

✓

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	Economics
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018/19
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	2018/19 - 2022 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>Bruce Brown</u> Printed Name	<u>Bruce Brown</u> Signature	4/9/18 Date
DRTPC Chair:	<u>Greg Hunter</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	4/9/18 Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

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

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

CRTPC Chair:	<u>Daniel Lewis</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	5/15/18 Date
--------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN

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

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

Dean/Director:	<u>Fris Levine</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	5/30/18 Date
----------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. Approved for the following years 5 years. 2018/2019 to 2022/2023
2. Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs:	<u>Martin Sancho-Madriz</u> Printed Name	<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	08.08.18 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.

DATE: May 15, 2018

TO: Dr. Iris Levine, Dean
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

FROM: Dr. Daniel Lewis, Chair
College RTP Committee

RE: Review of Economics Department RTP Document Updates

The CRTPC has reviewed the RTP revisions that the conversion to a semester-based system of operations requires. We make the following suggestions:

Typos: The committee would prefer to see "long-term" hyphenated, since it modifies "goals" on page 3; and in section 1.2.4, there is an extra space in line 8.

Please make these corrections to the document and return the revised document to the college dean's office at your earliest convenience. Assuming these changes are made in the document going forward, the CRTPC approves the revised document.

While no other changes are required, the committee did note the following issues for the department to consider in future revisions to RTP criteria:

The committee wondered if the department views the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service equally or if one matters more than the others? A statement about the relative weight of the categories that clarifies this would help candidates focus and prioritize their work.

On page 10, a footnote suggests that "extenuating circumstances" might allow candidates a break in meeting the criteria relating to "Scholarly and Creative Work." The committee believes that it is best to set a standard without qualifications that render standards meaningless.

These points are included for your consideration and do not constitute required changes.

Draft May 17, 2018

**Department of Economics
College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
Cal Poly Pomona**

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Document

2018/2019 to ~~2023/2024~~ 2022/2023

Section I – Introduction

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which the University assures the success of faculty and thereby assures educational quality for its students. While the President makes final decisions on RTP, it is the Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) which is in the best position to provide clear expectations to the RTP candidate, to create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and to render the most informed recommendations to the President based on the Department RTP criteria. The Department's RTP Document communicates the requirements for earning a positive recommendation at the Departmental level for the various RTP actions. The Department's RTP Document also defines and communicates the RTP procedures used within the Economics Department to the Department faculty, candidates, the Dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators.

University policies, including the Unit 3 collective bargaining agreement (CBA) and policy number 1329 (formerly appendix 10) and policy number 1328 (formerly appendix 16) 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 Department policies.

The CBA requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided with a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document by the department chair within two weeks of the start of his/her first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. The Department RTP document is also maintained on the Department web page. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Document is to articulate the criteria that the Department expects of a faculty member and in particular what a candidate must achieve in order to receive a positive recommendation from the Department for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Expectations are stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidate is able to plan his/her activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with the Department, College, and University's mission, goals, and accreditation standards.

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting candidates, in order to provide them with the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, clear, and fair (CPP Policy No: 1328) just as it is important for candidates to be knowledgeable of Department expectations and to be committed to meeting them. Throughout the process, the candidate

is responsible to submit an RTP package and all the supporting documents to the DRTPC in a timely manner.

- I.1.** CPP Policy No: 1328 provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.
- (a) **The DRTPC** is usually restricted to tenured, full-time faculty. DRTPC members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. Faculty on FERP may serve, if requested by a majority of vote of probationary and tenured faculty and approved by the President. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing to do so. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may participate in reappointment cases *only* -- and may *not* participate in promotion or tenure recommendations.
 - (b) **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the Department RTP Document. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria are determined by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty. The Department RTP Document and CPP Policy No: 1328 contain procedural information as well as criteria. The Department RTP document is submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his/her designee.
 - (c) A **probationary year** of service involves the fall and spring semesters of an academic year. The first probationary year begins with the first fall semester of appointment.
 - (d) The due dates for each step of the RTP process are determined by the University, and communicated to the candidate by the DRTPC. The candidate has the responsibility for complying with all the due dates.
 - (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 he/she applies for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible to apply for 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) **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on exceptional teaching ability, and shall require a level of scholarly and creative activities, and service that substantively exceed those required for regular actions.
 - (h) **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by CPP Policy No: 1329 of the University Manual and the CBA.

