University level as well as participation in professional societies and/or the community external to the University. Candidates need to address each one of the items described below.

Candidates must meet performance criteria in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review in order to be recommended for the

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

requested RTP action. Regarding requirements for "additional activities," candidates may choose to repeat an activity.

### ***III.2. Criteria for Reappointment***

#### III.2.1 Teaching Effectiveness

- III.2.1.1. A candidate for reappointment is expected to exhibit effective teaching as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, signed student and faculty input, and documentation of additional teaching activities, as listed in Appendix 1.
- III.2.1.2. **Student Evaluations:** Examination and discussion of student evaluations is required. Candidates are required to examine in detail the results of the student evaluations and comment upon them in the RTP package. Candidates will summarize the information by averaging the scores for each question across courses evaluated and presenting this information in a table (see Appendix 2). The candidate has the opportunity to demonstrate growth over the probationary period and by the time the candidate applies for tenure and promotion, the overall average score should be at least 2.75 (on a scale of 1 to 4 where 4 is best). In probationary years, any scores lower than 2.75 (on a 1 to 4 scale where 4 is best) should be explained, and if appropriate, a plan of action should be addressed with the expectation that the candidate shows evidence of striving for excellence.
- III.2.1.3. **Peer Evaluations:** Candidates are required to examine in detail the peer observations and comment upon them in the RTP package. In probationary years, the candidate is expected to discuss the results of their peer evaluations and respond to comments from reviewers. By the time the candidate is applying for tenure and promotion, they are expected to "Meet Expectations" in categories of the peer evaluation. Each probationary year, the candidate should reflect on their peer reviews and what steps they take as they progress towards promotion. The peer review forms are presented in Appendix 3.
- III.2.1.4. **Additional Teaching Activities:** Candidates are expected to participate in, and complete teaching activities listed in Appendix I during the probationary period. To ensure that candidates have the flexibility needed to take advantage of teaching-related opportunities as they arise, no specific requirements for additional teaching activities are stipulated for each probationary year. However, candidates are expected to have completed a minimum

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

of three teaching activities by the time the candidate applies for tenure and promotion to associate professor. A narrative paragraph is required to explain the additional teaching activities relevant to the appendix that the candidate has implemented.

### III.2.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities

III.2.3.1 The candidate must have made progress toward establishing a clear line of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by documented evidence of peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations, as well as involvement and achievement in additional areas of scholarship as listed in Appendix I.

III.3.2. Service - The DRTP Committee will evaluate Service activities provided to the university community, the candidate's profession, and local, regional, and national community service at different levels. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. Candidates are recommended to summarize in a table the type of service category, committee name, duration of service, the contribution provided by the candidate to the committee, and estimated commitment of time to the committee. The DRTPC will consider the time commitment and impact of committees in their evaluation.

III.2.3.1 The candidate must be a member of 1 committee/taskforce per year (starting the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> probationary year) at the department, or the college, or university level that has a significant time commitment, or must hold a director/coordinator position or chair/co-chair for at least one committee within the department, college, or university. All positions must be held for at least one year or designated term. Additionally, holding a leadership position in a professional society will count for this level of service as well.

III.2.3.2 The candidate is required to complete **five** additional service activities by the time of tenure from the list provided in Appendix I.

III.2.3.3 *It is expected that candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in required department activities and advising, faculty meetings and retreats, discipline-specific meetings, scholarship and applicant reviews, department and college outreach events, as well as all task forces to which all faculty are expected to contribute.*



## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

### **III.3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

It is expected that candidates applying for tenure and promotion will provide reflection and self-evaluation for all three review areas during the entire review period and not simply during the year immediately prior to application for tenure and promotion. However, the evaluation of student evaluation scores will only be based on the most recent probationary period.

#### **III.3.1. Teaching Effectiveness**

- III.3.3.1 Student Evaluations: For all classes evaluated during the period of review, an overall average score greater than or equal to 2.75 is expected.
- III.3.3.2 Peer Evaluations – The candidate is expected to “Meet” in all categories.
- III.3.3.3 Additional Teaching Activities: Candidates must provide evidence of completing at least **three** additional teaching activities (refer to Appendix I) during the period of review.

