

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	Aerospace Engineering
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	5 years

DEPARTMENT

"This Department RTP Document has been approved by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in this department."

Dept. Chair:	<u>Ali R. Ahmadi</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	<u>8/27/18</u> Date
DRTPC Chair:	<u>Donald Edberg</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	<u>8/27/2018</u> Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

"The CRTPC has reviewed this Department RTP Document and makes the following recommendation."

- Recommend Approval
- Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.
- Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

CRTPC Chair:	<u>Sean Monemi</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	<u>8/29/18</u> Date
--------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN

"I have reviewed this Department RTP Document and make the following recommendation."

- Recommend Approval
- Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.
- Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

Joseph J. Rencis, Dean

Dean/Director:	<u>Joseph J. Rencis</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	<u>8/29/18</u> Date
----------------	---	---------------------------------	------------------------

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- Approved for the following years 5
- Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs:	<u>Martin Sancho-Madriz</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	<u>AUG 29 2018</u> Date
--------------------------	---	---------------------------------	----------------------------

In cases where the Department RTP Document does not conform to the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or University Policy 1328 (formerly Appendix 16), or Policy 1329 (formerly Appendix 10), those documents take precedence.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
 College of Engineering
 Department of Aerospace Engineering
Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria
 AY 2018-19 through AY 2022-23

I.	INTRODUCTION	6
	I.1. Definitions	6
	I.2. Department Philosophy	7
II.	PROCEDURES	8
	II.1. Summary of RTP Procedures from Policy No. 1328	8
	II.2. Department RTP Procedures	9
	II.3. Student Evaluation of Teaching / Advising	11
	II.4. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	12
	II.5. Departmental Evaluation of Candidate	12
	II.6. Candidate’s Responsibilities	13
	II.7. Candidates and Future Candidates	15
	II.8. Personal Professional Development Plan	15
III.	CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION	16
	III.1. Elements of Performance and Evaluation	16
	III.2. Criteria for Reappointment	17
	III.3. Criteria for Tenure	18
	III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor	19
	III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor	19
	III.6. Criteria for Early Tenure	21
	III.7. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor	22
	III.8. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor	23
	III.9. Evaluation of Faculty Serving on Temporary Assignments	24
	Appendix 1. Student Evaluation Form of Teaching	27
	Appendix 2. Aerospace Engineering Disciplines	28
	Appendix 3. Student Evaluation Form of Advising	29
	Appendix 4. Other Supporting Evidence for Quality of Teaching	30

Appendix 5. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities32
Appendix 6. Evaluation of Service to the University and Community33

VISION STATEMENT FOR CAL POLY POMONA'S TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL

DEFINITION:

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

EXPLICATION:

1. Teaching

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

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

2. Scholarship

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

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

3. Integration

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

- Bring the practice of their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way,
- Promote a community of inquiry in their role as faculty members, and model and encourage academically rigorous scholarship as appropriate to their discipline,
- Foster a climate in which faculty/student scholarly, research, practice, or artistic collaboration can take place by:
 - Enhancing student learning through meaningful experiences at Cal Poly Pomona as appropriate in their discipline through inquiry based classroom, studio, laboratory, practice and field activities that are embedded within the curriculum,
 - Collaborating with students in a culture of learn-by-doing inquiry, discovery, professional practice and/or creative work through the involvement of students in scholarship outside of regular coursework.

SCOPE:

The scholarly and creative activities of Teacher-Scholars vary widely across disciplines at Cal Poly Pomona. Consistent with discipline practices, academic departments/units may adapt this vision statement to establish the standards to which Teacher-Scholars are held.

I. INTRODUCTION

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. The RTP process is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the President of the university 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 of the College, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Appendices 10 and 16 (now Policy No. 1328) 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 first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member to 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 what the department expects of its faculty members and in particular what they must achieve in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity so 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, and providing them the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for candidates to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

I.1. Definitions

Policy No. 1328 provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

- a) **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- b) **RTP Committee** members must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-

in-pay) may serve if elected and willing. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only participate on reappointment cases – may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. (see also Policy No. 1328 section 305.114, 305.300, 305.400, 305.500).

- c) **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy No. 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his designee. (see also Policy No. 1328 section 305.200).
- d) 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.
- e) A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.
- f) A 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**.
- g) **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by Appendix 10 of the University Manual.
- h) **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabus & other teaching materials, and a written report.
- i) A **candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.
- j) A **candidate for tenure or promotion may choose between the criteria** in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

I.2. Department Philosophy

The Aerospace Engineering Department believes that it is the right and responsibility of the department to weigh the merits of its faculty. The aerospace engineering faculty, as aerospace engineers, are the most qualified to judge professional competence in the disciplines of aerospace engineering.

The criteria and procedures contained in this document provide a philosophical and operational basis for conducting reappointment, tenure and promotion (RTP) reviews. The criteria reflect the following basic tenets of the department:

- A. The ultimate quality of the faculty depends upon the criteria and standards used to judge professional performance.
- B. The judgment of professional performance by faculty peers must accommodate individual goals and aspirations within the framework of the academic program.
- C. The evaluation process must contribute to a high level of faculty morale. Every aspect must reflect the expectation that competent and responsible faculty members will achieve their advancement goals.

