

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	CEMaST
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2019
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: Nicole Wickler Nicole J. Wickler 3-26-19
Printed Name Signature Date

DRTPC Chair: Paul Beardsley Paul Beardsley 3/26/2019
Printed Name Signature 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: John Chan John Chan 5/2/19
Printed Name Signature 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: Alison Baski Alison Baski 5-13-19
Printed Name Signature Date

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. Approved for the following years 2019/20 to 2023/24
 2. Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs: Martin Sancho-Madriz Martin Sancho-Madriz 8/1/19
Printed Name Signature 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.

Center for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (CEMaST)

Criteria and Guidelines for RTP Evaluation and Procedures

For Academic Years 2019-2024

Table of Contents

Statement of Purpose	1
Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)	2
Department RTP Procedures	3
Student Evaluation of Teaching	5
Peer Evaluation of Teaching	5
DRTPC Evaluation of Candidate	6
Evaluation of Teaching Performance	6
Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities	7
Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University, and Community	8
Candidate's Responsibilities	8
Criteria for RTP Actions	10
Criteria for Reappointment	10
Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor.....	12
Criteria for Promotion to Professor	14
Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion to Associate Professor	15
Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor	15
Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave	16
RTP Document Changes	17
Appendix A. Instructional Assessment by Students: Procedure for Administering Assessment Forms.....	18
Appendix B. Other Supporting Evidence for Quality of Teaching	18
Appendix C. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities	19
Appendix D. Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University and Community	20

1. Statement of Purpose

The Center for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (CEMaST) is the vehicle through which the College of Science at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, serves the educational community. CEMaST's goals are to:

- improve teaching and learning of science and mathematics at all levels,
- promote professional development of mathematics, science, and technology educators,
- reach out to educators to enhance the study of science and mathematics by **all** students, and
- promote equity for all students in science and mathematics education.

The primary ways through which CEMaST addresses its goals are:

- CEMaST actively works with local school districts to identify challenges related to the curricula and teaching of math and science, and helps school districts and teachers work to address these challenges.
- CEMaST develops and provides professional development in mathematics and science education.
- CEMaST continues to find new ways to help educators give students the methods and tools to deal with new challenges – ones that cross traditional disciplinary and cultural lines.

Given CEMaST's mission, faculty who are appointed to the Center have responsibilities that embody the teacher-scholar model, but differ somewhat from those of the traditional university faculty member. CEMaST faculty serve as examples for other educators with respect to their teaching effectiveness. Service to the community and the profession is a major aspect of a CEMaST faculty member's responsibility. Lastly, it is a faculty member's own professional development and contributions through research, scholarly, or creative activities that nourish both their teaching and service. It is, therefore, incumbent upon CEMaST to have Guidelines for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion that reflect the mission and the broad nature of responsibilities of a successful CEMaST faculty member. It is expected that faculty members will contribute significantly in all three areas.

For the purpose of this document the following definitions are made. A faculty member's area of specialization is defined to be either mathematics education, science education, or technology education. A faculty member's cognate discipline is defined to be mathematics, computer science, or one of the sciences (biological sciences, chemistry, geological sciences, kinesiology or physics) or as interdisciplinary science.

- 1.1. CEMaST believes that it is the right and responsibility of the center to weigh the merits of its faculty. We, as STEM educators, are the most qualified to judge professional competence in the field of science and/or mathematics education.
- 1.2. 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 expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The CEMaST RTP document communicates the Center's expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators.

2. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)

- 2.1. The DRTPC shall consist of three eligible (according to the University Manual) full-time tenured faculty members in the Center. Should CEMaST require additional faculty members on its RTP committee, they shall be nominated and elected by CEMaST faculty and be from the candidate's cognate discipline, CEMaST fellows, or other faculty with appropriate backgrounds. The director will eligible to be a member of the DRTPC (unless they are being reviewed that year – in which case they may not be a member of the subcommittee examining their own packet) and will **not** write a separate evaluation of each RTP candidate. Formation of multiple subcommittees, each consisting of three full-time tenured faculty members, will be considered when multiple CEMaST faculty are being considered for RTP action, especially when the faculty member's cognate disciplines or rank are different. In promotion considerations, the members will have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion.
- 2.2. DRTPC Election Procedure: The faculty whose primary RTP lie in CEMaST shall nominate committee members and then elect, via secret ballot, members of the DRTPC. Should CEMaST require additional faculty members on its RTP committee, they shall be nominated and elected by CEMaST faculty and be from the candidate's cognate discipline, CEMaST fellows, or other faculty with appropriate backgrounds. The CEMaST RTP committee will be constituted by March 1st preceding the academic year in which they begin to serve. CEMaST shall notify the college dean of the composition of the DRTPC, including election results, immediately after the election.
- 2.3. A special election may be held to replace a DRTPC member in the event that a member cannot serve on any particular RTP action, during a particular semester(s), or for the remainder of his/her term. The DRTPC chair shall notify the college dean of the composition of the DRTPC shortly after a special election.