#### **III.3.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Using the Scholarly Activities list in Appendix I, the candidate is expected to complete at least **twenty** total “A” and “B” activities over the probationary period, of which six of them are “A” activities. The candidate may have multiples of A and B items. For example, if the candidate had 3 journal articles published, they would count that as three A items. Additionally, if the candidate has completed 10 “A” activities, they would only need to complete an additional 10 “B” activities to meet the standard.

#### **III.3.3. Service**

- III.3.2.1 The candidate must be a member of 1 committee/task force per year (starting the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> probationary year) at the department, or college, or university level that has a significant time commitment, or the candidate must hold a director/coordinator position or chair/co-chair on at least one committee within the department, or college, or university. All positions must be held for at least one year or a designated term. Additionally, holding a leadership position in a professional organization will fulfill this requirement as well.
- III.3.2.2 The candidate is expected to complete **five** additional items from the service list in Appendix I over the probational period.

### ***III.4. Criteria for Early Tenure or Early Promotion to Associate Professor***

#### **III.4.1. Teaching Effectiveness**

III.4.1.1 **Student Evaluations:** For all classes evaluated during the review period, the overall average score should be greater than or equal to 3.25.

III.4.1.2 **Peer Evaluations:** For all classes observed during the review period, the candidate should score “Exceeds” on at least one category and score “Meets” on the remaining categories.

III.4.1.3 **Teaching Activities:** Candidates must have completed at least **four** teaching activities during the probationary period (refer to Appendix I)

#### **III.4.2. Scholarly and Professional Activity**

The candidate is expected to complete a combined **25** total “A” and “B” activities, with at least **ten** being “A”.

#### **III.4.3. Service**

III.4.1.4 The candidate must chair/co-chair at least one committee/task force at the department, or college, or university level, or they must hold a director/coordinator position within the department, college, or university. All of the above positions must be held for at least one year or designated term. The candidate must also be a member of 1 other committee with significant time commitment per year.

III.4.1.5 The candidate is required to complete **five** additional items from the list of service activities in Appendix I during the review period.

### ***III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor***

The department believes that after initial promotion to Associate Professor, many faculty will often choose an area of focus (research or service) in their career. Although what is provided in this document is the general route to Full Professor, the candidate can discuss and document options for evaluation with the DRTPC as they progress toward Full Professor

### III.5.1

#### Teaching Effectiveness

- III.5.1.1 Student Evaluations: For all classes evaluated during the review period, the overall average score for all classes should be greater than or equal to 2.75.
- III.5.1.2 Peer Evaluations: For all classes observed during the review period, the candidate should score “Meets” in all categories.
- III.5.1.3 Teaching Activities: Candidates must show evidence of completing at least **three** teaching activities (refer to Appendix I) during the period of review.

### III.5.2 Scholarly and Professional Activity

The candidate is expected to complete **twenty** total “A” and “B” activities over the probationary period, with at least **six** being “A”.

### III.5.3 Service.

- III.5.3.1. Committee(s): Must chair or co-chair at least one committee at the department, college, or university level or hold a director/coordinator position within the department. The candidate must also be a member of 3 other committees with significant time commitment spaced over the review period. All positions must be held for at least one year or designated term.
- III.5.3.2. The candidate is required to complete **five** additional service activities from the list provided in Appendix I during the review period.

### ***III.6. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor***

The department believes that after initial promotion to Associate Professor, many faculty will often choose an area of focus (research or service) in their career. Although what is provided in this document is the general route to Full Professor, the candidate can discuss and document options for evaluation with the DRTPC as they progress towards Full Professor.

#### **III.6.1 Teaching Effectiveness**

- III.6.1.1. Student Evaluations: For all classes evaluated during the review period, the overall average score should be greater than or equal to 3.25.
- III.6.1.2. Peer Evaluations: For all classes observed during the review period, the candidate should “Exceed” in at least one category and “Meet” in all other categories.
- III.6.1.3. Teaching Activities: Candidates must show evidence of completing at least **four** teaching activities (refer to Appendix I) during the period of review.