The advancement of faculty through various ranks is a merit-based process. Every RTP evaluation includes the following elements of performance:

- A. Teaching effectiveness and advising/mentoring
- B. Research, scholarly and professional development activity
- C. Service to the department/college/university/community

In addition, it is essential that candidates maintain cooperative working relationships with faculty, staff and students.

II. PROCEDURES

II.1. Summary of RTP Procedures from Policy No. 1328

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure and promotion are of great importance to the RTP candidate, his/her department, the college and university. These deliberations shall be confidential except that the candidate, RTP committee members, appropriate administrators, and the president shall have access to written recommendations.

There are eight possible levels in the RTP process at Cal Poly Pomona that pertain to the College of Engineering:

1. Candidate
2. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)
3. Department Chair
4. College RTP Committee (CRTPC)
5. Dean
6. University RTP Committee (URTPC)
7. Vice President for Academic Affairs
8. President

The RTP Cycle begins each year on the first day of the fall semester. For almost all faculty members, an RTP cycle corresponds to one year of service.

There are two official RTP Calendars: One sets the timelines for review of requests for tenure, early tenure, promotion, early promotion, and reappointment to a fourth, fifth or sixth

probationary year; the other, review of requests for reappointment to a second or third probationary year. Thus there is only one calendar for tenure and promotion reviews, but there are two for reappointment.

II.2. Department RTP Procedures

The department RTP committee shall consist of full time, tenured faculty members elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The minimum size of the committee shall be three if the Department has seven or fewer full time faculty eligible to serve, and five if the Department has eight or more full time faculty eligible to serve. The committee may be larger than the minimum at the discretion of the faculty.

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

The 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 the department chair is also a full-time, tenured faculty member, the tenured and probationary faculty will decide annually whether the Department Chair will serve on the committee. Normally the chair of the ARO department will write an independent evaluation of all candidates for RTP action. However, if the Chair of the ARO department is elected to the DRTPC, the ARO Chair may not author an independent evaluation of any candidate.

No committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Also, in promotion considerations, the committee members must have higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Tenured candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any other 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 and difference in pay) may serve as a committee member. Faculty who know in advance that they will, during one semester or more, be unavailable or ineligible should not be nominees for the committee.

The committee shall elect a Chair who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the Departmental RTP document and Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual are carried out. The Department RTP Chair shall perform the following duties:

Fall semester:

- A. Gives written notice to each candidate who is eligible for a regular RTP action;
- B. Reminds candidates to submit requests for RTP actions to Department RTP Chair.
- C. Informs Faculty Affairs of requests.
- D. Provides RTP candidates all appropriate forms;
- E. Provides each RTP candidate a copy of the University RTP Calendar for the current academic year;

- F. Provides a copy of the Department RTP Document to each RTP candidate and to new faculty who will need the document for preparation of their RTP package the following academic year;
- G. Assists candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages.
- H. Is 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.

Throughout the year:

- A. Ensures that peer evaluations are conducted for all faculty members who will be candidate for RTP action in the future.
- B. Ensures that reports are provided to candidates within 2 weeks of a classroom visit.

The committee's duties include the following:

- A. Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to Department and University policy;
- B. Soliciting input from students by publicizing names of candidates for RTP action and names to whom signed statements may be submitted;
- C. Evaluating the candidate's request for a RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.

The 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,
- B. Reappointment with tenure,
- C. Reappointment with early tenure,
- D. Promotion to requested rank,
- E. Early promotion to requested rank,
- F. Termination (available for candidates currently in first or second probationary year),
- G. Reappointment with terminal year (available for candidates in either third, fourth, fifth or sixth probationary year),
- H. Deny promotion,
- 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 committee by the candidate or requested by the committee from the candidate. No conditions or contingencies can be attached to the decision.

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

- A. Summaries and interpretations of students evaluations in accordance with Appendix 10 and Policy No. 1328 Section 305.302 of the University Manual;
- B. Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy No. 1328, Section 305.303 of the University Manual;

- C. Self evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);
- D. Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);
- E. Material requested from the candidate by the committee which include requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package;
- F. Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the committee before the closing date.

II.3. Student Evaluation of Teaching effectiveness and Advising/mentoring

Student evaluations of the teaching skills of RTP candidates shall be obtained via in-class evaluation forms and optional ad-hoc evaluations from students.

II.3.a. In-class Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

Student evaluation of teaching, as set forth in Faculty Senate Report FS-331-79/AH, University Manual, Appendix 10, Revised March 1995 and effective September 1995 and Policy No. 1328, Section 305.302 is required. The department RTP Committee (hereafter "Committee") will solicit and collect the student and graduate input. Faculty Agreement Section 15.16 speaks to survey makeup. All classes taught by the candidate will be evaluated. The phrase "all classes" is defined as those classes, which the ARO department has previously considered as potentially subject to evaluation. For example, ARO has not previously conducted student evaluations in thesis and supervisory classes, therefore such classes would not be subject to evaluation within the meaning of "all classes."

