

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT  
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018-19
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>Halima ElNaga</u> Printed Name	<u>H. ElNaga</u> Signature	<u>8/27/18</u> Date
DRTPC Chair:	<u>Norali Peralta</u> Printed Name	<u>Norali Peralta</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>Sean Monemi</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.)

Dean/Director:	<u>Joseph J. Rencis, Dean</u> Printed Name	<u>Joseph J. Rencis</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>Martin Sancho-Madriz</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 ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING**

**RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION<sup>1</sup> CRITERIA**

2018/2019 Academic Years

**ABSTRACT**

This document defines all procedures and criteria used by the Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) Department to evaluate probationary and tenured faculty members (referred to as RTP candidates). All RTP related recommendations made by the ECE Department shall be based on this document.

---

<sup>1</sup> Referred to as RTP throughout this document

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1	DEFINITIONS.....	4
1.2	DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY .....	5
SECTION 2	PROCEDURES.....	8
2.1	COMPLETE RTP PROCEDURES .....	8
2.2	DEPARTMENT RTP PROCEDURES.....	8
2.2.1	DRTP COMMITTEE MEMBERS.....	8
2.2.2	DRTP COMMITTEE CHAIR .....	8
2.2.3	DRTP COMMITTEE.....	9
2.2.4	DRTP COMMITTEE VOTING .....	10
2.2.5	CONFIDENTIALITY OF DRTP COMMITTEE MEETINGS .....	10
2.3	STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING .....	10
2.4	PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING .....	11
2.5	EVALUATION OF STUDENT ADVISING AND MENTORING .....	11
2.6	CANDIDATES NOT TEACHING FULL TIME.....	11
SECTION 3	CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION .....	13
3.1	ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION.....	13
3.1.1	CANDIDATE RTP PACKAGE.....	13
3.1.2	CANDIDATE PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	16
3.2	CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION .....	16
3.2.1	ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION .....	16
3.2.2	CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT.....	17
3.2.3	CRITERIA FOR TENURE.....	18
3.2.4	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....	20
3.2.5	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR.....	21
3.2.6	CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE .....	23
3.2.7	EARLY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....	24
3.2.8	EARLY PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR.....	24
APPENDIX A:	STEP QUESTIONS.....	26
	LECTURE STEP QUESTIONS.....	26

LAB STEP QUESTIONS..... 26  
APPENDIX B: PEER REVIEW FORM..... 28  
APPENDIX C: IEEE CODE OF ETHICS..... 29

## **SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION**

The reappointment, tenure and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure and promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving the desired expectations and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The Department RTP Criteria Document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee and academic administrators.

University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Appendix 10 and Policy 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 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.

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.

### **1.1 DEFINITIONS**

Policy 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 commendations. (See also Policy 1328 sections 1.14, 3.0, 3.4, 3.5).
- c. Criteria are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Policy 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty submitted to the

dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment and ultimately approved by the president or his designee. (See also Policy 1328 section 2.0).

- d. A probationary year of service is defined as a “period of review” as stated in Policy 1328 Section 7.3 . 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. Normally, a faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, if not yet at the rank of Professor, the faculty member is eligible to apply 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. Criteria for early actions (tenure or promotion) shall place emphasis on teaching effectiveness and accomplishment and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to research, scholarly and professional development activities and university service.
- h. Student evaluation of teaching is governed by Appendix 10 of the University Manual.
- i. Peer evaluation of teaching is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabus and other teaching materials and a written report.
- j. 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.
- 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 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.

## 1.2 DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY

The Faculty of the Electrical & Computer Engineering (ECE) Department is committed to the Department’s mission to prepare students to become successful practitioners of electrical and computer engineering. The Department emphasizes the importance of the following in assuring its continuing success:

- Learn by doing
- Student centered culture
- Collegial manner and teamwork

The ECE Department has adopted the IEEE Code of Ethics (see Appendix C) as the Standard Practice for Conduct. All Electrical and Computer Engineering faculty accept this code as their personal obligation to the profession, their colleagues and their Department and agree to implement and abide by this Standard. The department philosophy follows Cal Poly Pomona’s *Teacher-Scholar model* reproduced below for reference:

### **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.*

### **EXPLANATION:**

### **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:**

August 13, 2019

*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.*



## **SECTION 2 PROCEDURES**

### **2.1 COMPLETE RTP PROCEDURES**

The full details of Policy 1328 are available on Cal Poly Pomona's web page.