- (i) **Completing Peer evaluations of teaching** is the responsibility of the DRTPC and includes classroom visits, review of course syllabi, tests, handouts, other teaching materials, and a written report. Further information is provided in section II. 4.
- (j) **A candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment.
- (k) **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 an RTP 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. During the review for tenure or promotion *all* years of service are evaluated.

I.2.1 Department Philosophy: From here to its conclusion, this Document represents the position of the Department of Economics, in compliance with the current and approved University Policy/Procedures (**CPP Policy Nos: 1328 and 1329**) and the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The RTP process is intended to clarify expectations, to create mentoring relationships between new and senior faculty (thereby building trust and helping candidates to achieve success), and to strengthen the Department's programs. The RTP process reflects the Department's thoughts about the meaning and application of standards; the wide-ranging forms and implications of accountability measures; and the kinds of professional growth that benefit the Department and its students.

Throughout the RTP process, the candidate will receive - in writing - constructive feedback on how to advance to tenure and the rank of professor. In each RTP package submitted by the candidate, the DRTPC will clearly identify those areas of the candidate's performance that require improvement. It is expected that the candidate will address and improve the identified areas prior to the next RTP self-evaluation or by a time period identified by the DRTPC.

As part of the self-evaluation in the RTP process, the candidate is required to develop a realistic Professional Development Plan (PDP) stating the candidate's short and long-term goals. The short and long-term goals must be such that, if achieved would result in positive recommendations for reappointment, tenure and promotion. The PDP must be approved by the DRTPC in the candidate's first evaluation cycle. The PDP must address areas to be evaluated in the RTP process including, teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. The DRTPC recognizes that as candidates progress toward tenure and/or promotion, PDPs may change. Changes to a PDP must be approved by the DRTPC in each evaluation cycle. The revised plan must contain short and long-term goals that if achieved, would result in positive recommendations for reappointments, promotion, and tenure. The DRTPC will use the PDP to evaluate the candidate's progress toward

meeting his/her goals. It is recommended that the candidate stay in continuous communication with the DRTPC as milestones are met in the PDP.

I.2.2 Teaching Effectiveness: The Department expects that all tenure track faculty will continually enhance and improve their teaching with respect to the student population at Cal Poly Pomona. The DRTPC expects that teaching effectiveness will be reflected in student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other measurements related to teaching performance. The DRTPC recognizes that average percentile rankings relative to other members of the department are not necessarily the best indicators of success. Raw teaching scores and trends in those scores may be more useful in pointing out areas of success or concern.

The Department acknowledges that teaching effectiveness can be documented in a number of ways. For example, student evaluations are helpful, but the Department does not consider them the sole indicator of teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations will also be used to assess teaching effectiveness and will be given substantial weight. Included in the peer evaluations will be evidence of progress in developing one's teaching expertise. Peer evaluations by an evaluator appointed by the chair of the DRTPC will include an analysis of classroom visits, syllabi, examinations, writing assignments, grading procedures, grade distributions, and availability during office hours.

Consistent with the policies in CPP Policy No: 1329, the DRTPC will make judgments about the quality of teaching, and the maintenance of academic standards.

Candidates are encouraged to participate in workshops and conferences for the enhancement and/or improvement of teaching hosted by the Faculty Center for Professional Development, the CSU, and other professional organizations.

A faculty member applying for an RTP action may request that additional peer evaluations be conducted on his/her behalf. The Department may not refuse such a request unless it is made after a deadline established by the Department or the RTP process. All student and peer evaluations conducted during the review period will be considered by the DRTPC.

Academic advising is a required part of a faculty member's core responsibilities. The candidate is expected to address this area in her/his RTP package. The DRTPC will evaluate a faculty member's performance as an academic advisor in helping students with academic policies, curricula, petitions, and probationary and graduate contracts.

I.2.3 Scholarly or Creative Work: This category includes combinations of the following:

- publications (e.g., articles in refereed/peer reviewed journals, book/textbook/monograph publications by an academic/commercial press, chapters of books);
- conference presentations (e.g. papers, poster sessions, session chairs, session discussants);
- other publications (e.g. newspaper or magazine articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries);
- editing professional journals or serving on editorial advisory boards;
- serving in leadership positions in professional organizations;
- acting as a referee for academic journals, organizing conferences, etc.; and
- success in obtaining external grants.

