

Philosophy Department  
College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences  
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Document  
2022-2027

## Section I – Introduction

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (hereafter “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, Dean, College RTP Committee (CRTPC), University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies, including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and policies 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual, define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes precedence, and university and departmental policies are superseded by the CBA.

The CBA requires that tenure-track faculty members be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the department web page so that they are available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly the department’s expectations for its faculty members and in particular criteria they must meet to earn reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department expectations must be stated with clarity and specificity sufficient for candidates to be able to plan their activities to meet them.

Department criteria should be consistent with department and College mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. We, the philosophy department, are committed to facing, taking responsibility for, and repairing the injustice internal to our institutions and communities. We collectively acknowledge the white supremacy, misogyny, classism, ethnocentrism, homophobia, ableism, and further intersectional dimensions of oppression in our society at large, as well as in our structures of higher education, the academic field of philosophy, and our department in particular. In alignment with these commitments, we invite RTP candidates to document, discuss, and foreground their efforts towards promoting our department social justice and equity aims. Criteria in all three areas of evaluation (Teaching, Research, and Service) are articulated below to reflect this department priority. For additional discussion of these commitments, candidates are encouraged to consult our Department Equity Statement as well as the Department RTP Committee (DRTPC).

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators

should commit themselves to supporting candidates and providing them with 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 and committed to meeting department expectations.

**I.1. Definitions:** University Manual, policy 1328, provides a comprehensive overview of RTP and periodic evaluation procedures. Some of the most pertinent definitions are provided here.

- a) **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for periodic evaluation, reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- b) **DRTPC** members must be full-time tenured faculty members. DRTPC members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty by secret ballot. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) for only one semester during a particular RTP cycle may serve if elected and willing and with prior approval by the Provost; a faculty member who is on leave for two semesters or more during a particular RTP cycle may not be elected. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected but may participate on reappointment cases *only*—and may *not* participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. In promotion considerations, RTP committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. (See also policy 1328, sections 1.17 B. 2. and 3.1. G.)
- c) **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in policy 1328, section 2.0. 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 CRTPC for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the President or his/her designee.
- d) A **probationary year** of service is defined in terms of the traditional academic year; that is, fall and spring semesters. For faculty members entering the department without service credit, the first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment. For faculty members entering the department with service credit, the first probationary year takes years of service credit into account (e.g., a faculty member hired with two years of service credit begins their third probationary year in their first fall term of appointment. (See CBA, 13.4 regarding possibility of receiving up to 2 years of service credit at time of initial appointment.) **Probationary faculty** are faculty who have not yet received tenure.
- e) A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.
- f) Faculty members entering the department at the Assistant Professor rank are **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. Faculty members entering the department at the Associate Professor rank without tenure are eligible to apply for promotion to Full Professor at the time they apply for tenure. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**.
- g) **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and the criteria shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and university service.

- h) **Student evaluations of courses** is governed by policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- i) **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the DRTPC. Peer evaluation activities include classroom visits and reviews of course syllabi and other teaching materials, as well as written reports of candidates' teaching performance.
- j) **A candidate for reappointment must use the department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment (see policy 1328, section 7.1) *Current* procedures and policies apply. ***"Procedures and policies" mean matters covered by Section II of this document, by contrast with criteria which are matters covered by Section III of this document.***
- k) **A candidate applying for tenure or promotion (including early tenure or promotion) may choose between the criteria currently** in effect, or those criteria in effect at the time they were hired (see policy 1328, section 7.2). 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.
- l) **Performance review** is defined by policy 1328, section 7.3 as an "actionable" evaluation process conducted by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), dean, URTPC, and Provost that "results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure and/or promotion" (see also CBA 15.38). Only through a performance review can a candidate apply for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
- m) **Periodic evaluation** is a non-actionable abbreviated review process defined by policy 1328, section 7.3 as "an intermittent evaluation process that includes review only by the DRTPC, Department Chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and Dean," which "does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions."
- n) **The period of review** is defined by Policy 1328, section 7.4 as: "the period of performance under review or evaluation. If a candidate is applying for reappointment for the first time, the period of review shall be the period since the candidate's original appointment. For subsequent reappointment applications and for periodic evaluations the period of review shall be the period since the last performance review. The period of review for application for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure shall be the period since the original appointment. The period of review for application for promotion to Full Professor shall be the period since the previous application for promotion to Associate, or, if the candidate was hired at the Associate rank, the period since the original appointment." Reappointment performance reviews are normally based on the candidate's performance since their last performance review; promotion performance reviews are based on the period since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment; and tenure performance reviews are based on the period since original appointment to the probationary position. The candidate may discuss achievements outside of the period of review, but only for the purpose of demonstrating consistency of performance. Thus, this discussion should be brief.