### **2.2 DEPARTMENT RTP PROCEDURES**

#### **2.2.1 DRTP COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

The Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (DRTPC) shall consist of tenured members of the department elected by probationary and tenured faculty. The DRTPC will include the Department Chair unless the Department Chair is not eligible to serve. The number of members shall be as required by the University Manual, Policy 1328. In promotion considerations, all DRTPC members shall have a higher rank/classification than the RTP candidates. Candidates being considered for promotion are not eligible for service on RTP promotion or tenure consideration committees. The DRTPC may use one or more subcommittees formed from its membership for dealing with different RTP actions. In the case where the Department Chair is ineligible to serve on the DRTPC, the Department Chair shall not write a separate recommendation.

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 by March 1 of the school year proceeding the given RTP cycle. The 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. No committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle.

#### **2.2.2 DRTP COMMITTEE CHAIR**

The DRTP Committee will elect a chair during the spring semester to serve for the following academic year. The DRTPC chair shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the DRTP document and Policy 1328 of the University Manual are carried out. The DRTPC Chair will be 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. In this period, the DRTPC Chair and only the DRTPC Chair shall be responsible for additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.

During the Fall semester the DRTPC Chair must:

- Ensure that candidates have the department RTP criteria.
- Ensure that candidates know what RTP actions they must/may apply for and the corresponding procedures.
- Assist candidates in understanding expectations.
- Inform Faculty Affairs of requests.
- Assist candidates in preparing packages and ensure that packages are in correct format.
- Provide the DRTPC recommendation to the candidate.

And throughout the year

- Ensure that peer evaluations are conducted for all RTP candidates.
- Ensure that the results of the peer evaluations are provided to candidates in a timely manner no later than 2 weeks after a classroom visit.

### **2.2.3 DRTP COMMITTEE**

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 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 1328 Section 3.2 of the University Manual.

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

The DRTPC may use one or more subcommittees formed from its membership for dealing with different RTP actions. Subcommittees may be tasked to review and evaluate each candidate's RTP package and signed student comments. The subcommittees will then report their findings and recommendations to the DRTPC committee. Members of the subcommittees will be chosen at random from the DRTPC members.

#### **2.2.4 DRTP COMMITTEE VOTING**

After completing deliberations on a candidate, the DRTPC committee will vote by closed ballot on teaching excellence, service to the university community and research, scholarly and professional development. Each vote shall be a "yes" or "no" vote on whether or not the candidate has met the criterion under consideration. To receive a positive recommendation the candidate must obtain a majority vote on all areas: teaching excellence, service to the university, research and scholarly and professional development activities. If a majority of the votes is "no" for any of the areas then the DRTPC committee will not recommend the candidate for the action under consideration. The committee must document the reasons why the criterion has not been met.

Members of the DRTPC that votes on any of the RTP actions should read the candidate package before attending any meeting that discuss that package. A DRTPC member who misses a meeting for legitimate reasons may still vote given that they notify the DRTPC Chair or the ECE Department Office before the DRTPC meeting begins.

#### **2.2.5 CONFIDENTIALITY OF DRTP COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, DRTPC, CRTPC and URTPC members, the department Chair, appropriate administrators, and the President. Confidentiality of the DRTPC and its procedures are of paramount importance to all parties and shall be zealously protected. Candidates must neither seek nor accept information concerning what was said or who said it at DRTPC meetings.

### **2.3 STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

Candidates must include in their RTP packages copies of the original computer generated summaries of the Student Evaluations of Teaching (using the forms in Appendix A of the RTP document) carried out in accordance with Appendix 10 of the University Manual. These evaluations must include all lectures and lab evaluations for the preceding academic year. Candidates must not use any form of encouragement or coercion of students in the process of acquiring the evaluations. All official summaries of conducted student evaluations should be included in the candidate package.