I.2.4 Service: This category includes service to the Department, College, University, and community as well as to our academic discipline. It includes active membership on Department, College, University, Academic Senate committees, or discipline related service to the community at large. Candidates are expected, in time, to assume leadership roles, which could mean extending or improving Departmental outreach, serving in a leadership capacity in the Department (e.g. Department Chair), chairing a College or University committee, serving on the Steering Committee of the Academic Senate or chairing any of its sub committees, serving or leading an accreditation team, serving on a Search Committee, or taking a leadership role in the California Faculty Association. Another valued form of service is making oneself available as a resource, such as providing expertise to the Department, College, or University.

See Section III of this Document for the specific criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative Work, and service Criteria for each specific RTP action.

Section II – Procedures

The following Departmental procedures are in compliance with CPP Policy Nos: 1328 and 1329, which describe University-wide RTP procedures and student evaluation of teaching.

II.1.a Election and Duties of the DRTPC and DRTPC Chair

The DRTPC members and chair shall be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty within the department before the end of spring semester of the academic year preceding the RTP cycle. The term of the DRTPC shall not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC's recommendations have been concluded. The department chair shall notify the dean of the composition and chair of the DRTPC immediately after the election. The department chair shall make available, no later than 14 days after the first day of fall semester instruction, to all RTP candidates

and the DRTPC, the department RTP Document that the candidate is eligible to use.

The size of the DRTPC shall be the maximum allowable size under CPP Policy No: 1328. This number is based on the number of tenured members of the Department eligible to serve within the RTP cycle. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members. FERP faculty members are eligible to participate, if voted by the tenure and probationary faculty members and approved by the President. Tenured faculty members who are candidates for promotion may participate in reappointment actions only. Only those members of the DRTPC who hold a higher rank than the candidate being considered will make recommendations for promotion. Faculty members who are away from the campus during a particular semester may be excused from participation. The department chair will not make a separate recommendation.

II.1.b Duties of the DRTPC Chair

(1) Fall semester:

- a) Verify the list of faculty members considered eligible for an RTP action with the dean;
- b) Ask all candidates for an RTP action to notify the DRTPC chair of their intent to request or to not request an RTP action during the first week of fall semester;
- c) Assist candidates in understanding expectations and preparing packages;
- d) Ensure that packages are complete;
- e) Act as the official custodian of the RTP package for the period between the submission of the package to the DRTPC by the candidate and the forwarding of the package to the Dean's office;
- f) Authorize any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package;
- g) Notify the appropriate parties of any additions or changes; and
- h) Review the Department's recommendations with each candidate.

(2) Throughout the year:

- (a) Be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the DRTPC Document and CPP Policy Nos: 1328 and 1329 are carried out within the prescribed deadlines established by the University for the department review;
- (b) Schedule peer evaluations (and ensure they are conducted) for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action in the future;
- (c) Ensure that written peer evaluations are provided to candidates within two weeks of the classroom visit;
- (d) Notify the candidate in writing of his/her right to provide a written response to a peer-evaluator's comments within ten (10) calendar days of receiving a copy of the peer evaluation.

- (e) Notify the candidate in writing of his/her right to provide a written response to written comments from students within ten (10) calendar days of receiving a copy of the written comments.

II.3 Student Evaluation of Teaching: Student course evaluations must be completed in every class.. The candidate must include summaries and analyses for all classes evaluated. The candidate must also include a discussion of his/her teaching philosophy and methods that enhance and improve student learning outcomes. The DRTPC shall serve as the official evaluation committee for analyzing, summarizing and interpreting the results of the student course evaluations.

The DRTPC will be responsible for posting notices that solicit written comments from students. For a two-week period, these notices will be displayed outside the department office and outside classrooms where Economics classes are taught. The notices will include the candidates under review, deadlines, and any other pertinent information. With this exception, neither Department faculty nor any of its representatives will directly solicit information from students regarding the performance of any candidate.

II.4 Peer Evaluation of Teaching: For all faculty holding a rank less than professor, a minimum two peer evaluations shall be conducted by different faculty in each academic year. Scheduled by the DRTPC, in consultation with candidates and reviewers, peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. Each peer review shall be conducted by a colleague of senior academic rank and shall include a classroom visit and a review of course syllabi, examinations, writing assignments, grading procedures, grade distributions, and availability during office hours. In addition, if appropriate, the peer review should address the use of innovative teaching techniques (such as collaborative learning and the use of technology) to enhance student-learning outcomes.

Within two weeks of the classroom visit, a written evaluation report should be given to the candidate and filed with the DRTPC chair. The candidate has the right to submit a written response to the peer-reviewers comments within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the report. Once the candidate has reviewed and signed the peer evaluation, all reports regarding the peer evaluation will be placed in the candidate's official University personal action file (PAF). At the beginning of spring semester, the DRTPC chair 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.5 Leaves and Other Changes to the 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.