- 2.4. A quorum for meetings involving deliberations and voting on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be two of the three DRTPC members. The DRTPC evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the committee. In all DRTPC deliberations, abstentions by members present count as negative votes.
- 2.5. The DRTPC shall select a Chair from the DRTPC members.
- 2.6. The DRTPC Chair shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the DRTP document and appropriate University policies are carried out. In addition, the DRTPC chair shall perform the following duties:
 - 2.6.1. Provide all appropriate forms to the RTP candidates.
 - 2.6.2. Provide each candidate with a copy of the university RTP calendar for the current academic year.
 - 2.6.3. Assure the required peer evaluations are completed for an RTP action.
 - 2.6.4. Coordinate all necessary meetings of the DRTPC.
 - 2.6.5. Coordinate all necessary meetings with candidates, including meetings to review RTP packages and to convey the DRTPC recommendations.
 - 2.6.6. In consultation with the Center's Director, identify a faculty mentor for each candidate and inform candidates of their faculty mentor.

Criteria, Procedures, Examples, and Ratings

Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion exist for the three areas of teaching effectiveness, research, scholarly or creative activities, and service activities. A candidate must satisfy the evaluation criteria as described in each of these areas. For each pre-tenure review, the candidate must demonstrate they are making satisfactory progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure. Each Professor and Associate Professor will be evaluated every five years on the activities from the previous five years. The level of accomplishment in each category is a function of the candidate's rank, year of appointment, and whether the candidate is applying for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The expectations are presented after the criteria for each category.

Each candidate will submit a self report using the Faculty Performance Review Form detailing how the criteria are met in each of the three areas.

For faculty members serving in administrative positions, serving in positions of academic governance, on leave, or serving as visiting professor/scholar, modifications of the relative weightings of RTP categories will be developed in consultation with the majority of the faculty with CEMaST as their home department and with the concurrence of the Dean. If the faculty member's activities do not apply to the three standard categories of review, it is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the relevance and importance of their activities in furthering the objectives and mission of CEMaST. This written agreement shall become part of the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF). In no circumstances shall tenure be granted to a faculty member who does not provide evidence of meeting the criteria in the area of teaching.

3. Center RTP Procedures

- 3.1. Newly appointed faculty shall be given relevant information on RTP-related dates and assigned a faculty mentor at the beginning of their first semester. At the request of the faculty member to the Director, a new mentor may be assigned.
- 3.2. For the purpose of receiving input from students and faculty, the DRTPC Chair shall post announcements, in prominent places, of the names of candidates requesting RTP action or under review, the type of action requested, the deadline (date and time) for receipt of signed comments, and the name of the DRTPC Chair to whom signed comments or recommendations should be delivered. This posting will take place within one week of notification to the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request RTP action. The candidate is encouraged to solicit input from colleagues outside of the university with whom they have worked on CEMaST related projects. Signed comments will be not accepted beyond the posted deadline.