The DRTP Committee shall give students the opportunity to submit signed written comments on candidates requesting RTP actions by posting notices including lists of the candidate names and their requested RTP action and the name of the individual to whom signed comments or recommendations can be given. These notices will be posted on the department bulletin boards and other relevant locations. 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 DRTP Committee. This posting will take place within one week of notification of the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request an 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. Emails will not be accepted. All signed comments will be added to the candidate's RTP package. Candidates must not request students to submit recommendations on their behalf. 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.

## **2.4 PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

DRTP Committee members must conduct peer evaluations of teaching performance of the RTP candidates. The individual faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of the visit at least five (5) working days in advance that a class room visit is to take place. A minimum of two peer evaluations shall be conducted each academic year. These evaluations are based on classroom visits of both lecture and lab classes as well as a review of the course syllabus and related material. Peer evaluations will reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. The class visit shall be at least thirty minutes. Classroom visits must be followed within no more than two weeks by a written report on the form in Appendix B of this document. The report must be submitted to the faculty member and then put in the candidate's file. The period of peer evaluations considered for deliberations is the same period that has elapsed since the last application for the same or a similar action. Exceptions may only be allowed in unusual cases and require a vote of the DRTP Committee. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those initiated by the DRTPC. Such requests should be directed to the DRTPC Chair.

## **2.5. EVALUATION OF STUDENT ADVISING AND MENTORING**

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 1328, Section 2.1. The committee will solicit the candidate's advisees for input in this area.

## **2.6 CANDIDATES NOT TEACHING FULL TIME**

The following procedures apply to candidates and future candidates serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance or on leave (see Policy 1328, section 2.1)

- 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 time lines 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 the department while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. In this situation it is the Department's policy that the faculty member, the Department RTP Committee and the Department Chair shall agree in writing how the Department's RTP Criteria will be used to evaluate the faculty member in that position. This agreement should be in place prior to the faculty member's acceptance of the temporary position. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the Dean, URTPC chair and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

## **SECTION 3            CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION**

### **3.1        ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION**

The departmental RTP procedure is based upon the procedures specified in Section 8.0 of Policy 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.

Candidates for retention, tenure and promotion will be evaluated for teaching and advising performance, service to the University and continued research, scholarly and professional development activities. The candidate must pass each area to receive a positive recommendation from the DRTP Committee.

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.

#### **3.1.1    CANDIDATE RTP PACKAGE**

A candidate's RTP package is considered to be an important reflection of the individual's professional pride and communication skills. It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that their portion of the package is well written and well prepared. Candidates are urged to begin preparation of their package for the next year immediately following DRTP committee recommendations. At the candidate's request, the DRTP Committee Chair will provide clarification of the RTP procedures and criteria. Candidates must submit RTP packages on the form provided by the University available on the university website.

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 evaluations 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.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should include but not be limited to the following:

1. Teaching a variety of undergraduate and/or graduate lecture and laboratory courses within one's technical area.
2. Demonstrated proficiency with the subject matter, as well as the ability to clearly and effectively communicate the material to students and providing course-related advising.
3. Providing timely and accurate academic advising, including guiding students through the curriculum and other related matters. Excellence in academic advising requires familiarity with policies and procedures.
4. Mentoring students, including assisting them with their professional development plans.
5. Holding regular posted office hours. This helps facilitate the various advising and mentoring activities.
6. Developing and implementing new courses and improving and updating existing courses.
7. Planning and implementing improvements in laboratory facilities and capabilities.
8. Conducting course-related assessment and accreditation activities.
9. Active involvement with student clubs or organizations. Serving as the faculty advisor is one of the most visible ways.

**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.

RTP evaluations of research, scholarly and professional development activities shall include but not be limited to the following:

1. Publications in peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings.
2. Evidence of keeping currency in the candidate's areas of expertise. This might be accomplished through regular presentation and attendance at conferences and attending short courses, seminars, workshops, professional consulting, or other similar activities.
3. Serving on and/or chairing professional committees.
4. Preparation and submission of proposals for externally funded projects consistent with the faculty member's professional development.
5. Effective management, execution and completion of externally funded projects consistent with the faculty member's professional development.
6. Consulting or professional engineering practice consistent with advancing the Department's mission.
7. Obtaining external funding for laboratory enhancements

**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.

RTP evaluations of service to the university, college, department and community shall include but not be limited to the following:

Department-Level Activities

1. Attendance and active participation in department meetings and in standing and ad-hoc committees. This includes substantive contributions to the actual work and chairing committees.
2. Being a course and laboratory coordinator and effectively carrying out the associated duties and responsibilities.
3. Contributing to preparation for ABET accreditation visits.
4. Working with the Industrial Action Committee (IAC).