**I.2 Department Philosophy:** From here to its conclusion, this document represents the position of the Philosophy Department of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona in compliance with University Policy/Procedures and the Unit 3 CBA.

Policy 1328 and this document are unequivocally and absolutely binding on all RTP actions, procedures, and recommendations undertaken within the department. No vote, decision, or department practice or custom shall be taken to override, amend, or permit exceptions to either Policy 1328 or this

document. Past failures to abide by the provisions of either policy 1328 or this document establish no presumption that such failures are permissible in future RTP cycles.

## **Section II – RTP and Periodic Evaluation Procedures**

**II.1** What follows complies with Policy 1328, which describes University-wide RTP procedures that departmental procedures cannot violate.

### **II.2 Review Cycles**

**II.2.a Pre-RTP:** According to Policy 1328, section 7.3, “Probationary faculty will receive an initial appointment of two years. In Year One they will undergo a unique form of periodic evaluation known as “Pre-RTP.” As a periodic evaluation, Pre-RTP is not actionable and will be reviewed only by the DRTPC and Dean.”

**II.2.b Review Cycle Schedules:** Probationary faculty will typically undergo a full performance review every two years; i.e., they will typically undergo a performance review in their second, fourth and sixth probationary years. In the interim years, probationary faculty will typically undergo periodic evaluation. This cycle schedule may vary for faculty hired with service credit or who apply for early tenure. All probationary faculty must undergo a *minimum* of *three* full performance reviews, except in certain specific cases of application for early tenure (see policy 1328, section 7.3)

Review cycle schedules may also vary for candidates who are required to undergo additional performance reviews. According to policy 1328, section 7.4, “Based on review of the RTP package and evaluation of progress towards tenure and promotion, evaluators at any level of review may recommend that a probationary faculty member undergo another performance review rather than a periodic evaluation in the following year. This recommendation is not subject to appeal although the probationary faculty member can submit a rebuttal.”

**II.3 Department RTP and Periodic Evaluation Procedures:** In this section the department’s procedures for electing the DRTPC (by March 1 of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle [see policy 1328, 3.1.D]) will be detailed, as well as the role of the RTP Chair.

#### **II.3.a Selection of the DRTPC**

The Philosophy DRTPC shall consist of full-time tenured members of the department elected by probationary and tenured faculty by secret ballot. Tenured faculty members who are candidates for promotion may sit on the DRTPC, participating in reappointment actions *only* (see I.1.b above). The department may use one or more subcommittees for dealing with different RTP actions (e.g., one subcommittee for tenure cases and one for reappointment cases) (see policy 1328, 3.1. H.) or different forms of review (e.g., one subcommittee for performance reviews and one for periodic evaluations). In all cases, members of RTP subcommittees are elected by tenured and probationary faculty by secret ballot (see I.1.b above).

With respect to the size of the DRTPC, policy 1328, section 3.1 A. states “[t]he membership size for a

DRTPC shall be: three (3) to seven (7) for departments with ten (10) or fewer faculty eligible to serve, five (5) to nine (9) for departments with eleven (11) to seventeen (17) faculty eligible to serve, seven (7) to fifteen (15) for departments with eighteen (18) or more faculty eligible to serve. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members.”

Policy 1328, section 1.17 A. notes that the CBA “restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members and, if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). The RTP committees shall not be solely comprised of faculty participating in the FERP.”

The department Chair may serve as a member of the DRTPC if a simple majority of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty vote to allow them to serve. If the department Chair does not serve as a member of the DRPTC, they will prepare a separate evaluation of the candidates.

Nominations for election to the DRTPC shall be taken during a department meeting by March 1 prior to the academic year during which the DRTPC is to serve. Self-nominations are allowed. The voting shall be by secret ballot and each probationary and tenured faculty member in the department shall vote for that number of members sufficient to constitute a DRTPC in accordance with policy 1328 (according to guidelines stated above). The nominees receiving the highest number of votes shall constitute the DRTPC.

The DRTPC shall elect one of its members as Committee Chair.

Responsibility for assuring that RTP and periodic evaluation procedures are honored falls on the department faculty as a whole, with special responsibility falling on the DRTPC chair to ensure that such procedures are honored. Candidates under review bear no special responsibility to ensure that such procedures are honored. The department chair shall consult policy 1328 and relevant sections of this document to verify who is eligible to serve on the DRTPC, and create a list of faculty for the department meeting where voting will take place.