#### **III.6.2 Scholarly and Professional Activity**

The candidate is expected to complete a combined **25** total “A” and “B” activities, with at least **ten** being “A”.

#### **III.6.3 Service**

- III.6.3.1. Must chair or co-chair at least two committees at the department, college, or university level or hold a director/coordinator position within the department. Must also be a member of 1 other committee with significant time commitment per year. All positions must be held for at least one year or designated term.
- III.6.3.2. The candidate is required to complete **five** additional service activities from the list provided in Appendix I during the review period. NFS DRTP CRITERIA

Table 1. NFS Criteria Summary

Action	Overall Student Evaluations Average	Peer Evaluations	Add'l Teach Act	Scholarship	Service	Add'l Service
3rd Probationary Year	Discuss any item lower than 2.75	Candidate is demonstrating progression towards tenure and promotion.				
4th Probationary Year						
5th Probationary Year						
6th Probationary Year						
Tenure/Assoc Prof	≥2.75 over all years of review period	All items "Meets"	3	6 A 20 total A&B	1 committee/taskforce or director/coordinator or chair/co-chair at least one committee within the department, college, or university.	5
Early Tenure/Assoc Prof	≥3.25 over all years of review period	All items "Meets" and at least 1 "Exceeds"	4	10 A 25 total A&Bs	Chair/Co-Chair 1 committee or director/coordinator within the department, college, or university	5
Professor	≥2.75 over all years of review period	All items "Meets"	3	6 A 20 total A&B	Chair/Co-Chair 1 committee or director/coordinator within the department, college or university and must be member of 3 other committees	5
Early Professor	≥3.25 over all years of review period	All items "Meets" and at least 1 "Exceeds"	4	10 A 25 total A&Bs	Chair/Co-Chair 2 committees or director/coordinator within the department, college or university and must be member of 1 other committee	5

# Appendices

## APPENDIX I

Examples of Activities

Diversification in various areas is preferred Additional

Activities for TEACHING:

1. Narrative of Implementation of high impact practices or evidenced based pedagogical strategies as community-based learning, practice-based learning, service learning, etc. as appropriate to the coursework.
2. Assessment of student performance such as examinations, assignments, etc., should be in accordance with teaching objectives. Criteria for assessment should be clearly explained to students.
3. Describe involvement in new course development, which may include service learning, Expanded Course Outline (ECO) revisions, and general curriculum development, as appropriate.
4. Participate in Professional Development opportunities dedicated to teaching preparation and performance.
5. Being a guest speaker for a course OR arranging for guest speakers.
6. International exchange activities
7. Participation in workshops, committees or presentations that enhance teaching and/or advising.
8. Interdisciplinary teaching
9. Instructional activities that have a significant multicultural, international, or diversity component
10. Mentorship of students
11. Teaching awards or honors (internal or external)
12. Development and/or implementation of innovative teaching techniques
13. Development and/or implementation of service-learning courses
14. Development and/or implementation of online or hybrid courses
15. Development of a new course or significant revision of an existing course
16. "Development and/or implementation of active teaching techniques.
17. Other teaching activities in consultation with the DRTPC

Activities for SCHOLARLY WORK:

A:

1. Serving as a chair of a MS graduate committee.
2. Serving as the advisor of undergraduate research work such as RSCA, STARS, Project Hatchery, etc. with deliverables (e.g., poster presentations, Bronco Scholar Works, etc.
3. Scholarly and creative work generated from community engagement, and community-based participatory work such as but not limited to reports, white papers, knowledge translation initiatives (such as podcasts, videos, and educational resources).