II.5.a Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for an RTP action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates who provide their RTP requests

by fax or e-mail must provide fax numbers, addresses, and other pertinent contact information to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

II.5.b Candidates who accept full and/or partial positions outside of the Economics Department while they are still eligible for an RTP action must ensure that they understand Department expectations during the time that they are away. The candidate and the DRTPC shall develop and sign a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the absence period that provides (a) an interpretation of the Department's criteria, (b) a statement that specifies expectations and outcomes, and c) a provision for teaching evaluations prior to the candidate's departure. The Dean and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs shall approve this Memorandum of Understanding.

II.6 Candidates' Additional Responsibilities: Candidates are required to assemble an RTP package that makes the case for a positive recommendation for the requested action. The RTP package shall consist of the candidate's self-evaluation and additional materials submitted by the DRTPC and administrators relating to the evaluation of the candidate. Supporting materials regarding the candidate's teaching effectiveness, scholarship, or service, should be indexed and provided to the DRTPC chair for review by the DRTPC. To prepare the RTP package, candidates are encouraged to attend University-sponsored workshops and to seek the counsel of the DRTPC.

II.6.1 Self Evaluation: Candidates must include a self-evaluation that explicitly addresses the Department's criteria for the action/s requested. The self-evaluation must include:

- a) Discussion of teaching performance -- includes analyses of student and peer evaluations, a discussion of teaching philosophy and methods, and an explanation of activities related to student advising and/or mentoring;
- b) Discussion of scholarly and creative activities -- includes specific citation of all peer-reviewed publications, dates of attendance at professional meetings, all duties/assignments in professional organizations; and an explanation of work in progress and ongoing activities;
- c) Discussion of service to the University, College, Department, and the community -- includes the contributions made by the candidate in each service activity;
- d) Discussion of and progress towards fulfilling the short-term and long-term goals specified in the PDP and/or any changes in the PDP;
- e) A detailed response to any problems/deficiencies pointed out at any level of evaluation in the previous RTP cycle;

Section III -- Criteria for RTP Action

III.1 A positive recommendation for an RTP request will require that the criteria for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the specific RTP action be addressed and satisfied. **In all cases, teaching effectiveness is considered to be the most important category.**

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) The self-evaluation provided by the candidate based on the department RTP criteria;
- b) Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluations of teaching performance;
- c) Summaries and interpretations of students' course evaluations;
- d) Signed material (to be added to the candidate's RTP package) received from other faculty, students, administrators;
- e) Material requested from the candidate by the committee (e.g., requests for clarification of, corrections to, and/or 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 progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for *Promotion to Associate Professor* (III.4, below) and *Tenure* (III.3, below) or if hired at the Associate Professor level, for Professor (III.5 below) and Tenure (III.3 below). "Relative progress toward meeting the criteria" during each RTP period can be demonstrated by an analysis of where the candidate is at in achieving the short and long-term goals of the PDP. Any modifications to the PDP must be approved by the DRTPC and must contain short and long-term goals that, if achieved, would result in positive recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

If during the third request for reappointment, the DRTPC determines that the candidate (i) is not making sufficient progress towards the criteria for tenure as stated in the Department RTP Document (ii) is not achieving or progressing toward the short and long-term goals of his/her PDP, and/or (iii) has not addressed concerns from any level of review during the previous the previous RTP cycle, the DRTPC will provide the candidate with one year to correct any deficiencies. If by the fourth request for reappointment, the candidate does not show sufficient progress that, if continued, would result in a positive recommendation for tenure, the DRTPC would recommend that the candidate be reappointed to a terminal year. While improvement is the responsibility of the candidate, the DRTPC will assign a faculty member to work with and guide the candidate through this process.

III.3 Criteria for Tenure: A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. The candidate for tenure must satisfy criteria III.3 a - c listed below.

The candidate is reminded that an application for tenure is an action that evaluates all the years of services.

III.3.a Teaching Effectiveness: The candidate **must satisfy the three criteria listed below.** See 1.2.2.