If the DRTPC Chair finds that one or more members of those selected for the DRTPC are ineligible, the Chair shall immediately notify all members of the DRTPC of this fact, as well as notifying the Department Chair and the Dean. Members found ineligible shall resign from the DRTPC. The DRTPC Chair shall then make provisions for the immediate replacement of these individuals.

Likewise, should the DRTPC Chair determine that they are ineligible to serve as Chair of the RTP committee, they shall immediately notify all members of the DRTPC, the Department Chair, and the Dean, and resign as Chair. The DRTPC members, in consultation with the rest of the Department, shall then identify a new DRTPC Chair.

The DRTPC Chair’s duties include the following:

- Fall semester:
  - Ensure that candidates have information they need— including information about what type of review they are subject to (i.e., performance review or periodic evaluation), RTP actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests, and department criteria;

- Ensure that candidates have a plan and schedule for undergoing the sufficient number of performance reviews prior to applying for tenure;
  - Ensure that the provisions of the department RTP document and the relevant policies in the University Manual are carried out;
  - Assist candidates in understanding expectations, preparing RTP packages or periodic evaluation reports;
  - Inform Faculty Affairs of requests for RTP action;
  - Ensure that RTP packages or periodic evaluation reports are complete;
  - Act as a liaison between the candidate and the office of Faculty Affairs, in ensuring that the package is submitted properly to the relevant offices, and on the relevant platform;
  - Work with candidates to email the university RTP committee chair to request authorization for any additions to packages or reports, or any changes in the contents of packages or reports;
  - Notify the appropriate parties of any additions or changes approved by the university RTP committee chair;
  - Ensure all necessary signatures are obtained;
  - Provide the department's recommendation to the candidate.
- Throughout the year:
    - Schedule peer evaluations (and ensure they are conducted) for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action in the future;
    - Ensure that reports are provided to candidates within two weeks of the classroom visit, ensure they have the ten (10) calendar days to respond in writing, and forward the peer evaluation and evaluated faculty member's response (if any), to the dean/director for placement in the faculty member's PAF.

The DRTPC will be responsible for posting notices that solicit written comments about any RTP candidates indicating which candidates are under review, the deadline for submission of comments, and any other pertinent information. Philosophy majors will also be emailed such notices with this information. Any faculty member, student, or academic administrator may submit written input to the DRTPC. Notice requesting faculty and student letters will be prominently displayed outside the Philosophy Department Office and Philosophy classrooms 20 working days prior to the deadline for candidates' packages to be received by the DRTPC, displaying a deadline that is 10 working days prior to the deadline for candidates' packages to be received by the DRTPC. Copies of any letters received up to the deadline will be provided to the candidate, who will then have 10 days to respond before they must submit their packages. Any letter received after the deadline will not be accepted for the current RTP cycle but may be used in the subsequent RTP cycle.

The DRTPC is also responsible for conducting periodic evaluations.

**II.4 Student Course Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness:** See policy 1328, section 3.2, policy 1329, and Article 15 section 17 of the CBA. The purpose of student course evaluations is to provide instructors with useful, if imperfect, feedback on their courses. According to university policies 1328 and 1329, the DRTPC must factor student course evaluations into its assessment of candidates' teaching performance. Yet, it is widely documented that student course evaluations are subject to biases, implicit

and otherwise. Consequently, candidates may submit written rebuttals to student course evaluations whenever bias occurs or is suspected in student course evaluations. In its assessment decisions of candidate teaching performance, the DRTPC shall review such written rebuttals when considering student course evaluations. (A copy of the department form is attached as an appendix.)

A copy of the summary of these evaluations (which instructors receive after evaluation) must be submitted in the candidate's RTP packet for each class evaluated. All eligible classes that are evaluated must be included in the RTP packet (unless, due to confounding circumstances such as a pandemic, an overriding policy modifies this requirement). Analysis by the candidate and the DRTPC must accompany descriptions of results.