II.3.b. Out-of-Class Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

For faculty requesting promotion or tenure, the committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place(s) near the Department office, of the names of candidates requesting a RTP action, the type of request made, and the name of the individual to whom signed comments or recommendation can be given. These notices will specify that any student, who has been enrolled in one or more of the candidate's courses or worked under his/her guidance for senior project or master's thesis, may submit a written evaluation to the RTP Committee. This posting will take place within one week of notification of the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request a RTP action. The signed comments will be accepted up to the time that the committee starts its evaluation of the candidate's request. These notices will be posted for at least two weeks.

Approximately four weeks after the posted notices, the Committee will meet and review the student's evaluations. A letter summarizing the substance of the evaluations will be prepared by the Committee and submitted to the candidate. This letter will be placed in the candidate's RTP file. The candidate may review student letters and may subsequently submit to the Committee a specific response to any such letters he/she may choose prior to the Committee's final recommendation. Any such response will be placed in the RTP package.

II.3.c. Evaluation of Student Advising

Student advising and mentoring is recognized as an important part of the candidate's teaching responsibilities. The DRTP Committee shall consider the performance of the candidate in the area of student advising and mentoring, as set forth in Policy No. 1328, Section 305.201. The committee will solicit the candidate's advisees for input in this area.

II.4. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The tenured faculty will conduct at least two peer evaluations of teaching performance each year in different semesters. These evaluations are defined in Policy No. 1328, Section 305.303 and departmental guidelines for the peer review are provided in the appendix of this document. Additional evaluations may be performed if requested by either the individual faculty member or the DRTP committee. These peer evaluations of teaching performance shall include, at a minimum, classroom visits and review of course syllabus, and related material (may include tests and test results, course notes, and grades). A written report of the peer evaluation shall be placed in the candidate's RTP file within two weeks of the class visit. A copy of the written report will also be given to the candidate. The written report will include, at a minimum, an evaluation of the following: the classroom visit, the course syllabus and any other related material that was reviewed.

Peer evaluations should be conducted during the time period that has passed since the last application was made for the same or a similar action. Exceptions may be allowed if the candidate does not have the minimum number of evaluations. The normal timeline for evaluation is stated in Policy No. 1328: "Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations are based on the period since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment; and tenure evaluations are based on the period since original appointment to the probationary position." For tenured and promotion evaluations, the candidate should have peer evaluations from all tenured faculty in the department on the previous year.

II.5. Departmental Evaluation of Candidate

The departmental RTP procedure is based upon the procedures specified in Section 305.800 of Policy No. 1328 of the University Manual. The DRTP calendar conforms to that issued annually by the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, and candidates must appear on the list issued by that office by name in order to be eligible to request any RTP action.

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 Department RTP Committee, the Dean, the University RTP Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In their evaluation, the committee must include a discussion of the candidate's student and peer evaluations.

Criteria for reappointment decisions shall be the criteria that were in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus. Candidates for tenure or promotion may use either the Departmental RTP criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year

of probationary service on this campus or the Departmental RTP criteria in effect in the year the candidate requests action. If a candidate requests simultaneous consideration for both promotion and tenure, the candidate must select a single set of criteria. Once the evaluation process has started, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the candidate.

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

The candidate is evaluated in three areas: teaching effectiveness and advising; research, scholarly and professional development; and service. Teaching effectiveness and advising is considered the most important component of a candidate's evaluative qualities. Research, scholarly and professional development activities are ranked next in importance (i.e. weighed less). Service is given the least weight but the candidate is expected to show meaningful committee activity at the Department, College and University level as well as participation with the community external to the University. However, quality in all three categories is required for RTP. An all-inclusive list of ways in which a candidate can contribute to each of these areas would be endless. Examples are provided in the Appendix. The candidate should pursue activities that both enhance their career and benefit the university and the department.

II.6. Candidate's Responsibilities

The candidate initiates all RTP requests. If the candidate is eligible for an RTP action then there will be written notification from the Committee Chair. The candidate must respond that either there will or will not be a request for consideration. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then the candidate must notify the Committee Chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action.

At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups. The candidate can withdraw the request, without prejudice, at any level of review.

In the self-evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references, item by item, to the Department RTP criteria. If the candidate is requesting reappointment then there must be clear and explicit evidence that there is progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the self-evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:

- A. **Discussion of teaching effectiveness and advising/mentoring activities.** This includes an assessment of the student and peer evaluations, and activities relating to student advising and/or mentoring. All deficiencies noted in the student and peer evaluation shall be addressed fully. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must also be addressed.
- B. **Discussion of research, scholarly and professional development activities.** This includes specific citation of all peer reviewed publications, dates of presentation at professional meetings and other scholarly activities, including grants and contracts, and

explicit reference to all duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.

- C. **Discussion of service to the University, College, Department and community.** This includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties including assistance in a professional capacity to any group, and other services to the university community at large. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.

The period of time covered by the self-evaluation should be since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; tenure on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position.

The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and to make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's RTP file. Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the committee and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should consider an appendix to the evaluation package which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals and results, course materials, lab manuals, letters of appreciation, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.). These supplemental materials can be placed in the faculty member's office, Department office, or the Dean's office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the RTP package.