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

4. Publishing in a peer-reviewed journal
5. Publishing a book/textbook
6. Publishing a chapter in a peer-reviewed book/textbook.
7. Serving as a chair or committee member on a doctoral committee.
8. Serving as an editor of a book or textbook in the area of expertise.
9. Serving as an associate editor or editor of a peer-reviewed journal and/or resource (Each year) with significant time commitment.
10. Oral presentation at a conference
11. Being awarded a grant
12. Other A-level scholarly activities with significant time commitment may qualify in consultation with the DRTPC.

### B:

1. Presentation of a poster at a conference/symposium/etc.
2. Developing and submitting grant proposals
3. Receiving an award or comparable status from a professional society (e.g., recognition of research or excellence in the profession)
4. Being the main organizer of a professional conference, workshop, or short course
5. Speaking engagements in area of expertise.
6. Earning a certification, license, or credential in a field relevant to one's professional practice.
7. Serving as reviewer of grants or conference proposals for each call for proposals.
8. Serving on the editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal.
9. Consulting with industrial, business or government agencies related to their area of expertise.
10. Attending a professional meetings at all levels, local, state or national.
11. Achieving goals established within the timeline for an awarded grant.
12. Serving as a manuscript reviewer for peer-reviewed journals.
13. Serving as an expert witness for legal matters in area of expertise.
14. Serving as a committee member for a graduate or undergraduate committee.
15. Publishing in newspapers, magazines, online media, or other outlets in area of expertise.
16. Developing and submitting manuscripts for publication.
17. Developing and submitting grant proposals.
18. Engaging in community initiatives to build relationships with marginalized populations such as but not limited to consultation, partnership, or advisory committees related to area of faculty expertise with the intent of developing scholarly work.
19. Other B-level scholarly activities in consultation with the DRTPC.

### Additional Activities for SERVICE:

1. Advising students, if applicable
2. Serving as an advisor for a student club
3. Developing student recruitment materials, such as brochures, videos, websites, etc. that were adopted by the department.
4. Successfully establishing of an ongoing multi-student undergraduate or graduate internship
5. Organizing a regional student conference or competition
6. Serving in a leadership position in a professional society
7. Speaking engagements to campus or community groups
8. Judging for community events
9. Actively participating in community service organizations related to one's area

## NFS DRTP CRITERIA

of expertise.

10. Participating in recruitment activities such as speaking at high schools or community colleges.
11. Serving on advisory committees for community colleges or other educational, professional, and community institutions or organizations where contributions are made to curricular and program development.
12. Serving as a member of a professional organization's committee or task force
13. Writing letters or recommendation for students, colleagues, or alumni
14. Mentoring/Advising or coaching a student group involved in extra-curricular activity(ies) counted as per team or per year
15. Holding a leadership position in professional organizations with some service component.
16. Other service activities in consultation with the DRTPC



NFS DRTP CRITERIA

**Appendix II**

Sample  
Table for summarizing scores from student evaluations

Question	Course #1	Course #2	Course #3	Course #4	etc.	Average per question
1						
2						
3						
etc.						
Average per class						

NFS DRTP CRITERIA  
**APPENDIX III**

**NFS INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS**  
**Scale – 1 low to 4 high**

1. I understood the learning outcomes in this course.
2. To me, the course content seemed well organized.
3. To me, class sessions seemed well organized.
4. The time I spent in class sessions furthered my understanding of the course material.
5. Examples and illustrations provided in this course aided my understanding.
6. The course provided some general concepts that helped me see connections among specific topics.
7. The course was a valuable learning experience for me.
8. The assignments in this course aided my learning.
9. I was able to effectively use instructor feedback to increase my learning.
10. I learned ways of reasoning that I could apply to other disciplines.
11. My learning experience increased my appreciation for the subject covered.
12. I gained awareness of the relevance and importance of the course material.
13. The course made a relevant contribution to my overall education.
14. I felt I was evaluated fairly in this class.
15. I felt I was treated with respect in this class.
16. The class atmosphere supported my learning.
17. I felt encouraged to contribute respectful dialogue to this class.

*Answer the next three questions only if you have first-hand experience from making contact for help.*

18. When I sought outside help from the instructor (such as by phone, e-mail, or office visit), I received it.
19. I felt welcome to seek help and advice from the instructor.
20. The help I received from the instructor was useful to my learning.