- (1) A composite average score on the last three years of student course evaluations of “good” or “very good” on all questions on the Student Evaluation Course Form that pertain to teaching effectiveness. In addition, the DRTPC will evaluate evidence of improvement in existing courses since the original appointment; accounts of how the candidate plans to respond (as well as reports on how the faculty member did respond) to less-than-positive evaluations of teaching; accounts that provide contexts for specific evaluations, whether positive or negative, of teaching; currency in the discipline; the development of new courses; and the development of appropriate creative approaches and applications of technology.
- (2) Peer evaluations of teaching and course materials demonstrating that the candidate has the confidence of her/his peers with regard to her/his overall teaching effectiveness.
- (3) An analysis of the candidate’s performance as an academic advisor.

III.3.b Scholarly and Creative Work: A successful candidate for tenure will have published or have accepted for publication (without revision) two refereed journal articles since his/her initial appointment.¹ In addition, the candidate should demonstrate effectiveness in scholarly activities by documenting at least two of the following in each RTP cycle:

- Published books/textbooks/monographs in an academic/commercial press, government documents, and/or other professional reports;
- Presentation of papers at professional conferences related to the profession;
- Completed drafts of working papers ready to be submitted for publication;
- Other publications (newspaper or magazine articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries);
- Work in a professional associations;

¹ Under extenuating circumstances, a candidate may be recommended for tenure by the DRTPC without having met the criteria to publish or have accepted for publication (without revision) two refereed journal articles. In such a circumstance, the candidate must explain why this criterion was not satisfied. Furthermore, the candidate must demonstrate to the DRTPC’s satisfaction that she/he has a record of other substantial scholarly and creative work that would merit the granting of tenure.

- Role as a session Chair or discussant at conferences or participation in a poster session;
- External grant activities including grant proposals and awards.

III.3.c Service: During the *evaluation period*, the candidate is expected to take an *active* role in a minimum of three service activities listed below.

- Department Committees (assigned each academic year)
- College-level or University-level Committees
- Department Chair or Graduate Coordinator
- Program Development
- Curriculum Development
- Community Service and Outreach
- Academic Senate/Senate Steering Committee/Senate Sub-committees
- Other service area beneficial to the Department, College, University, or Community

The DRTPC will review the evidence submitted by the candidate (including his/her contributions and level of participation) to determine the quality and amount of work. The DRTPC will provide the candidate with written comments about the acceptable amount of work.

III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor: A faculty member is first **eligible to apply for promotion to associate professor** at the time he or she applies for tenure. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion** (see I.1.f and g).

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must show continued effectiveness in satisfying the criteria III.3 a-c for tenure (above).

III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor: Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible for a subsequent promotion** to professor after having served four years in the Associate Professor rank. For faculty appointed at the associate professor level, promotion to Professor requires tenure or the simultaneous award of tenure.

The candidate for Professor must demonstrate increased effectiveness in areas III.5 a-c below since the promotion to associate professor. In addition, the candidate should document areas of noteworthy achievement in teaching and scholarship, and leadership in service. The DRTPC recognized that candidates with a good record may face limitations on further improvements; still it is expected that candidates with good records will continue to sustain their level of activities and performance and with the help of the DRTPC develop and achieve the goals in their PDP that may lead to further improvements in teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

III.5.a Teaching Effectiveness: Demonstration of increased **effectiveness and professionalism** is expected including competency in the classroom, efforts to improve and stay current, and willingness to support fellow teachers in their efforts to improve and stay current. The candidate should document achievement of the following:

- Strong evidence of continued teaching effectiveness. A composite average score of “good” to “very good” on student course evaluations for all courses evaluated since the last RTP action. The DRTPC will evaluate evidence of improvement or maintenance of excellence in teaching; the development of new courses; currency in the discipline; and the development of appropriate creative pedagogies and applications of technology.
- Peer evaluations of teaching and course materials demonstrating that the candidate continues to have the confidence of her/his peers with regard to her/his overall teaching effectiveness.
- The evaluation of teaching performance includes an assessment by the DRTPC of the candidate’s performance as an academic advisor.

III.5.b Scholarly or Creative Work: A successful candidate for promotion to professor will have published or have accepted for publication (without revision) two refereed journal articles since being promoted to Associate Professor. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate effectiveness in scholarly activities by documenting at least two of the following during each academic year since promotion to Associate Professor.

- Published books/textbooks/monographs in an academic/commercial press, government documents, and/or other professional reports;
- Presentation of papers at professional conferences related to the profession;
- Completed drafts of working papers ready to be submitted for publication;
- Other publications (newspaper or magazine articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries);
- Work in a professional associations;
- Role as a session Chair or discussant at conferences or participation in a poster session;
- External grant activities including grant proposals and awards.