College-Level Activities

1. Participation in and/or chairing college-level standing or ad-hoc committees.
2. Participation in commencement, student outreach and recruitment, project symposium day, and other special events.

University-Level Activities

1. Serving as a senator on the academic senate.
2. Serving on senate or other university-level committees.
3. Serving on search committees.
4. Attending and participating in university-level events.
5. Representing the university at CSU-level events.

Service to the Professional Community

1. Review of technical professional documents for journals and conferences
2. Review of grants and contracts
3. Serving as a session or track chair in a professional conference
4. Membership and active participation in professional societies. Holding local, regional, or national officer positions is especially noteworthy



### **3.1.2 CANDIDATE PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Each faculty member being considered for retention, tenure, and/or promotion must prepare a Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP) as part of the RTP package submitted for evaluation. The annual revision of the PPDP must demonstrate continued professional development and continued effective contribution to the ECE department, the College of Engineering, and the University. This plan should outline short-term (1 – 3 year time-frame) and long-term (4 – 8 year time-frame) goals for the faculty member in each of the primary areas of faculty endeavor: teaching and advising, research, scholarly and professional development, and university and community service. This PPDP will be reviewed and approved annually by the DRTPC and timely progress of the specific activities and goals will play a significant role in determining the candidate's performance and long range potential to serve in the department.

In the first year of joining the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, the candidate's RTP package must include a five-year plan for professional development that addresses the requirement to maintain technical competency and support the department's mission of teaching and hands on laboratory experiences. The plan must include an estimated time schedule for accomplishment and a discussion of how this plan will be used to support classroom instruction. For all consecutive RTP actions, a detailed discussion of the progress made by the candidate to meet his/her professional development plan must be included.

## **3.2 CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION**

### **3.2.1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION**

Teaching and advising are very important components of RTP evaluation. Teaching is considered effective when it results in measurable student learning. Candidates are not limited to a single pedagogy, but have the freedom to employ different teaching methods and styles that they believe will lead to better learning. Thus, use of technology, application of service learning pedagogy, use of a diversity of teaching strategies, introduction of international perspectives, etc. is valued to the extent that they produce student learning outcomes. Advising is essential to student success as well. The criteria in the following sections articulate expectations in terms of teaching and advising and how they will be evaluated.

Research, scholarly and professional development activities include the scholarship of teaching, applied and/or basic research. The criteria in the following sections articulate expectations in terms of quality and quantity of scholarly activities, to provide the candidate insight into the types of activities expected and how these activities will be assessed for quality and significance. The department criteria will also describe types of peer review and the department's view of the various types.

Service to the department, college, and university is an expectation of each faculty member. The department RTP criteria in the next section will articulate ways in which each faculty member can contribute to the governance and collective endeavors of the university and community, and how activities will be assessed for quality and significance.

### **3.2.2 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 the following criteria:

#### **3.2.2.1 TEACHING EXCELLENCE**

Candidates must demonstrate progressively higher levels of teaching effectiveness in both lecture and laboratory sufficient to meet the high quality of performance that is expected of an ECE faculty member. In addition to the teaching effectiveness criteria in section 3.1.1, candidates must provide evidence and meet this level in each of the following eight areas:

- (1) Good teaching effectiveness based on peer evaluation and student evaluations.
- (2) Diversity of courses taught.
- (3) Organization, pacing and content of courses taught.
- (4) Clarity of objectives, explanations and effectiveness in answering of questions.
- (5) Ability to communicate and explain course material clearly.
- (6) Contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs.
- (7) Meeting of course objectives in approved Course Outlines, as indicated by homework, exams and laboratory and computer assignments.
- (8) Active involvement with students as advisors and mentors

Candidates must also show that they are increasing their knowledge in student advising by participating in activities like advising workshops. Candidates must provide evidence of consistent effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of advising graduate students, type of advising and outcomes should also be submitted. During the review process the candidate should be able to describe and explain the grades used in the classes taught. The grades should follow a distribution that reflects the students' competitive performance.