**II.5 Peer Evaluation of Teaching:** See Policy 1328, section 3.3, outlined below.

1. *For all candidates eligible for RTP actions, or undergoing periodic evaluation, policy 1328 also requires two peer observations per year. Peer evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Policy 1328, section 3.3. At the beginning of the academic year, the DRTPC will make a copy of this section available to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. A minimum of one peer evaluation per semester shall be conducted in at least two different semesters in each academic year. Scheduled by the DRTPC, in consultation with candidates and reviewers, peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the diversity of courses taught. Each peer review shall be conducted by a colleague of academic rank higher than or equal to that of the candidate (however, the best practice is to avoid having untenured faculty provide peer reviews for other untenured faculty, and in general to avoid having faculty of equal rank provide peer reviews for each other). Peer reviews shall include a classroom visit and a review of course syllabi and related material, and shall be documented using the Department's Peer Evaluation form (a copy of which is attached as an appendix). Within two weeks of the classroom visit (see policy 1328, section 3.3), the report should be given to the candidate and filed with the DRTPC Chair. The evaluated faculty member has the right to respond in writing to the peer evaluation within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the evaluation. It is the responsibility of the DRTPC chair to forward the peer evaluation, and the evaluated faculty member's response (if any), to the dean/director for placement in the faculty member's PAF.*

At the beginning of spring semester, the DRTPC will contact candidates to verify that they have had the requisite peer evaluations for that academic year and will help remedy the situation if they have not.

**II. 6 Leaves and Other Changes to Tenure Timetable:** The following applies to candidates who are serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also policy 1328, section 2.1):

**II.6.a** Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

**II.6.b** Candidates who accept positions outside of the department while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing, in light of the special circumstances, (a) an

interpretation of the departmental criteria and (b) a statement that specifies expectations and outcomes. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the Dean and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

**II.7 Candidates' Additional Responsibilities:** Candidates are required to assemble an RTP package, which makes the case for the requested action, or, in years of periodic evaluation, a periodic evaluation report. Packages and reports will require candidates to submit an up-to-date curriculum vitae. To prepare RTP packages or periodic evaluation reports, candidates are encouraged to attend university-sponsored workshops and seek the counsel of the DRTPC.

**II.7.a RTP Self-Evaluation:** In their RTP packages, candidates must include a self-evaluation (no page limit) *which explicitly addresses the Philosophy Department's RTP criteria* for the action/s requested. The following structure will help make such reference explicit:

- a) Discussion of teaching performance—includes analysis of student and peer evaluations, and discussion of any outcomes-assessment measures to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.
- b) Discussion of research, scholarship, and creative activities--includes specific citation of all peer-reviewed publications, dates of attendance at professional meetings, and all duties/assignments in professional organizations; also includes an explanation of work in progress and ongoing activities.
- c) Discussion of service to the University, College, Department, and community-- includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc.
- d) Response to any problems/deficiencies pointed out in previous evaluations (steps taken, progress made). These responses can be made in relevant sections on teaching performance, research, and service, or they can be combined as a separate section.
- e) Discussion of short-term and long-term goals in all areas of evaluation, including a brief discussion of why goals are appropriate (i.e., candidates' goals are related not only to their own interests, strengths, responsibilities, and career aspirations but also to the Department's, College's, and University's goals and mission) and of how these goals will be met.
- f) Discussion of progress made on goals established in previous year's self-evaluation, with such progress connected clearly and reasonably to the current year's self-evaluation.
- g) Discussion of contributions towards the department's equity aims.

**II.8 Periodic Evaluation Self-Evaluation:** According to policy 1328, section 7.4, in years when candidates undergo the more abbreviated periodic evaluation process, they must include a shorter self-assessment narrative, *not to exceed four pages*. This self-assessment narrative need not address the specific department RTP criteria but should broadly discuss the candidates "strengths and areas for growth in teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service and other professional activities," from the relevant period of review. Candidates should also highlight, where applicable, their contributions towards the department's equity aims.

### **Section III -- Criteria for RTP Action**

**III.1 Elements of Performance and Evaluation:** The areas of evaluation are: 1) Teaching Performance, 2) Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, 3) Service to the Department (including general advising), College, University, or to the Community. Candidates for any personnel action, except for administrators for whom there is no evidence of teaching performance, must be evaluated in all three areas. Of the three areas of faculty performance evaluated for RTP purposes, the department considers teaching the most fundamental. It is unlikely that candidates for RTP action whose teaching performance is not judged proficient will be evaluated positively, regardless of their contributions in the areas of research or service.

Contributions in all three areas are expected in any RTP action but the granting of tenure and/or promotion requires proficient teaching performance **and excellence in at least one of the other areas (research or service).**

The department conceives of faculty as teacher-scholars who seek to integrate pedagogy and research by bringing their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way, thereby promoting a community of inquiry, encouraging rigorous scholarship, and facilitating faculty-student collaboration.