III.5.c Service: During the *evaluation period*, the candidate is expected to take a more *active* role in a minimum of three service activities listed below. The DRTPC will review the evidence submitted by the candidate (including his/her contributions and level of participation) to evaluate the quality and amount of work. In addition, the candidate is expected to take a significant leadership role in one or more service activities and to serve as a mentor for junior faculty.

- Department Committees (assigned each academic year)
- College-level or University-level Committees
- Department Chair or Graduate Coordinator
- Program Development
- Curriculum Development
- Community Service and Outreach
- Academic Senate/Senate Steering Committee/Senate Sub-committees
- Other service areas beneficial to the Department, College, University, or Community

III.6. Criteria for Early Tenure: A candidate for early tenure must have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank on this campus prior to the effective date of the action. Consideration for early tenure “shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and University service.” The candidate must receive a positive recommendation from the DRTPC for the request for early tenure to go forward.

It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding the specific criteria for tenure in each of the three areas including teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Performance that exceeds our expectations might *add* criteria that are indicated in the following sections.

III.6.1 Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Teaching Effectiveness:

- An average of “Good” to “Very Good” performance on each item of student numerical evaluations related to teaching effectiveness in *each* course evaluated
- Peer evaluations per year that attest to extraordinary quality
- Significant number of thesis committees chaired (an average of three or more per year)
- Significant course and curriculum development
- Significant work or leadership in assessment activities
- Leadership in teaching-related workshops
- Innovative integration of technology in each course, e.g. simulations, games
- Development of service-learning components in at least two courses
- Ongoing participation in regional and national workshops related to teaching effectiveness in each year considered in the evaluation period

III.6.2 Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Scholarly and Creative Work:

- Several refereed publications (one per each year evaluated) *or* a scholarly book (with evidence of more work, such as other publications, work in press, or a contract). The candidate is expected to provide clear information on the work done for co-author books.
- Editorship of a scholarly journal or a position on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
- Significant external grants awarded

III.6.3 Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Service:

- Directorship of a College or University center or program for at least two years
- Leadership in two or more service areas

III.7. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor:

A faculty member will be considered for early promotion to associate professor only if he/she has demonstrated exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications in all areas of evaluation. Consideration for early promotion to associate professor “shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities and University service.”

It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding the specific criteria for promotion to associate professor in each of the three areas including teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Performance that exceeds our expectations might *add* criteria that are indicated in the following sections.

III.7.1 Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Teaching Effectiveness:

- An average of “Good” to “Very Good” performance on each item of student numerical evaluations related to teaching effectiveness in *each* course evaluated
- Peer evaluations per year that attest to extraordinary quality
- Significant number of thesis committees chaired (an average of three or more per year)
- Significant course and curriculum development
- Significant work or leadership in assessment activities
- Leadership in teaching-related workshops
- Innovative integration of technology in each course, e.g. simulations, games
- Development of service-learning components in at least two courses
- Ongoing participation in regional and national workshops related to teaching effectiveness in each year considered in the evaluation period

III.7.2 Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Scholarly and Creative Work:

- Several refereed publications (one per each year evaluated) *or* a scholarly book (with evidence of more work, such as other publications, work in press, or a contract). The candidate is expected to provide clear information on the work done for co-author books.
- Editorship of a scholarly journal or a position on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
- Significant external grants awarded

III.7.3 Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Service:

- Directorship of a College or University center or program for at least two years
- Leadership in two or more service areas

III.8. Criteria for Superior Performance for Early Promotion to Professor: The candidate must have completed two years of full time services in an academic rank prior to the effective date of the RTP action requested and must be tenured or be awarded tenure simultaneously. The request for a positive action must be initiated by the candidate within the RTP procedures. The candidate must receive a positive recommendation from the DRTPC for the request for early promotion to professor to go forward.

It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding the specific criteria for promotion to professor in each of the three areas including teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Performance that exceeds our expectations might include additional criteria that are indicated in the following sections.

III.8.1 Additional Criteria for Superior Performance in Teaching Effectiveness:

- “Good” to “Very Good” scores for each item of the student course evaluations related to teaching effectiveness;
- Continuous and demonstrably effective academic advising; and
- Leadership roles at workshops on teaching.

III.8.2 Additional Criteria for Superior Performance in Scholarly or Creative Work:

- More than two articles in refereed journals since promotion to associate professor; and
- Regular invited-speaker status at conferences.

III.8.3 Additional Criteria for Superior Performance in Service:

- Significant accomplishment as result of committees chaired;
- Key leadership positions in department, college, or university committees;
and
- Significant grants awarded.