The candidate is responsible for making sure that all his/her classes have had student evaluations completed. Appendix 10 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on student evaluations of teaching performance.

The only professional means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in faculty performance review is to reach students collectively, not individually. Any solicitation by the candidate on his/her own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is unprofessional and is prohibited. This does not mean that the candidate cannot include other forms of evaluation. It just means that anything other than Department approved student evaluation forms and the results from the use of these forms cannot be included in the RTP package.

The candidate needs to work closely with the Department in order to schedule the minimum number of peer reviews of teaching performance. The minimum number of peer reviews is two and not both in the same semester. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations, directly from the Chair of the RTP Committee, beyond the minimum required. All original Department-approved peer review forms must be included in the RTP package. The candidate must have course syllabi and other relevant teaching materials ready during the peer review session (or at some other prearranged time). Policy No. 1328, Section 305.303 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on peer review of teaching performance.

II.7. Candidates and Future Candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance or on leave (see also Policy No. 1328, section 305.201)

- a. Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP requests by fax and must provide fax numbers or addresses to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.
- b. Individuals who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The department may articulate expectations for these exceptional situations in the Department RTP Criteria document. If these exceptions are not addressed in the department criteria, then the candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing an interpretation of the department criteria in light of the special circumstances. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the dean, URTPC Chair and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

II.8. Personal Professional Development Plan

Each faculty member requesting RTP action shall prepare and attach a Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP) to the RTP package being submitted for evaluation. The PPDP should address, but it is not limited to factors such as:

- Development of Academic courses in multiple disciplines as listed in Appendix 2.
- Advising Activities.
- Participation in courses, workshops, seminars.
- Pursuit of advanced degree.
- Plans for Research, scholarly and professional development activities to include items such as:
 - a. Sponsored research
 - b. Publication in refereed journals or conference proceedings and presentation of professional papers
 - c. Professional consulting
 - d. Textbook authoring
- Service to the University and professional communities.

The PPDP is intended to be flexible and may be revised in accordance with the evolving interests and needs of the candidate and the Department. The purpose of the PPDP is to help the candidate and the DRTPC gain a common understanding of what specific activities will satisfy the RTP criteria.

III. CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION

III.1. Elements of Performance and Evaluation

All full-time faculty members are expected to actively contribute to all three of the following areas, but the candidate is not expected to comprehensively cover all activities listed below.

- **Teaching Effectiveness, Advising and Student Activities (Also refer to Appendix 4)**

- A. Good performance in course preparation, as evidenced by the inclusion of new and advanced concepts in course materials, the use of innovative teaching methods and development of new courses and laboratories.
- B. Student evaluations of teaching with at least 40% of student responses in the Good and Very Good categories. See Appendix 1, for Evaluation Form.
- C. Good performance in academic advising, which requires being familiar with policies and procedures and holding regular posted office hours, which helps facilitate the various advising and mentoring activities. See Appendix 3 for Evaluation Form.
- D. Good peer evaluations. At least two such evaluations, consisting of classroom visits and reviews of course syllabi and related materials, shall be conducted each academic year.

- **Research, Scholarly, and Professional development Activities (Also refer to Appendix 5)**

- E. Continued scholarship in the candidate's designated specialty (research) area, as evidenced by two or more of the following:
 - 1. Publications in refereed journals or conference proceedings
 - 2. Presentations at professional conferences
 - 3. Pursuit of sponsored research
 - 4. Active participation in courses, workshops or seminars related to research, scholarly and professional development.
 - 5. Professional consulting
 - 6. Preparation of technical textbook(s)

- **Service to the Department, College, University and Community (Also refer to Appendix 6)**

- F. Good performance in all assigned administrative duties.
- G. Good service to the College of Engineering, the University and/or the candidate's professional organization.
- H. Assumption of leadership position(s) in professional organization(s).

An evaluation will be made by the DRTPC of the documented evidence related to criteria A through H as provided by the candidate. A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC will be required.

III.2. Criteria for Reappointment

A probationary faculty member must apply for reappointment during an RTP cycle if the previous reappointment letter (or initial appointment letter) specifies that the term of (re)appointment expires at the end of the current academic year. The only exception is the case of a probationary faculty member in the sixth probationary year, who must apply for tenure. Recommendations for reappointment are based solely on contributions made during the time period since the previous evaluation for reappointment. All claims to accomplishments must be able to be documented. To be recommended for reappointment to a given rank, the individual must satisfy each of these criteria:

- A. Provide evidence of effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of good teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation, student surveys, and graduate evaluations (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of good teaching effectiveness include: (1) variety of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs.
- C. Demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development in Aerospace Engineering
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process.
- E. Exhibit good performance in activities that provide service to the department, college, university, and off-campus community, as evidenced by memoranda, committee reports and other tangible items.
- F. A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through E as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions. Favorable reappointment evaluations are, by definition evidence of satisfactory progress toward satisfying criteria for tenure. In case of a tie, the Department Chair, in consultation with DRTPC, will break the tie.