“Proficient” teaching performance is indicated in part by overall scores on student course evaluations that are at or near the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC. The criterion used by the department as an indication of “proficient” teaching for the purposes of award of tenure and promotion, as judged by students, is an average score of 2.0 or lower on the student assessment summaries. The criterion used by the department as an indication of “proficient” teaching for the purposes of reappointment to a subsequent probationary year, as judged by students, is an average score of 2.5 or lower on the student assessment summaries. Student evaluations, however, are only one indication of teaching performance and are best interpreted alongside other methods of evaluation such as peer review. Accordingly, “proficient” teaching is also demonstrated in part by peer evaluations which indicate, in the DRTPC's judgment, a consistent record of competent and conscientious teaching.

**III.1.a Expectations for Documentation of Performance:** In its evaluation of the candidate, the DRTPC shall take into account information from the following sources:

- a) Data summaries of students' numerical evaluations
- b) Signed peer evaluations of teaching performance
- c) Self-evaluation provided by candidate
- d) Signed material (to be added to candidate's RTP package) received from other faculty, referees/editors for academic journals and presses, administrators, and students
- e) Material requested from candidate by committee (e.g., requests for clarification of, corrections to, augmentations of any aspect of RTP package)
- f) Other written material, identified by source, submitted to the committee before the closing date

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

To be reappointed, a candidate must provide evidence (see III.1.a, above) of making steady progress toward meeting the criteria for *Tenure* (III.3, below) and *Promotion to Associate Professor* (III.4, below) or if hired at the Associate Professor level, for *Tenure* (III.3, below) and *promotion to Professor* (III.5, below). “Steady progress” can be demonstrated by evidence of student and peer

evaluations, submission of scholarly work (including referees' reports), conference and other professional activity, participation on committees and in student-involvement areas, and criteria-referenced plans that are also responsive to the recommendations made by the DRTPC, the Dean and the Provost in prior reappointments. A candidate's initial request for reappointment should include a plan outlining how he or she plans to satisfy the department's criteria for tenure. In each subsequent request for reappointment, candidates must summarize their progress to date in fulfilling that plan.

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

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** (see I.1.e—emphasis in original).

The candidate for tenure must satisfy criteria III.3.a-c listed below.

**III.3.a Teaching Performance:** Of the three areas of faculty performance evaluated for RTP purposes, the department considers teaching the most fundamental. It is unlikely that candidates for RTP action whose teaching fails to be proficient will receive an overall positive evaluation, regardless of their contributions in the areas of research or service. The candidate's self-evaluation should discuss the progress the candidate has made during the period of evaluation in meeting these criteria.

There are three principal sources of information used to evaluate teaching performance: student course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, and candidate self-evaluations (submitted in conjunction with requests for RTP action). However, candidates may submit other evidence of teaching performance as well (signed letters from students, instructional diagnoses by personnel from the Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence, etc.). Instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely not to be judged proficient in teaching performance. With respect to peer evaluations of teaching, candidates are required to have *two* evaluations administered per academic year. Student and peer evaluations should, to the degree possible, reflect the candidate's full range of teaching responsibilities (lower-division/upper-division, online or hybrid/traditional, etc.) Furthermore, with respect to both student and peer evaluations, candidates must submit *all* student and peer evaluations of eligible courses gathered during the period of review.

When evaluating teaching performance, the DRTPC will consider the candidate's success in:

1. Effectively facilitating student learning
2. Providing timely feedback on student work
3. Providing informative feedback on student work
4. Offering well-organized in-class and online activities (lectures, discussions, etc.)
5. Being accessible to students in office hours
6. Clearly communicating goals and expectations to students
7. Improving specific student skills such as writing, critical thinking, logical reasoning, etc.
8. Fairly and consistently evaluating student work
9. Showing a willingness to consider divergent points of view
10. Approaching teaching with commitment
11. Stimulating students' interest in further study in the discipline

12. Using one's expertise in course content to enhance student learning
13. Developing new curricular initiatives
14. Incorporating relevant feedback, research, etc. into one's teaching efforts
15. Using appropriate technologies to enhance student learning
16. Participating in professional development activities related to teaching (workshops, conferences, etc.) and/or conducting teaching-related scholarship
17. Diversifying the range of courses taught
18. Employing equity-minded pedagogy (broadly construed to include course design, assessment, etc.) and empowering students from underserved groups.