#### **3.2.2.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Candidates must demonstrate that they are actively involved in ongoing research and scholarly activities and have been involved in acquiring external funding to be used in scholarly activities as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidates must contribute to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through publishing in peer reviewed journals/ proceedings/ conferences relevant to their specialty area.

Candidates must demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development in the area of Electrical and Computer Engineering by attending conferences, workshops and seminars directly related to their area of specialty. Candidates must also demonstrate that they are making steady progress in their plan for professional development as well as include a summary of any changes.

### 3.2.2.3 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

Candidates must demonstrate that they are actively participating and making contributions in department, college and/or university activities and committees as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidates must also demonstrate a commitment to the ECE Department mission and goals by being willing to:

- a. Accept teaching assignments and teaching schedules based upon department needs
- b. Actively participate in department activities beyond the minimum required office hours, teaching assignments and department committees.

In addition, candidates must demonstrate the ability to express their professional opinions in a collegial manner and to work collegially for their implementation in adherence with the equity goals of this University including respect for and understanding of the diverse nature of the faculty, students and staff

A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria 3.2.2.1 through 3.2.2.3 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.

### 3.2.3 CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Tenure evaluations are normally based on a faculty member's performance over the six-year period since the original appointment to the probationary position as well as fulfillment of any pertinent conditions stated in the letter of initial appointment. All claims to accomplishments must be documented. Faculty who have been granted service credit may request regular tenure evaluation prior to (up to the number of years of service credit granted) the sixth year. Persons not achieving their sixth probationary year will be reappointed to a terminal year. Candidates applying for tenure will be evaluated in each of the following criteria:

#### 3.2.3.1 TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Candidates must have demonstrated during their probationary period a progressively higher level of teaching effectiveness in both lecture and laboratory sufficient to meet the high quality of performance that is expected of an ECE faculty member. In addition to the teaching effectiveness criteria in section 3.1.1, candidates must meet this level in each of the following eight areas:

- 1) Provide evidence of very good teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation and student evaluations, as well as promise and evidence of continued growth and fulfillment of program needs after awarding of tenure.
- 2) Diversity of courses taught.
- 3) Organization, pacing and content of courses taught.
- 4) Clarity of objectives, explanations and effectiveness in answering questions.
- 5) Ability to communicate and explain course material clearly.

- 6) Contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs.
- 7) Meeting of course objectives in approved Course Outlines as indicated by homework, exams and laboratory and computer assignments.
- 8) Demonstrating active involvement with students as advisors and mentors

Candidates must also show that they are knowledgeable in student advising by demonstrating the results of participating in activities like advising workshops. Candidates must provide evidence of consistent effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of advising graduate students, type of advising and outcomes should also be submitted. During the review process the candidate should be able to describe and explain the grades used in the classes taught. The grades should follow a distribution that reflects the students' competitive performance.

### 3.2.3.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Candidates must demonstrate that they are actively involved in ongoing research and scholarly activities and have been involved in acquiring external funding to be used in scholarly activities as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidates must contribute to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through publishing in peer reviewed journals/ proceedings/ conferences relevant to their specialty area.

Candidates must demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development in the area of Electrical and Computer Engineering by regular attendance at conferences, workshops and seminars directly related to their area of specialty. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have made substantial progress in their plan for professional development as well as include a summary of any changes.

### 3.2.3.3 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Candidates must demonstrate that they are making important contributions in department, college and/or university activities and committees as discussed in section 3.1.1 as they take on increasing levels of responsibility. Candidates must also demonstrate a commitment to the ECE Department mission and goals by being willing to:

- a. Accept teaching assignments and teaching schedules based upon department needs,
- b. Actively participate in department activities beyond the minimum required office hours, teaching assignments and department committees.