III.3. Criteria for Tenure

A request for tenure is obligatory when a probationary faculty member has begun the last of the probationary period. Recommendations for tenure are based on contributions made during the time period since the candidate's initial appointment in the department. All claims to accomplishments must be able to be documented. To be recommended for tenure, the individual must satisfy each of the following criteria:

- A. Provide evidence of consistent effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of very good teaching effectiveness, as well as promise and evidence of continued growth and fulfillment of program needs after awarding of tenure. This assessment will be based on peer evaluation, student surveys, and graduate evaluations (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of very good teaching effectiveness include: (1) diversity of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs. Other examples are provided in Appendix 4.
- C. Demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development activities in Aerospace Engineering (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process, as well as promise and evidence of continued growth in research and scholarly activities (See Appendix 6 for examples).
- E. Exhibit very good performance in activities that provide service to the department, college, university, and off-campus community, as evidenced by memoranda, committee reports and other tangible items. Examples of service contributions are provided in Appendix 6.
- F. A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through E as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions. In case of a tie, the Department Chair, in consultation with DRTPC, will break the tie.

III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

A request for regular promotion to Associate Professor is never obligatory. The request for promotion to Associate Professor will be considered only if the candidate has served four years in the rank of Assistant Professor. The candidate may apply at the beginning of the fifth year.

Recommendations for promotion to Associate Professor are based solely on contributions made during the time period since the candidate's initial appointment. Promotion to Associate Professor depends on the fulfillment of any pertinent conditions stated in the letter of initial appointment as well as the criteria stated below. All claims to accomplishments must be able to be documented. To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor the individual must:

- A. Provide evidence of effective and consistent student advising and mentoring. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of very good teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation, student surveys, and graduate evaluations (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of good teaching effectiveness include: (1) variety of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and/or improvement of existing courses and labs. See Appendix 4 for examples.
- C. Demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development activities in Aerospace Engineering (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process. (See Appendix 6 for examples).
- E. Exhibit very good performance in activities that provide service to the department, college, university, and off-campus community, as evidenced by memoranda, committee reports and other tangible items. Examples of service contributions are provided in Appendix 6.
- F. A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through E as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions. Favorable reappointment evaluations are, by definition evidence of satisfactory progress toward satisfying criteria for tenure. In case of a tie, the Department Chair, in consultation with DRTPC, will break the tie.

III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

A request for promotion to Professor is never obligatory. The request for promotion to Professor will be considered only if the candidate has served four years in rank of Associate Professor. The candidate may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. Furthermore, promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.

Recommendations for promotion to Professor are based solely on the contributions made during the time period since the candidate's last promotion or since the initial appointment, whichever is more recent. Promotion to Professor depends on the fulfillment of any pertinent conditions stated in the letter of initial appointment. All claims to accomplishments must be able to be documented. To be eligible for promotion to Professor the individual must:

- A. Provide evidence of consistent and effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of excellent teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation and student and graduate surveys (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of excellent teaching effectiveness include: (1) variety of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs. See Appendix 4 for examples. Demonstrate a leadership role in the maintenance and further development of at least two courses offered by the Department. One of these courses must be a core course.
- C. Demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development activities in Aerospace Engineering (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process. (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- E. Exhibit strong and meaningful contributions to the university and the department. Special attention will be given to course and laboratory development. Effective interaction with industry to the benefit of the department is also necessary. The candidate must show evidence of significant leadership roles at all levels within the University as well as in the larger professional community. In addition, the evidence presented by the candidate should clearly indicate that the candidate will continue efforts in the area of service.
- F. A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through E as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions. In case of a tie, the Department Chair, in consultation with DRTPC, will break the tie.

III.6. Criteria for Early Tenure

A request for early tenure is never obligatory. Policy No. 1328, Section 305.206, of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early tenure must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona before the effective date of early tenure. Thus, a faculty member's application for early tenure can occur no earlier than the second year on campus.

Early tenure may be recommended prior to the end of the normally required six-year probationary period in very exceptional cases. To be recommended for early tenure, the individual must satisfy each of the following criteria:

- A. Provide evidence of consistent very good academic advising. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of exceptional teaching performance as well as promise and evidence of continued growth and fulfillment of program needs after awarding of tenure, as demonstrated by consistent high student ratings; awards by the University, College or Department for outstanding teaching and student advising and very positive peer review. Provide evidence of exceptional teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation and student and graduate surveys (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of exceptional teaching effectiveness include: (1) variety of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and/or improvement of existing courses and labs. See Appendix 4 for examples.
- C. Demonstrate firm evidence of exceptional accomplishments in scholarship and professional development activities as evidenced by recognition in the form of award or other special action by professional organization in recognition of peer-reviewed research and/or scholarly activity.
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make exceptional contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process as well as promise and evidence of continued growth in research and scholarly activities. (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- E. Exhibit exceptional service to University, College or Department as evidenced by being chair of active committees, taking a lead role in advancement activities, or special recognition for outstanding service by either the Department, College or University.
- F. The Aerospace Engineering candidate must have demonstrated exceptional ability to teach substantially all of the aerospace engineering related courses.
- G. Show exceptional interest and effectiveness in assisting professional student organizations as evidenced by either national recognition of the student chapter or student participation in the organizations professional activities.
- H. A favorable written evaluation from all of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through G as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions.