The department recognizes that the main sources of information concerning teaching performance speak more saliently to some of these criteria than to others (e.g., student evaluations are irrelevant to 16 but very relevant to 5, etc.). Although instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely to be judged not to be proficient in teaching performance, the DRTPC will make its determination of a candidate's teaching performance based on the totality of evidence presented. Consequently, the achievement (or non-achievement) of student evaluation scores that fall within a desired range shall not be the sole basis for the DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance. The department furthermore recognizes these points concerning student evaluations:

1. Student course evaluations do not “speak for themselves” and must be interpreted with great care.
2. Small differences in scores should not be given great weight in the evaluation of instructors' teaching performance.
3. Student course evaluations can only measure student *perceptions* of the outcomes of candidate's teaching efforts. Many factors influence student learning and perceptions thereof that are beyond an instructor's control (composition of the student population, academic difficulty of the course, student background and preparation, etc.). Interpretations of student course evaluations must be mindful of these facts.

Candidates' self-evaluations must contain discussion and analysis of the candidate's student course evaluations that indicate how the evidence they present supports the candidate's claim to proficient teaching performance.

**III.3.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities:** For all actions, candidates must satisfy criteria in three tiers of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (See Grids 1 and 2 below).

The department requires faculty to conduct the ongoing research and study necessary to (a) sustain breadth of understanding, for example, by remaining familiar with the philosophical research relevant to their typical teaching areas, and (b) develop the depth necessary for expertise in their area(s) of research specialization. As **Grid 1** below indicates, candidates meeting minimal numerical benchmarks for various RTP actions will thereby have demonstrated that they have a cogent and active program of philosophical research, but there are no exact requirements concerning the class of the activities or accomplishments that candidates for various RTP actions must meet. (E.g., candidates are not required to publish in specific journals, present their works at specific scholarly venues, etc.)



<b>GRID 1</b>			
<b>MINIMAL expectations of research, scholarship, and creative activities for RTP actions</b>			
ACTIVITY LEVEL	REAPPOINTMENT (probationary)	PROMOTION (Associate)/TENURE	PROMOTION (Full)
<p><u>Tier 1:</u></p> <p>peer reviewed articles or monographs (including scholarship of teaching and learning)</p>	<p>Recommended, but not strictly necessary</p>	<p>Some contribution required (i.e., at least 2 articles or a monograph)</p>	<p>Additional contribution required (i.e., at least 2 articles or a monograph since previous RTP action).</p>
<p><u>Tier 2*:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• chapters in anthologies of research and invited articles</li> <li>• conference or colloquia presentations, including commentaries or panels</li> <li>• scholarly book reviews</li> <li>• publication of textbooks, pedagogical materials, or pedagogical research</li> <li>• editing of professional journals or newsletters</li> <li>• editing collections and anthologies.</li> <li>• translations</li> <li>• organization of conferences or scholarly events</li> <li>• grant proposals and/or awards</li> <li>• receipt of fellowships, awards, or other scholarly honors</li> <li>• publications or contributions to non-scholarly media</li> <li>• contributions concerning equity and social justice in scholarly or non-scholarly media/venues.</li> <li>• development of, and participation, in scholarly technology endeavors (weblogs, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly recommended, but not strictly necessary. Activities in this area should provide evidence of steady progress toward achievements in tier 1.</p>	<p>Substantial contribution required. (E.g., 3 or more items and/or items in multiple areas)</p>	<p>Additional substantial contribution required. (E.g., 3 or more items and/or items in multiple areas since previous RTP action)</p>

<p><u>Tier 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation or leadership in professional organizations or involvement in informal research activities (e.g., work-in-progress groups, reading groups, study groups).</li> <li>• participation or leadership in informal research activities related to equity and inclusion.</li> <li>• reviewing manuscripts for journals or academic presses</li> <li>• other service of value to the profession, e.g., organizing conferences in one's area of specialization</li> </ul>	<p>Some Activity Required</p>	<p>Some Activity Required</p>	<p>Some Activity Required</p>
---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

<b>GRID 2</b>			
<b>Expectations for EXCELLENCE in research and professional activities for RTP actions</b>			
ACTIVITY LEVEL	REAPPOINTMENT (probationary)	PROMOTION (Associate)/TENURE	PROMOTION (Full)
<p><u>Tier 1:</u></p> <p>peer reviewed articles or monographs (including scholarship of teaching and learning)</p>	<p>Recommended, but not strictly necessary</p>	<p>Substantial contribution required (i.e., at least 4 articles or a monograph and at least 1 article)</p>	<p>Additional substantial contributions required (i.e., at least 4 articles or a monograph and at least 1 article since previous RTP action).</p>
<p><u>Tier 2*:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• chapters in anthologies of research and invited articles</li> <li>• conference or colloquia presentations, including commentaries or panels</li> <li>• scholarly book reviews</li> <li>• publication of textbooks, pedagogical materials, or pedagogical research</li> <li>• editing of professional journals or newsletters</li> <li>• editing collections and anthologies.</li> <li>• translations</li> <li>• organization of conferences or scholarly events</li> <li>• grant proposals and/or awards</li> <li>• receipt of fellowships, awards, or other scholarly honors</li> <li>• publications or contributions to non-scholarly media</li> <li>• contributions concerning equity and social justice in scholarly or non-scholarly media/venues.</li> <li>• development of, and participation, in scholarly technology endeavors (weblogs, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly recommended, but not strictly necessary. Activities in this area should provide evidence of steady progress toward achievements in tier 1.</p>	<p>Substantial contribution required. (E.g., 5 or more items and/or items in multiple areas)</p>	<p>Additional substantial contribution required. (E.g., 5 or more items and/or items in multiple areas since previous RTP action)</p>