# NFS DRTP CRITERIA

## Appendix IV

### NFS PEER OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

(Use for face-to-face, hybrid, online synchronous, and Hyflex class formats)

Form last revised: 03.20.2023

Instructor's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Course number and name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date(s) of review: \_\_\_\_\_

Topic covered during observation: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer observer's name: \_\_\_\_\_

The instructor must provide access to or copies of the following materials prior to **the course's review:**

- Course syllabus
- Class activity handouts
- Lecture notes used for the observation
- Example exam with summary of class performance with key if possible
- For writing or presentation assignments, include the rubric and outcome.
- Provide access to Canvas or equivalent learning management system.

**\*Mark (X) in the items that have been met in the 6 categories\***

1. **Course Materials** – this category is based solely on the provision of basic course materials.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have components 1 – 4. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

1. **Syllabus or “Start Here” module includes:**
  - a. **Course title and number and what time taught and room location**
  - b. **Catalog description**
  - c. **Unit hours**
  - d. **Instructor name, office hours and office number**
  - e. **Instructor office phone number and e-mail**
  - f. **Course pre-requisites and co-requisites**
  - g. **Course learning objectives (if a DPD course, these need to comply with ACEND 2022 standards as posted in ECO on the learning management system (Canvas))**

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- h. Outline of content (schedule or timetable) including assignments and exams
  - i. Description of teaching methods
  - j. Method of student evaluation/grading system
  - k. Required and recommended readings
  - l. Safety information (not necessary if it is an online synchronous course)
  - m. Policy on make-up exams and assignment
  - n. Policy on attendance
  - o. Information on academic honesty
  - p. Stated policies regarding netiquette and courteous, collegial behavior; instructor models appropriate communication.
2. Lecture notes and or videos in various forms that demonstrate organization, clarity, and sequence.
  3. Provides a sample of assignment(s) and or exam(s)
  4. Has instructions for assignments that demonstrate organization and clarity
  5. Uses supplemental materials such as articles, external videos, websites, radio programs, podcast, etc.
  6. Uses rubrics for assessments on assignments, exams, presentations, papers, etc.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 or more additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category neither during the class session, in the course materials, nor in any other way. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer's Selection (X)

Observer comments:

**2. Course Organization** – This category is based on having clear instructions, logical course and module navigation, a course schedule of topics, and a lecture(s) is well-organized.

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have items 1 – 5. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

- 7. Instructions are clear on how to get started and where to find various course components within the learning management system (Canvas).
- 8. Navigation throughout modules is chronological and logical, consistent, and efficient.
- 9. A published course schedule (online or within the syllabus) that outlines topics to be covered and assignment due dates.
- 10. Topic learning objectives are used and clearly stated.
- 11. Lecture is organized in a logical or sequential manner.
- 12. Course syllabus provides an estimate of the amount of time students should spend on the course (e.g., “On average, most students spend eight hours per week working on course assignments. Your workload may depend on your prior experience with computing and the Web in general, and with this subject in particular.”)
- 13. Estimated times for completion of course assignments (e.g., “This assignment should take you approximately 2 hours to complete.”)

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 to 4 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 5 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 or more additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category neither during the class session, in the course materials, nor in any other way. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer's Selection (X)

**Observer comments:**

**2. Knowledge, Currency and Command Of Course Material** – This category is based on if and how well the instructor exemplifies their command for the course’s content and its topics.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have items 1 – 6.***

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

*All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.*

1. \_ Instructor demonstrates command of course material and knowledge of current/future developments
2. \_ Textbooks and other materials are current and in accordance with the course ECO
3. \_ Instructor shows effective use of lecture material
4. \_ Instructor effectively responds to in-class questions whether the answer is known or not
5. \_ Instructor effectively makes use of their exceptional work experiences in the field or relevant research findings in the form graphs or figures.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional item)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category neither during the class session, in the course materials, nor in any other way. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.
Observer's Selection (X)				

**Observer comments:**

**4. Clear and Effective Communication** – This category is based on whether and how well the instructor communicates conveys course topics and instructions, and generally communicates with students.