In addition, candidates must demonstrate the ability to express their professional opinions in a collegial manner and to work collegially for their implementation in adherence with the equity goals of this University including respect for and understanding of the diverse nature of the faculty, students and staff.

A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria 3.2.3.1 through 3.2.3.3 as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions.

### **3.2.4 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. See Section 3.2.7 for early promotion to associate professor. Promotion to associate professor will be based on the candidate's performance while an assistant professor as well as fulfillment of any pertinent conditions stated in the letter of initial appointment in each of the following criteria.

#### **3.2.4.1 TEACHING EXCELLENCE**

Candidates must have demonstrated during their time as an assistant professor a progressively higher level of teaching effectiveness in both lecture and laboratory that meets the high quality of performance that is expected of an ECE faculty member. In addition to the teaching effectiveness criteria in section 3.1.1, candidates must meet this level in each of the following eight areas:

- 1) Provide evidence of good teaching effectiveness based on peer evaluation and student evaluations.
- 2) Diversity of courses taught.
- 3) Organization, pacing and content of courses taught.
- 4) Clarity of objectives, explanations and effectiveness in answering of questions.
- 5) Ability to communicate and explain course material clearly.
- 6) Contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs.
- 7) Meeting of course objectives in approved Course Outlines as indicated by homework, exams and laboratory and computer assignments.
- 8) Demonstrating active involvement with students as advisors and mentors

Candidates must also show that they are knowledgeable in student advising by demonstrating the results of participating in activities like advising workshops. Candidates must provide evidence of consistent effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of advising graduate students, type of advising and outcomes should also be submitted. During the review process the candidate should be able to describe and explain the grades used in the classes taught. The grades should follow a distribution that reflects the students' competitive performance.

#### **3.2.4.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Candidates must demonstrate that they are actively involved in ongoing research and scholarly activities and have been involved in acquiring external funding to be used in scholarly activities as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidates must contribute to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through publishing in peer reviewed journals/ proceedings/ conferences relevant to their specialty area.

Candidates must demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development in the area of Electrical and Computer Engineering by regular attendance at conferences, workshops and seminars directly related to their area of specialty. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have made steady progress in their plan for professional development as well as include a summary of any changes.

### 3.2.4.3 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Candidates must demonstrate that they are making important contributions in department, college and/or university activities and committees as they take on increasing levels of responsibility as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidates must also demonstrate a commitment to the ECE Department mission and goals by being willing to:

- a. Accept teaching assignments and teaching schedules based upon department needs,
- b. Actively participate in department activities beyond the minimum required office hours, teaching assignments and department committees.

In addition, candidates must demonstrate the ability to express their professional opinions in a collegial manner and to work collegially for their implementation in adherence with the equity goals of this University including respect for and understanding of the diverse nature of the faculty, students and staff.

A favorable written evaluation from the majority of the DRTPC will be based upon documented evidence related to criteria 3.2.4.1 through 3.2.4.3 as provided by the candidate and acceptable improvement in all areas needing improvement noted in previous RTP actions.

### 3.2.5 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL 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. See Section 3.2.8 for early promotion to full professor. 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.

#### 3.2.5.1 TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Candidates must have demonstrated during their time as an associate professor a progressively higher level of teaching effectiveness in both lecture and laboratory sufficient that meets the high quality of performance that is expected of an ECE faculty member. In addition to the teaching effectiveness criteria in section 3.1.1 candidates must meet this level in each of the following areas:

- 1) Provide evidence of very good teaching effectiveness, based on peer evaluation and student evaluations, as well as promise and evidence of continued growth and fulfillment of program needs after awarding of tenure.
- 2) Diversity of courses taught.
- 3) Organization, pacing and content of courses taught.
- 4) Clarity of objectives, explanations and effectiveness in answering of questions.
- 5) Ability to communicate and explain course material clearly.
- 6) Contribution to the development of new courses and labs, and improvement of existing courses and labs.