III.7. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor

A request for early promotion to Associate Professor is never obligatory. Policy No. 1328, Section 305.206, of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early promotion must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona in the rank as an Assistant

Professor before the effective date of early promotion. Thus, a faculty member's application for early promotion to Associate Professor can occur no earlier than the second year on campus.

To be eligible for early promotion to Associate Professor the individual must:

- A. Provide evidence of consistent and exceptional academic advising. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of exceptional teaching performance as demonstrated by consistent high student ratings; awards by the University, College or Department for outstanding teaching and student advising and very positive peer review. Provide evidence of good teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation and student and graduate surveys (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of good teaching effectiveness include: (1) variety of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and/or improvement of existing courses and labs. See Appendix 4 for example.
- C. Demonstrate firm evidence of exceptional accomplishments in scholarship and professional development activities as evidenced by recognition in the form of award or other special action by professional organization in recognition of peer-reviewed research and/or scholarly activity.
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make exceptional contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process. (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- E. Exhibit exceptional service to University, College or Department as evidenced by being chair of active committees, taking a lead role in advancement activities, or special recognition for outstanding service by either the Department, College or University.
- F. The Aerospace Engineering candidate must have demonstrated exceptional ability to teach substantially all of the aerospace engineering related courses.
- G. Show exceptional interest and effectiveness in assisting professional student organizations as evidenced by either national recognition of the student chapter or student participation in the organizations professional activities.
- H. A favorable written evaluation from all of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through G as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions. Favorable reappointment evaluations are, by definition evidence of satisfactory progress toward satisfying criteria for tenure.

III.8. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor

A request for early promotion to Professor is never obligatory. Policy No. 1328, Section 305.206, of the University Manual requires that a recipient of early promotion must have completed two years of full time service at Cal Poly Pomona before the effective date of early promotion. Thus, a faculty member's application for early promotion to Professor can occur no earlier than the second year on campus. Furthermore, early promotion to Professor is only possible if the faculty member is tenured or is granted tenure at the time of promotion.

To be eligible for early promotion to Professor the individual must:

- A. Provide evidence of exceptional academic advising. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.
- B. Provide evidence of exceptional teaching performance as demonstrated by consistent high student ratings; awards by the University, College or Department for outstanding teaching and student advising and very positive peer review. Provide evidence of good teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation and student and graduate surveys (see Section III for appropriate procedures). Elements of good teaching effectiveness include: (1) variety of courses taught; (2) organization and content of courses; (3) ability to communicate and explain difficult principles; and (4) contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and/or improvement of existing courses and labs. Other examples are provided in Appendix 4. Demonstrate a leadership role in the maintenance and further development of at least two courses offered by the Department. One of these courses must be a core course.
- C. Show firm evidence of exceptional accomplishments in scholarship and professional development activities as evidenced by recognition in the form of award or other special action by professional organization in recognition of peer-reviewed research and/or scholarly activity.
- D. Develop or continue with an ongoing research and scholarly activities and make exceptional contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process. (See Appendix 5 for examples).
- E. Exhibit exceptional service to University, College or Department as evidenced by being chair of active committees, taking leading roles in advancement activities, or special recognition for outstanding service by the Department, College or the University.
- F. Exhibit exceptional University-Industry Relations, e.g., makes use of industrial contacts for field trips, senior project topics, seminars, gifts and/or grants.

- G. The Aerospace Engineering candidate must have demonstrated exceptional ability to teach substantially all of the aerospace engineering related courses.
- H. Show exceptional interest and effectiveness in assisting professional student organizations as evidenced by either national recognition of the student chapter or student participation in the organizations professional activities.
- I. A favorable written evaluation from the all of the DRTPC. This evaluation will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria A through H as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions.

III.9. Evaluation of Faculty Serving on Temporary Assignments

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members planning to serve on temporary assignment (e.g., administrative positions, positions of academic governance, interim ARO department chair, on leave, or visiting professor/scholar) will, in consultation with the DRTP Committee, develop suitable criteria applicable to the temporary assignment. These criteria, which will be used for evaluation during the period of temporary assignment, must be submitted in writing and approved by the DRTP Committee and the Dean prior to initiation of the temporary assignment. **If such criteria are not developed, the criteria provided below will be used.**

Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment:

- A. For promotion or tenure, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within two years of the candidate's request. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- B. For reappointment, the candidate serving an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- C. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of research and scholarly activity.
- D. Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.

Faculty Serving in Academic Governance:

- A. For promotion or tenure, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught Department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within two years of the candidate's request. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

- B. For reappointment, the candidate serving in academic governance and has release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- C. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment shall provide evidence of research and scholarly activities.
- D. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their academic governance duties.

Faculty on Approved Leave:

- A. Faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President of the University are on approved leave status. Normally, this is with pay from this University and thus, for tenure track candidates, the probationary status is still active and next several criteria apply. If the approved leave is without pay from the University then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate is inactive (i.e., "the clock has stopped") and the next several criteria do not apply.
- B. For promotion or tenure, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at this University, Department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within two years of the candidate's request. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.
- C. For reappointment, the candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department at this University. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.
- D. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity. Research and scholarly activity done at another institution, whether done alone or in collaboration with others, can be examined by the committee for the purposes of fulfilling the Department's criteria in the area of scholarly or creative activity.
- E. Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirement specified in the Departmental criteria for the requested RTP action.