<p><u>Tier 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation or leadership in professional organizations or involvement in informal research activities (e.g., work-in-progress groups, reading groups, study groups).</li> <li>• participation or leadership in informal research activities related to equity and inclusion.</li> <li>• reviewing manuscripts for journals or academic presses</li> <li>• other service of value to the profession, e.g., organizing conferences in one's area of specialization.</li> </ul>	<p>Some Activity Required</p>	<p>Some Activity Required</p>	<p>Some Activity Required</p>
--	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

\*Note: activities from Tier 2 might be considered more appropriately counted under Tier 1 given certain circumstances depending, for example, upon prestige of a particular journal or publisher, the significance of an invited address or other professional presentation, or the importance of a fellowship or award. In all cases, the candidate shall bear the burden of showing that the activity in question should count under Tier 1 rather than under Tier 2.

**III.3.c Service to the Department, College, University or Community:** During the *period of review*, it is expected that the candidate will perform service in some of the following areas. Adequate performance in service for all RTP actions is defined as involvement in the first four of the following areas:

1. Attendance at Department meetings
2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Mentoring and/or supporting students from underserved groups (through, e.g., career advising, advising undergraduate research, collaboration with students, and high-impact practices).

Excellent performance is defined as making a *significant impact* in at least *one* of areas 2-4 above and participation in at least *one* of the areas below. “Significant impact” includes, for example, chairing a committee, leading a new initiative or project, or writing a policy.

5. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
6. University Committee work
7. Program development
8. Student Club advising
9. Academic Senate
10. CSU System-wide work
11. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including, e.g., community outreach efforts and the development and teaching of service learning courses)
12. Service to the Department, College, or University aimed at promoting equity, inclusion, and social justice.

All candidates must speak to the specific contributions of their service and document it in their RTP applications (such as letters from committee chairs, Deans, Senate chairs, etc.).

#### **III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Because promotion to Associate Professor is tied to tenure (in the case when the candidate is hired as an Assistant Professor), see sections III.3 a-c for criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

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

Promotion to Professor requires tenure or the simultaneous award of tenure.

**III.5.a Teaching Performance:** The candidate for promotion to Professor must meet the criteria described in III.3.a, above, for teaching performance.

**III.5.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities:** For promotion to Professor, expectations of research, scholarship and creative activities are given in **Grid 1** (above, III.3.b).

A general discussion of research and scholarship expectations is given in III.3.b. Also see **Grid 2** (above, III.3.b) for expectations for excellence in research and professional activities for promotion to Professor.

**III.5.c Service to the Department, College, University or Community:** During the *period of review*, it is expected that the candidate for promotion to Professor will have continued to perform service as in III.3.c. Additionally, the candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to have made a *significant impact* in at least *one* of the areas below. Pursuant to III.3.c above, “significant impact” includes, for example, chairing a committee, leading a new initiative or project, or writing a policy. Service on the Academic Senate also suffices for significant impact. (Note that this list does not include 1. Attendance at Department meetings):

2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Mentoring and/or supporting students from underserved groups (through, e.g., career advising, advising undergraduate research, collaboration with students, and high-impact practices).
5. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
6. University Committee work
7. Program development
8. Student Club advising
9. Academic Senate
10. CSU System-wide work
11. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including e.g., community outreach efforts and the development and teaching of service learning courses)
12. Service to the Department, College, or University aimed at promoting equity, inclusion, and social justice.

Excellent performance is defined as making a *significant impact* in at least *one* of areas 2-4 above as well as a significant impact in at least *one* of areas 5-12 above.

### **III.6 and III.7 Criteria for Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor**

Policy 1328 section 2.6, states that requests “for early actions 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 those actions.” Further, such consideration “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.”