- 3.3. Based on the candidate's submitted RTP package, the DRTPC shall make recommendations according to the guidelines set forth in this document. In formulating its evaluation, the DRTPC must address specific criteria that apply to the request being considered. The evaluation should discuss the extent to which the candidate meets each criterion for the action requested. All evaluation and discussion of candidates shall be based upon materials documented in the candidate's PAF, which consists of the RTP Package and related documents, including:
 - 3.3.1. The self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate the candidate's statements).
 - 3.3.2. Signed material received from other faculty members, academic administrators, colleagues outside of the university, and students.
 - 3.3.3. Material from the Personnel Action File in the Dean's office.
 - 3.3.4. Student instructional assessment and workshop participant assessment summaries.
 - 3.3.5. Peer evaluations of teaching.
 - 3.3.6. Other material, identified by source, submitted to the DRTPC before the closing date including letters from off-campus colleagues familiar with the candidates teaching, scholarly work, and/or service within the greater community.
- 3.4. The DRTPC, after thorough deliberation, shall make its recommendation for or against reappointment, tenure or promotion. The DRTPC shall commit the reasons for the recommendation in writing on the standard university form. The DRTPC evaluation shall include a discussion of the candidate's strengths and deficiencies, as well as cite specific sections of the departmental RTP criteria and summarize the evidence upon which the recommendation is based. The DRTPC shall also include a discussion of progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle.
- 3.5. Any member of the DRTPC may file a supplementary report. Supplementary reports, if submitted, must accompany the recommendation in question and must have been made available to all members of the committee and to the candidate.
- 3.6. Before forwarding its recommendations to the Dean, the DRTPC shall notify each candidate of its recommendation. Such notification shall consist of a copy of the committee's written statements. The candidate shall indicate his/her reaction to the committee's evaluation and recommendations by checking the appropriate box, and by signing on the appropriate page of the Faculty Performance Review form.
- 3.7. Candidates for RTP actions are subject to evaluation in all categories of performance. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide materials for evaluation.
- 3.8. The review of tenured faculty members not being considered for promotion is an opportunity for mentoring other faculty of all ranks. Therefore, a committee consisting of at least three CEMaST faculty, regardless of rank, shall review the teaching, service, and scholarly accomplishments of the faculty member under review. Should CEMaST require additional faculty members on its review committee, they shall be nominated and elected by CEMaST faculty and be from the candidate's cognate discipline, CEMaST fellows, or other faculty with appropriate backgrounds. Members of the DRTPC may serve on the review committees of tenured faculty members, but the review committees may contain faculty who are not members of the DRTPC.

Teaching Effectiveness

As a Teacher Scholar, the faculty member is expected to apply knowledge from the frontiers of their discipline and pedagogical scholarship to the development of their courses and the curriculum. They should demonstrate an understanding of current developments in their disciplines and use this understanding to advance student learning and knowledge. The faculty member should also demonstrate knowledge of interdisciplinary and discipline-specific pedagogical strategies, apply effective strategies to

facilitate learning of a diverse student population, use evidence-based assessments of teaching to improve their pedagogy, and evaluate and analyze the impact of their pedagogy.

The required and most important criterion for reappointment, tenure or promotion is teaching effectiveness. A CEMaST faculty member's efforts in teaching are measured by direct contributions to 1) the instructional programs of CEMaST (both on and off campus), 2), their cognate department, and/ or 3) interdisciplinary programs.

Faculty members are expected to create a synthesis between their teaching and scholarship by bringing the practice of their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way. They are also expected to foster a climate for faculty and student scholarly research and practice by embedding meaningful inquiry-based experiences in classroom, laboratory, and/or field activities.

A section of each self report will detail the candidate's activities, innovations, and accomplishments related to teaching effectiveness. Included will be a reflective piece on the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

3.8. Student Evaluation of Teaching

- 3.8.1. Student evaluations of teaching are required for every CPP course or workshop (for individual workshops lasting 6 hours or more, or a series of workshops) taught during the evaluation period.
- 3.8.2. Department-approved procedures (see Appendix A) must be followed when student evaluations are conducted.
- 3.8.3. Separate student evaluation forms should be submitted for workshops and lecture and laboratory courses if student populations are different.

3.9. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

- 3.9.1. Peer evaluations of teaching shall be conducted at the frequencies indicated below. Fewer evaluations are permissible in cases of officially recognized absences (sick leave, sabbatical, etc.) or other special circumstances with the approval of the DRPTC or by university policy. Additional peer evaluations may be requested by any faculty member. Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted is the joint responsibility of the DRTPC and the candidate.
- 3.9.2. A candidate for an RTP action must submit a minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching for each year being evaluated. The peer evaluations should be in two different semesters, conducted by different evaluators.
- 3.9.3. Peer evaluations of teaching shall include classroom or workshop visits and a review of course syllabi and related material.
- 3.9.4. DRTPC members or a designee shall conduct peer evaluations. The evaluator shall confer with the faculty member for an appropriate time and date for the evaluation. At least five days' notice will be given before the visit. The faculty member being observed should inform the peer evaluator of how the particular class being observed relates to the overall course.
- 3.9.5. Classroom visits should be followed by a written report within no more than two weeks of the class visitation using the Peer Evaluation form (available in the CEMaST office) or equivalent from another department. The report will address observations of teaching performance. If applicable, the evaluator may also address the course syllabus, as well as other materials and procedures established in the class. The report must be submitted to the DRTPC Chair and placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF) in the Dean's Office. A copy of the report will be sent to the faculty member for their records to be submitted with their RTP package, and a copy will be placed in the Center's files.
- 3.9.6. The use of peer evaluation data by the DRTPC in the analysis of tenured, probationary or temporary faculty members shall fall within the designated evaluation period.