*\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have items 1–4. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.*

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

1. **Demonstrates a clear, audible, and concise lecture with effective descriptions, discussions, and explanations**
2. **Uses clear and concise instructions in assignment and activity**
3. **In-class or online announcements are used to communicate important up-to-date course information to students, such as reminders of upcoming assignment due dates, curriculum changes, scheduled absences, etc.**
4. **Correct grammar and spelling are used in all forms of communication whether verbal or written**
5. **Video and or audio self-recordings are used to explain complex assignments/activities**

<b>No Demonstration Provided (0 items)</b>	<b>Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)</b>	<b>Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)</b>	<b>Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)</b>	<b>Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional item)</b>
The instructor does not demonstrate this category neither during the class session, in the course materials, nor in any other way. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer's Selection (X)

Observer's Selection (X)

5. **Educational Climate for Learning Experience** – This category is based on student-student interactions, faculty-student interactions, student feedback, and the

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

encouragement of student communication.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have item numbers 1–6. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

1. The instructor successfully actively engages students with questions during the lecture.
2. The instructor encourages and fosters the exchange of thoughts, ideas, and experiences among students during the lecture.
3. The instructor holds regular office hours and those by appointment.
4. The instructor evidences a form of timely feedback to students on their work.
5. Provides example evidencing that student inquiries are responded to in a timely manner.
6. A "welcome message" or introductory page is provided on the LMS at the beginning of the course that encourages student-to-instructor contact for course-related discussions or concerns.
7. Course LMS makes available student resources such as Canvas library resources, chat, etc.
8. Demonstrates a good level of rapport with the students.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observers Selection(X)

Observer comments:



NFS DRTP CRITERIA

6. **Instructional Methods and Quality of Materials** – This category is based on the degree of student participation and engagement in activities and assignments.

*\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor **must have item 1, 2, or 3 in combination with at least one additional item (4-8)**. All other items and combinations of them are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.*

1. **Activities/assignments involve use of writing, speaking, and other forms of self-expression.**
2. **Activities/assignments involve reflecting, relating, organizing, applying, synthesizing, or evaluating information.**
3. **Activities/assignments involve information gathering, synthesis, and analysis in solving problems (including the use of library, electronic/computer and other resources, and quantitative reasoning and interpretation, as applicable)**
4. Activities/assignments involve participation in collaborative work.
5. Activities/assignments involve intercultural and international competence.
6. Activities/assignments involve dialogue pertaining to social behavior, community, and scholarly conduct.
7. Opportunities for students to “customize” their learning by tailoring assignments to their personal and professional interests and needs.
8. Opportunities allowing students to think, talk, or write about their learning.

Observer's Selection (X)

<b>No Demonstration Provided (0 items)</b>	<b>Meets All Expectation (Either 1 or 2 or 3)</b>	<b>Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional item)</b>
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer comments:

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

**7. Classroom management (physical and virtual classroom)** – This category may only be based on the in-class lecture observation as dated above. Additionally, this category is based on class time usage, class management and behavior, and the instructor’s ability to stay on task in an organized fashion.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have item numbers 1 – 5. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

1. Began class on time.
2. Makes effective use of the class period.
3. Demonstrates a sense of authority and maintains control of classroom dynamics involving the students and the instructor, such as student disruptions or excessive talking.
4. Provides and adheres to some form of a class schedule or set of tasks to complete.
5. Demonstrates a sense of preparedness.
6. The introduction and completion of learning objectives is stated in some way throughout the class session.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 to 4 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 5 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional item)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category neither during the class session, in the course materials, nor in any other way. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.
Observer's Selection (X)				

**Observer comments:**

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

8. Does the instructor adhere to Cal Poly Pomona's accessibility, with an Ally score of at least 85%, (<https://www.cpp.edu/accessibility/rules.shtml>) and copyright (<https://www.cpp.edu/copyright/materials.shtml>) policies as outlined by the university?