- 7) Meeting of course objectives in approved Course Outlines as indicated by homework, exams and laboratory and computer assignments.
- 8) Teaching of at least eight different lecture courses (with associated laboratory) at the junior level or above, of which four must be at the 4000 level or above within the past five years. Excluded are senior project and supervisory courses including Master projects/theses.
- 9) Demonstrating active involvement with students as advisors and mentors

Candidates must also show that they are knowledgeable in student advising by demonstrating the results of participating in activities like advising workshops. Candidates must provide evidence of consistent effective student advising and mentoring. Documentation of advising graduate students, type of advising and outcomes should also be submitted. During the review process the candidate should be able to describe and explain the grades used in the classes taught. The grades should follow a distribution that reflects the students' competitive performance.

### 3.2.5.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Candidates must demonstrate that they are actively involved in ongoing research and scholarly activities and have been involved in acquiring external funding to be used in scholarly activities as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidates must contribute to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through publishing in peer reviewed journals/ proceedings/ conferences relevant to their specialty area.

Candidates must demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development in the area of Electrical and Computer Engineering by participation and publications at conferences, workshops and seminars directly related to their area of specialty. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have made significant progress in their plan for professional development as well as include a summary of any changes.

### 3.2.5.3 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Candidates must demonstrate continual, active, positive and effective service to the department, college and/or university with increasing responsibilities and contributions as discussed in section 3.1.1. In addition, candidates must submit evidence that they held chairmanships and/or provided significant leadership in service to the ECE Department, the College of Engineering, and the University since the last promotion or the initial appointment, if this is the candidate's first promotion.

In particular candidates must demonstrate a commitment to the ECE Department mission and goals by being willing to

- a. Accept teaching assignments and teaching schedules based upon department needs,
- b. Actively participate in department activities beyond the minimum required office hours, teaching assignments and department committees.

In addition, candidates must demonstrate the ability to express their professional opinions in a collegial manner and to work collegially for their implementation in adherence with the equity goals of this University including respect for and understanding of the diverse nature of the faculty, students and staff.

### **3.2.6 CRITERIA FOR EARLY TENURE**

A request for early tenure is never obligatory. Policy 1328, Section 2.6, 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 truly exceptional cases. In addition to meeting the conditions for regular tenure a candidate for early tenure must also satisfy each of the following criteria:

#### **3.2.6.1 TEACHING EXCELLENCE**

Candidates must 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.

Candidates must provide evidence of consistent exceptional academic advising. Documentation of the student names, type of advising and outcomes should be submitted along with an estimate of total advisement hours.

#### **3.2.6.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Candidates must demonstrate that they are actively involved in ongoing research and scholarly activities and have been involved in acquiring external funding to be used in scholarly activities as discussed in section 3.1.1. Candidate must make contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through publishing in peer reviewed journals/ proceedings/ conferences relevant to his/her specialty area.

Candidates must demonstrate firm evidence of continued scholarship and professional development in the area of Electrical and Computer Engineering by attending conferences, workshops and seminars directly related to his/her area of specialty. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have made exceptional progress in their plan for professional development as well as include a summary of any changes.

#### **3.2.6.3 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**

The candidate must 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 the Department, College or University. The candidate must also have:

- a. Instituted and implemented a major academic or research program within the department
- b. Chaired a department, college or university committee or must have made outstanding contributions in department curriculum development.
- c. Shown 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.



#### 3.2.6.4 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Show evidence of having developed or continued with exceptionally productive research and scholarly activities and made 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. The candidate must also be

- a. Performing current research in state-of-the-art technologies and be engaged in the infusion of that technology in the classroom
- b. Engaged in engineering design and the infusion of that technology in the classroom.

#### 3.2.7 EARLY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A request for early promotion to Associate Professor is never obligatory. Policy 1328, Section 2.6, 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. Candidates for early promotion to associate professor must satisfy the criteria for regular promotion to associate professor as shown above plus each of the following in order to be recommended for early promotion:

- A. Provide evidence of consistent and exceptional academic advising.
- B. Provide evidence of exceptional teaching performance as demonstrated by consistently high student ratings; awards by the University, College or Department for outstanding teaching and student advising and very positive peer review.
- C. Provide firm evidence of exceptional accomplishments in scholarship and professional development activities as evidenced by recognition in the form of awards or other special actions by professional organizations 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.
- 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 the Department, College or University.
- 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.