It is therefore emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our three areas of performance and evaluation, *all* the specific criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The description of performance that exceeds our expectations in all three areas is as follows:

**III.6.a and III.7.a Teaching Performance:** Candidates for early tenure and early promotion shall demonstrate an exceptional level of accomplishment. An exceptional level of accomplishment is demonstrated by overall scores on student assessments that are consistently above the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC, peer reviews that note exceptional achievement, teaching awards, success with innovative pedagogical approaches (e.g., service learning, new technologies, etc.), success in the creation of new courses and programs, recognition beyond the department for contributions to academic programs on campus, effective use of course and program assessment to improve teaching, and evidence of inspiring a high level of achievement in our students (student awards and accomplishments).

When considering whether an exceptional level of accomplishment in teaching has been achieved, more than the student evaluations must be taken into account. As noted in III.3.a above, while instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely to be judged not to be proficient in teaching performance, the DRTPC will make its determination of a candidate's teaching performance based on the totality of evidence presented. Consequently, the achievement (or non-achievement) of student evaluation scores that fall within a desired range shall not be the sole basis for the DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance.

**III.6.b and III.7.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities:** Excellent performance (which thereby exceeds criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) in the area of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities is described in **Grid 2** under III.3.b above.

**III.6.c and III.7.c Service to the Department, College, University or Community:** The candidate for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate exceptional performance in the area of service by performing service in at least *five* of the areas listed below and by having made a *significant impact* in at least *two* of them. Pursuant to III.3.c and III.5.c above, “significant impact” includes, for example, chairing a committee, leading a new initiative or project, or writing a policy. Service on the Academic Senate also suffices for significant impact. (Note that this list does not include 1. Attendance at Department meetings).

2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Mentoring and/or supporting students from underserved groups (through, e.g., career advising, advising undergraduate research, collaboration with students, and high-impact practices).
5. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
6. University Committee work
7. Program development
8. Student Club advising
9. Academic Senate
10. CSU System-wide work
11. Community Service that relates to one’s disciplinary expertise (including, e.g., community outreach efforts and the development and teaching of service learning courses)
12. Service to the Department, College, or University aimed at promoting equity, inclusion, and social justice.

### **III.8. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor**

As with requests for early tenure, the consideration of such requests “shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and university service” (policy 1328, section 2.6). It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our three areas of performance and evaluation, *all* the specific criteria for promotion to Professor. The description of performance that exceeds our expectations in all three areas is as follows:

**III.8.a Teaching Performance:** Candidates for early promotion to Professor shall demonstrate an exceptional level of accomplishment. An exceptional level of accomplishment is demonstrated by overall scores on student assessments that are consistently above the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC, peer reviews that note exceptional achievement, teaching awards, success with innovative pedagogical approaches (e.g., service learning, new technologies, etc.), success in the creation of new courses and programs, recognition beyond the Department for contributions to academic programs on campus, effective use of course and program assessment to improve teaching, and evidence of inspiring a high level of achievement in our students (student awards and accomplishments).

When considering whether an exceptional level of accomplishment in teaching has been achieved, more than the student evaluations must be taken into account. As noted in III.3.a above, while instructors who receive student evaluations in which the majority of responses are consistently below the disciplinary norm as judged by the DRTPC are likely to be judged not to be proficient in teaching performance, the DRTPC will make its determination of a candidate's teaching performance based on the totality of evidence presented. Consequently, the achievement (or non-achievement) of student evaluation scores that fall within a desired range shall not be the sole basis for the DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance.

**III.8.b Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities:** Excellent performance (which thereby exceeds criteria for tenure and promotion to Professor) in the area of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities is described in **Grid 2** under III.3.b above.

**III.8.c Service to the Department, College, University and Community:** The candidate for early promotion to Professor will demonstrate exceptional performance in the area of service by performing service in at least *five* of the areas listed below and by having made a *significant impact* in at least *three* of them. Pursuant to III.3.c and III.5.c above, “significant impact” includes, for example, chairing a committee, leading a new initiative or project, or writing a policy. Service on the Academic Senate also suffices for significant impact. (Note that the list below does not include 1. Attendance at Department meetings).

2. Department or College Committee work
3. Academic advising when assigned
4. Mentoring and/or supporting students from underserved groups (through, e.g., career advising, advising undergraduate research, collaboration with students, and high-impact practices).
5. Service on Department, College or University Search Committees
6. University Committee work

7. Program development
8. Student Club advising
9. Academic Senate
10. CSU System-wide work
11. Community Service that relates to one's disciplinary expertise (including, e.g., community outreach efforts and the development and teaching of service learning courses)
12. Service to the Department, College, or University aimed at promoting equity, inclusion, and social justice.