9. What are the instructor's strengths for teaching?

10. Suggestions and constructive recommendations to assist instructor?

Date of Discussion of Assessment with the Instructor, if any:

Instructor name (print): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Observer name (print): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Observer signature: \_\_\_\_\_

# NFS DRTP CRITERIA

## Appendix V

### NFS PEER OBSERVATION OF ONLINE CLASSROOM TEACHING

(Use for the online asynchronous class format)

Form last revised: 03.20.2023

Instructor's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number and Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Module(s) reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date(s) of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Observer's name: \_\_\_\_\_

The instructor must provide access to or copies of the following materials prior to the course's review:

- Course syllabus
- Class activity handout(s)
- Lecture notes used for the observation.
- Example exam with summary of class performance with key if possible
- For writing or presentation assignments, include the rubric and outcomes.
- Provide access to Canvas or equivalent learning management system.

**\*Mark (X) in the items that have been met in the 6 categories\***

**1. Course Materials** – this category is based solely on the provision of basic course materials.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have components 1 – 4. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

1. Syllabus or “Start Here” module includes:
  - a. Course title and number and what time taught and room location.
  - b. Catalog description
  - c. Unit hours
  - d. Instructor name, office hours and office number
  - e. Instructor office phone number and e-mail
  - f. Course pre-requisites and co-requisites
  - g. Course learning objectives (if a DPD course, these need to comply with ACEND 2022 standards as posted in ECO on Canvas)
  - h. Outline of content (schedule or timetable) including assignments and exams
  - i. Description of teaching methods
  - j. Method of student evaluation/grading system

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- k. **Required and recommended readings**
  - l. **Policy on make-up exams and assignment**
  - m. **Policy on attendance**
  - n. **Information on academic honesty**
  - o. **Stated policies regarding netiquette and courteous, collegial behavior, instructor models appropriate communication.**
2. **Lecture notes and or videos in various forms that demonstrate organization, clarity, and sequence.**
  3. **Provides a sample of assignment(s) and or exam(s)**
  4. **Has instructions for assignments that demonstrate organization and clarity**
  5. Uses supplemental materials such as articles, outside videos, websites, radio programs, etc.
  6. Uses rubrics for assessments on assignments/exams/presentations/papers, etc.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer's Selection (X)

Observer comments:

**2. Course Organization** – This category is based on having clear instructions, logical course and module navigation, a course schedule of topics, and time estimates for the completion of course work.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have items 1 – 4. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- a. Instructions are clear on how to get started and where to find various course components.
- b. Navigation throughout modules is chronological and logical, consistent, and efficient.
- c. Includes a published course schedule that outlines topics to be covered and assignment due dates.
- d. Course learning objectives are used and clearly stated.
- e. Course syllabus provides an estimate of the amount of time students should spend on the course (e.g., “On average, most students spend eight hours per week working on course assignments. Your workload may be depending on your prior experience with computing and the Web in general, and with this subject in particular.”)
- f. Estimated times for completion on course assignments (e.g., “This assignment should take you approximately 2 hours to complete.”)

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer's Selection (X)

- 3. **Knowledge, Currency and Command Of Course Material** – This category is based on whether and how well the instructor exemplifies their command for the course’s content and its topics.

**\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have items 1 – 3. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.**

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

1. Instructor demonstrates command of course material and knowledge of current/future developments
2. Textbooks and other materials are current and in accordance with the course ECO
3. Instructor shows effective use of lecture material
4. Instructor effectively makes use of their exceptional work experiences in the field or relevant research findings in the form graphs or figures

Observer's Selection (X)

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (2 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 3 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer comments:

**4. Clear and Effective Communication** – This category is based on whether and how well the instructor communicates conveys course topics and instructions, and generally communicates with students.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have items 1–4. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

1. Clear and concise online lectures, emails, discussion board prompts are used.
2. Clear and concise assignment and activity instructions are used.