#### 3.2.8 EARLY PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A request for early promotion to Professor is never obligatory. Policy 1328, Section 2.6, 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. Candidates for early promotion to full professor must satisfy the criteria for regular promotion to full professor as shown above plus each of the following in order to be recommended for early promotion:

- A. Provide evidence of consistent and exceptional academic advising.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 the Department, College or University.
- 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.

## **APPENDIX A: STEP QUESTIONS**

### **LECTURE STEP QUESTIONS**

1. Class sessions were well organized.
2. The instructor was well prepared
3. The instructor explains course material clearly.
4. The instructor answered questions clearly.
5. The given course syllabus was followed.
6. Class time was efficiently used.
7. Examples and illustrations during lectures enhanced my understanding.
8. The instructor encourages class discussion.
9. The instructor is accessible to students during office hours.
10. The instructor was helpful during office hours.
11. The instructor was well aware of the student problems related to course material.
12. Homework /assignments helped prepare students for exams.
13. Feedback on exams was received in a timely manner.
14. Notes and handouts were useful to learn the course material.
15. The course increased my interest in the subject.
16. The instructor is concerned for the quality of his/her teaching
17. The course was a valuable learning experience for me.
18. Overall, you are satisfied with the teaching effectiveness of the instructor.

### **LAB STEP QUESTIONS**

1. The instructor was well prepared for the laboratory.
2. The instructor made the lab objectives clear.
3. The instructor met the lab objectives.
4. The lab was well organized.
5. The lab was well paced.
6. The lab experiments were well written.
7. The instructor prepared the students for the labs.
8. The instructor answered questions clearly.
9. The instructor explains clearly.
10. The instructor was well aware of student problems related to lab material.
11. The instructor was clear and consistent about lab report format.
12. The instructor grades and returns the lab reports on time.

13. The instructor is accessible to students during office hours.
14. The instructor was helpful during office hours.
15. The instructor was helpful in trouble shooting experiments.
16. The instructor starts the lab session on time.
17. The instructor makes a full use of the lab time.
18. Overall, you are satisfied with the teaching effectiveness of the instructor.

## APPENDIX B: PEER REVIEW FORM

### Electrical & Computer Engineering Department, Cal Poly Pomona

Name of Instructor:

Date of Class Visit:

Class Visited:

Room Number:

Before visiting an instructor's class, give him/her a note or memo requesting a copy of the course syllabus. **Attach the syllabus to this form.** Also, inform him/her when you will be visiting the class, at least five (5) days in advance. Please discuss your visit with the faculty member you are evaluating as soon as possible after the visit.

#### **MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE DAY:**

1. Is the instructor well prepared in the course material?

YES  NO

COMMENTS:

2. Is the instructor effective in explaining the course material?

YES  NO

COMMENTS:

3. Is the instructor well organized and the course well paced?

YES  NO

COMMENTS:

4. Does the instructor do a good job of covering the expected outcomes in the course outline?

YES  NO

COMMENTS:

5. General comments on the instructor's strong points:

6. Suggestions for improvement:

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C: IEEE CODE OF ETHICS

We, the members of the IEEE, in recognition of the importance of our technologies in affecting the quality of life throughout the world, and in accepting a personal obligation to our profession, its members and the communities we serve, do hereby commit ourselves to the highest ethical and professional conduct and agree:

1. to accept responsibility in making engineering decisions consistent with the safety, health and welfare of the public, and to disclose promptly factors that might endanger the public or the environment;
2. to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest whenever possible, and to disclose them to affected parties when they do exist;
3. to be honest and realistic in stating claims or estimates based on available data;
4. to reject bribery in all its forms;
5. to improve the understanding of technology, its appropriate application, and potential consequences;
6. to maintain and improve our technical competence and to undertake technological tasks for others only if qualified by training or experience, or after full disclosure of pertinent limitations;
7. to seek, accept, and offer honest criticism of technical work, to acknowledge and correct errors, and to credit properly the contributions of others;
8. to treat fairly all persons regardless of such factors as race, religion, gender, disability, age, or national origin;
9. to avoid injuring others, their property, reputation, or employment by false or malicious action;
10. to assist colleagues and co-workers in their professional development and to support them in following this code of ethics.

*Approved by the IEEE Board of Directors  
February 2006*