Appendix 1: Student Evaluation Form of Teaching.

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT										C.S.P.U. POMONA					
CLASS NBR		TERM	SUBJECT	COURSE	SECTION	COURSE TITLE				INSTRUCTOR					
0 0 0 0 0 0		0 0 0 0	INSTRUCTIONS: 1. USE A NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY. 2. MAKE HEAVY BLACK MARKS THAT FILL THE CIRCLE COMPLETELY. 3. PRINT THE CLASS NUMBER, TERM CODE, SUBJECT, COURSE, COURSE SECTION, COURSE TITLE AND INSTRUCTOR'S INITIAL AND LAST NAME. 4. ALWAYS BUBBLE INSTR NBR 1 FOR THE LEAD INSTRUCTOR 5. MARK ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION. 6. ALL CHANGES MUST BE CLEANLY ERASED.						INSTR NBR		RATINGS				
1 1 1 1 1 1		1 1 1 1							1 2 3 4		VERY	SATISFACTORY		VERY	NOT APPROPRIATE
2 2 2 2 2 2		2 2 2 2							GOOD	GOOD	POOR	POOR			
3 3 3 3 3 3		3 3 3 3													
4 4 4 4 4 4		4 4 4 4													
5 5 5 5 5 5		5 5 5 5													
6 6 6 6 6 6		6 6 6 6													
7 7 7 7 7 7		7 7 7 7													
8 8 8 8 8 8		8 8 8 8													
9 9 9 9 9 9		9 9 9 9													
1	How effectively does the instructor organize and structure the course?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
2	How well did the instructor define and meet objectives of the course?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
3	How well does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
4	How effectively does the instructor answer student questions?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
5	How effectively were whiteboard or other visual aids used?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
6	How available is the instructor to students for consultation?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
7	How accurately does the grading reflect what student has learned?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
8	How would rate this instructor compared to other instructors?						<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
9							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
10							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
11							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
12							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
13							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
14							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
15							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
16							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
17							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
18							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
19							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
20							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
21							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
22							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
23							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
24							<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		

Appendix 2: Aerospace Engineering Disciplines.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Aerospace Engineering Department
Technical Areas

1. Aerothermofluidynamics:

- Fluid Dynamics
- Gas Dynamics
- Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD)
- Linux Cluster for CFD
- Low-Speed Aerodynamics
- Wing Theory
- Low-Speed Wind Tunnel Testing
- High-Speed Aerodynamics
- High-Speed Wind Tunnel Testing
- Heat, Mass & Momentum Transfer
- Helicopter Aerodynamics

2. Aerospace Structures:

- Aircraft Structures
- Finite-Element Analysis
- Mechanics of Composite Materials
- Structural Design
- Structural Dynamics
- Structural Testing
- Composites Lab (shared)
- Aerospace Vibrations & Structural Dynamics Lab. (planned)

3. Atmospheric Flight Mechanics:

- Aircraft Performance
- Aircraft Stability & Control
- Aerospace Feedback Control Systems
- Flight Controls Lab

- MATLAB Simulink
- Advanced Dynamics of Aerospace Systems
- Advanced Aerospace Control Systems

4. Aerospace Propulsion:

- Aircraft Jet Propulsion
- Jet Propulsion Lab
- Rocket Propulsion: Solids & Liquids
- Rocket Propulsion Lab (planned)

5. Astronautics:

- Astronautics
- Space Environment
- Orbital Mechanics
- Launch Systems
- Spacecraft Mission Design
- Spacecraft Dynamics

6. Aerospace Vehicle Design:

- Aircraft Design
- Spacecraft Design
- UAV Design
- UAV Lab
- SmallSat Lab (planned)

7. General:

- Numerical Methods

Appendix 3: Student Evaluation Form of Advising.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Aerospace Engineering Department
Student Evaluation of Faculty Advising

1. Your faculty advisor: _____
2. What is the highest ARO course you have successfully completed: _____
3. **Rate the quality of advising you received:**
 Good **Satisfactory** **Unsatisfactory**
4. If unsatisfactory, explain and suggest how the advising can be improved.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Only signed and dated forms will be used for official purposes.
**Thank you for completing this form and turning it in to the Aerospace
Engineering Secretary in Room 17-2132.**

Appendix 4: Other Supporting Evidence for Quality of Teaching and Teaching Effectiveness

The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this area include, but are not limited to the following:

Courses

- Course syllabi and supplemental course material, such as lecture outlines, handouts, etc
- Developing and offering a new course
- Significantly revising an existing course
- Planning and implementing improvements in laboratory facilities
- Contributing to course development related to the mission of the department
- Incorporating innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching that enhance student learning
- Developing novel curricular materials including multimedia or computer-based materials
- Incorporating information from workshops or professional meetings into classroom instruction
- Developing new teaching methodologies to replace or supplement existing teaching methods

Improving pedagogical techniques

- Attending professional development seminars/workshops to enhance teaching and learning
- Observing teaching by other instructors and incorporating active learning techniques
- Collaborating with a mentor to improve teaching performance
- Incorporating assessment techniques into teaching

Assessment of teaching and learning activities

- Assessing novel curricular materials
- Assessing teaching and learning techniques

Enhancement of educational experiences for students

- Tutoring students
- Holding review sessions
- Mentoring students, which includes helping them plan their professional development and encouraging them to set high goals for themselves.