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

- 3. Announcements are used to communicate important up-to-date course information to students, such as reminders of upcoming assignment due dates, curriculum changes, scheduled absences, etc.
- 4. Correct grammar and spelling are used in all forms of communication
- 5. Video and or audio self-recordings are used to explain complex assignments/activities.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 2 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (3 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 4 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer's Selection (X)

Observer comments:

**5. Educational Climate for Learning Experience** – This category is based on student-student interactions, faculty-student interactions, student feedback, and the encouragement of student communication.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have item numbers 1–6. All other items are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

- 1. The instructor holds regular online office hours and those by appointment.
- 2. A "welcome message" is provided at the beginning of the course that encourages student-to-instructor contact for course-related discussions or concerns.
- 3. The instructor evidences a form of timely feedback to students on their work.



NFS DRTP CRITERIA

1. Provides example evidencing that student inquiries are responded to in a timely manner.
2. The instructor demonstrates a consistent online presence through regular correspondence with the class that extends beyond announcements.
3. The instructor encourages and fosters the exchange of ideas and experiences among students via a discussion forum.
4. Assignment feedback is robust, providing students with specific information on errors and or where to focus for improvement during their studies
5. Students are provided with interaction space for study groups, online "hallway conversations," etc., if applicable to the class
6. Course LMS makes available student resources such as Canvas library resources, chat, etc.

No Demonstration Provided (0 items)	Needs Significant Development (1 to 3 items)	Mostly Meets Expectations (4 to 5 items)	Meets All Expectations (all 6 items)	Exceptional or Outstanding (1 or more additional items)
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations	The instructor has very little demonstration of this category and will need to make significant changes or improvements to meet expectations.	Most components of this category are exemplified or sufficient but not entirely. Some work needs to be done here to fully meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.
Observer's Selection (X)				

**Observer comments:**

**6. Instructional Methods and Quality of Materials** – This category is based on the quality and level engagement used in course instructional activities and assignments whether online or offline.

***\*To meet all expectations in this category, the instructor must have item 1, 2, or 3 in combination with at least one additional item (4-8). All other items and combinations of them are strongly recommended and exceed minimum expectations.***

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

1. **Activities/assignments involve use of writing, speaking, and other forms of self-expression.**
2. **Activities/assignments involve reflecting, relating, organizing, applying, synthesizing, or evaluating information.**
3. **Activities/assignments involve information gathering, synthesis, and analysis in solving problems (including the use of library, electronic/computer and other resources, and quantitative reasoning and interpretation, as applicable)**
4. **Activities/assignments involve participation in collaborative work.**
5. **Activities/assignments involve intercultural and international competence.**
6. **Activities/assignments involve dialogue pertaining to social behavior, community, and scholarly conduct.**
7. **Opportunities for students to “customize” their learning by tailoring assignments to their personal and professional interests and needs.**
8. **Opportunities allowing students to think, talk, or write about their learning.**

<b>No Demonstration Provided (0 items)</b>	<b>Meets All Expectation (Either 1 or 2 or 3)</b>	<b>Exceptional or Outstanding (1 additional item)</b>
The instructor does not demonstrate this category in the course materials, nor in any other way within the course. This component(s) will need to be added to meet expectations.	All expectations are met in this category, but the instructor could take this category to the highest level.	Not only are all expectations met in this category, but expectations have been exceeded by demonstration of at least one additional item.

Observer’s Selection (X)

Observer comments:

7. **Does the instructor adhere to Cal Poly Pomona’s accessibility, with a score of at least 85%, (<https://www.cpp.edu/accessibility/rules.shtml>) and copyright (<https://www.cpp.edu/copyright/materials.shtml>) policies as outlined by the university?**

NFS DRTP CRITERIA

**8. What are the instructor's overall strengths in online teaching?**

**9. What are suggestions and constructive recommendations for the instructor?**

**Date of Discussion of Assessment with the Instructor, if any:**

Instructor name (print): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Observer name (print): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Observer signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**(Also ask the peer observers to "print" their names too; the instructor is the candidate, so, we don't need to read who is s/he. We often cannot tell who's who with a signature. You may update all forms)**