Service to students

- Service as an academic advisor to students
- Service as an advisor or sponsor to a student club
- Assisting in placing students in graduate or professional schools, internships or other job opportunities
- Participating in the recruitment of new students for the department

Integration of teaching and scholarship

- Expanding learning opportunities beyond the classroom, such as field trips, meetings, and website development
- Developing and offering supervisory courses for graduate and undergraduate students
- Incorporating course activities that enhance student contact with professionals in related fields
- Directing undergraduate research, senior projects and theses

- Directing graduate research and theses
- Sponsoring student presentations at local research days and at professional meetings
- Teaching at other institutions
 - Giving guest lectures at other universities or schools
 - Visiting professorship
- New course development
 - Developing course syllabi, and providing supplemental course material: outlines, handouts, etc.
 - Developing and offering a new course
 - Significantly revising an existing course
 - Contributing to course development related to the mission of the department
- Integration of scholarship and teaching
 - Serving on or chairing graduate student thesis committees
 - Incorporating information from workshops or professional meetings into research training
 - Publishing in a peer-reviewed journal the results of assessment of teaching and learning
 - Presenting the results of assessment of teaching and learning at professional meetings
- Service learning activities, honors course participation, and contributions to the training of teachers
- Any other activity that enhances teaching improves learning or provides service to the students.

Appendix 5: Evaluation Research, scholarly and professional development activities

The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this area include, but are not limited to the following:

Grants and contracts

- Research grants
- Student training grants
- Equipment grants
- Teaching/education grants

Research

- Conducting research in specialty area
- Involving students in research training
- Participating in research at another institution
- Working with mentor to improve research productivity

Publications

- Refereed journal and conference proceedings
- Non-refereed publication as a supplement to refereed publications Authoring or editing books and/or chapters of books appropriate to his/her specialty
- Other publications: software, instructional materials, manuals, popular articles, web pages, etc.
- Co-authoring of publications and presentations with students
- Authorship of documents, reports, etc. pertinent to the department, college, or university

Presentations

- Oral presentations to professional societies, symposia, workshops
- Poster presentations at professional societies, symposia, workshops
- Presenting seminar on research activities

Any other scholarly activity that enhances professional development.

Appendix 6: Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University and Community

The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this area include, but are not limited to, the following:

Service to the Aerospace Engineering Department

- Participating on department committees and task forces
- Chairing department committees
- Contributing to course or curriculum development related to the mission of the department
- Authoring and receiving education, training, or equipment grants that benefit the department
- Participating in department fund raising activities
- Organizing or participating in service activities such as career fairs, or career days
- Organizing or participating in department functions and activities
- Collaborating with a mentor to improve service performance
- Serving as a mentor to new faculty
- Participating in the recruitment of new faculty
- Coordinating a multi-sectioned course
- Regularly attending department meetings

Service to the College of Engineering

- Serving on or chairing of College committees
- Organizing or participating in College functions and activities

Service to Cal Poly Pomona University

- Serving on or chairing of university committees
- Organizing or participating in university functions and activities
- Service on the Academic Senate
- Service on administrative assignment for the University

Service to Community

- Working closely with professional organizations and nearby schools offering outreach programs
- Representing the department through speaking engagements at colleges, schools, clubs & other organizations

Professional organizations

- Organizing meetings or events associated with professional organizations
- Chairing sessions at professional meetings
- Attending professional meetings
- Holding office, leadership roles or contributions to a professional organization

Professional services

- Consulting work in some discipline of aerospace engineering
- Consulting work in other areas of expertise

Professional training

- A relevant certification, designation or license
- Attending special research techniques training workshop
- Attending grant-writing, web page or technology development workshop

Peer review

- Serving as reviewer for peer-reviewed journal or similar publication
- Serving as ad hoc reviewer or on review panel for grant proposals
- Serving on review or selection committee to review candidates for fellowships and awards
- Peer review of faculty teaching
- Leadership role in organizing activities, meetings or events
 - Organizing activities, events or meetings for a professional society or organization
 - Organizing activities, events or meetings for the Aerospace Engineering Department
 - Organizing activities, events or meetings for the College of Engineering or the University
- Participation in scholarly and creative activities and events
 - Attending planned departmental, college or university activities or events
 - Attending conferences, symposia, workshops, seminars and science fairs
- Honors, awards and recognition of candidate's contributions to engineering
 - Election to honor societies
 - Receipt of professional awards
 - Invitations to speak at other institutions or at professional society meetings
 - Number of citations of the candidate's work in other author's peer-reviewed works or books

- Any other activity that provides service to the Aerospace Engineering Department, College of Engineering, University or community.