4. DRTPC Evaluation of Candidate

- 4.1. The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable at any RTP level, unless stated in writing, with the agreement of the candidate, the DRTPC, the Dean, and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.
- 4.2. The deliberations of the DRTPC shall remain confidential. The committee shall not assign any of its deliberation and recommendation responsibilities to any other group or individual.
- 4.3. All faculty shall be evaluated according to all applicable University policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. (Policies may be obtained from the DRTPC Chair). The evaluation of candidates for RTP shall be based on the categories of 1) teaching performance, 2) scholarly and creative activities, and 3) service to the department, college, and/or university. Candidates shall be evaluated primarily in terms of their performance as it relates to the academic areas for which they were employed as stated in their appointment documents, or as modified for the benefit of the department/center.

Faculty members are expected to create a synthesis between their teaching and scholarship by bringing the practice of their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way. They are also expected to foster a climate for faculty and student scholarly research and practice by embedding meaningful inquiry-based experiences in classroom, laboratory, and/or field activities. Although teaching, scholarship, and service may be integrated, the candidate cannot “double count” these activities. It is up to the candidate to make clear which aspects of a project contribute to which area of evaluation.

4.4. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

4.4.1. All probationary faculty are normally expected to teach 12 WTUs per semester after the first probationary year, unless they receive reassigned time for research, service, or workload reduction.

4.4.2. The DRTPC's evaluation of teaching performance shall be recorded in the candidate's RTP Package. ‘Evaluation of teaching will include, but not be limited to, a statement summarizing and interpreting the results of student instructional assessments, peer evaluations, student and faculty comments, a comparison of student evaluations and peer evaluations, and other supporting evidence for quality of teaching.

4.4.3. Instructional Assessment by Students

4.4.3.1. The DRTPC places primary emphasis on evidence of teaching performance in its deliberations on RTP matters. Examination of student instructional assessments is required. Candidates are required to examine in detail the results of the student evaluations (all questions on the Student Instructional Assessment Form, on file in CEMaST as well as evaluations from departments in which the candidate taught) and comment upon them in the RTP package. The DRTPC members in their deliberations and recommendation shall examine and evaluate the candidate's student evaluations in detail.

4.4.3.2. Student evaluations by students enrolled in the candidate's classes are evaluated on the response of students to all questions, with a special focus on questions about the effectiveness of the candidate with respect to teaching and student learning. When candidates teach in other departments, they should consult the appropriate DRTP chair regarding which questions are of special focus in that department.

4.4.3.3. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to arrange for student instructional assessments according to Appendix A.

4.4.3.4. For every evaluation, the candidate will analyze, interpret, and reflect upon the summarized student evaluation data, and will determine the percentage of responses in the Very Good and Good categories combined. The DRTPC will review the candidate’s analysis, interpretation and reflection. It is expected that each course will meet the minimum requirements for evaluation responses, as specified in the sections below dealing with Criteria for Reappointment (Section 7.1.3), Criteria for Tenure

and/or Promotion to Associate Professor (Section 8.1.3), and Criteria for Promotion to Professor (Section 9.1.3). Student evaluation results will be placed in the PAF and made available to the candidate. A copy of the printout will be forwarded to the faculty member along with the original instructional assessment forms for her/his own use.

- 4.4.3.5. In addition to the regular course evaluations, students may submit signed evaluative material, commentary, and substantiating documentation to the DRTPC through the DRTPC Chair. This information shall be based only on the review period for the action requested.
- 4.4.4. Peer evaluation of teaching. To assure sufficient breadth in collecting this kind of evidence, peer evaluations shall be conducted at the frequencies stated in Section 3.9.2.
- 4.4.5. Other signed student and faculty input as well as input from external colleagues involved with CEMaST-related projects (Original, PAF; Copy, Candidate; Copy, RTP Package) will be included in the PAF.
- 4.4.6. Other supporting evidence for quality of teaching, including evidence of integration of teaching and scholarship may be included. See Appendix B.

Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities

As a Teacher Scholar, the faculty member is expected to apply knowledge from the frontiers of their discipline and pedagogical scholarship to their teaching and service. Therefore, a candidate's efforts with respect to research, scholarly or creative activities impact the quality of their teaching and service activities. As such, it is a critical component in the evaluation of a faculty member's accomplishments. Faculty members are expected to make intellectual and/or creative contributions that extend and/or develop new knowledge or creative inquiry, discover, integrate or apply facts, theories, or design to practice in their disciplines. All forms of professional scholarly activities in the discipline or in mathematics education or science education will be considered.

Faculty members are expected to create a synthesis between their teaching and scholarship by bringing the practice of their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way. They are also expected to foster a climate for faculty and student scholarly research and practice by embedding meaningful inquiry-based experiences in classroom, laboratory, and/or field activities.

Dissemination of research, scholarly, or creative activity:

Faculty are expected to 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. This dissemination may be to students or participants in programs, among practitioners, or to a wider community and may include electronic publications.

4.5. Evaluation of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

- 4.5.1. All performance in this category will be evaluated based on the time commitment, the level of participation, accomplishments in the identified activity, as well as the relevance and benefit to the STEM education community as well as CEMaST.
- 4.5.2. With the guidance of the DRTPC, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide materials documenting these activities. Lack of documentation will be considered as an indication that no scholarly and creative activities have been conducted.
- 4.5.3. The DRTPC's evaluation of scholarly and creative activities shall be recorded in the candidate's RTP Package. The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category are found in Appendix C, including evidence of integration of scholarship and teaching.

Service

CEMaST was created as the outreach unit for the College of Science with respect to the K-16 educational community. It is also responsible for assisting departments in the College of Science with activities related to science and mathematics teacher preparation as well as improving educational practices within the college. As such, service is a major component of CEMaST's responsibility.

CEMaST faculty are expected to provide service to the Center, the College of Science and its departments, and the university in general. In addition, the faculty are expected to work in partnerships with the pre-college schools in Cal Poly Pomona's service area to help them improve their mathematics and science education programs. CEMaST faculty are encouraged to participate in professional associations in their related field or with state-wide or national agencies related to issues in mathematics or science education.

4.6 Evaluation of Service to the Department, College, University and Community

- 4.6.1. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide materials documenting service activities to the DRTPC. Lack of documentation will be considered an indication that no service activities were conducted.
- 4.6.2. Community services related to a faculty member's discipline or STEM education carry more weight than general types of community services.
- 4.6.3. The RTP Committee's evaluation of these services shall be recorded in the candidate's RTP Package. The kinds of evidence that may be submitted in support of this category are found in Appendix D.

5. Candidate's Responsibilities

- 5.1. In the self-evaluation, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain clearly and specifically how the documentation submitted meets the criteria in each category cited above and the criteria for specific RTP actions described below.

As a Teacher Scholar, the faculty member is expected to apply knowledge from the frontiers of their discipline and pedagogical scholarship to the development of their courses and the curriculum. They should demonstrate an understanding of current developments in their disciplines and use this understanding to advance student learning and knowledge. The faculty member should also demonstrate 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 the impact of their pedagogy.

The required and most important criterion for reappointment, tenure or promotion is teaching effectiveness. A CEMaST faculty member's efforts in teaching are measured by direct contributions to 1) the instructional programs of CEMaST (both on and off campus), 2) their cognate department, and/or 3) interdisciplinary programs. Included will be a reflective piece on the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

Faculty members are expected to create a synthesis between their teaching and scholarship by bringing the practice of their own scholarship into the classroom in an appropriate way. They are also expected to foster a climate for faculty and student scholarly research and practice by embedding meaningful inquiry-based experiences in classroom, laboratory, and/or field activities. Although teaching, scholarship, and service may be integrated, the candidate cannot "double count" these activities. It is up to the candidate to make clear which aspects of a project contribute to which area of evaluation.

- 5.2. Reference to each criterion by section number is strongly recommended. The evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:
 - 5.2.1. Discussion of Teaching Performance. This includes an evaluation of the student and peer evaluations, and activities relating to student mentoring. All deficiencies noted in the student and peer evaluations shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, the steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed. Refer to Section 4.4.
 - 5.2.2. Discussion of Scholarly and Creative Activities. This includes specific citation of all peer-reviewed publications, disseminated works, dates of attendance of all professional meetings, and explicit references 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, the steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed. Refer to Section 4.5.

A candidate's efforts with respect to research, scholarly or creative activities impact the quality of their teaching and service activities. As such, it is a critical component in the evaluation of a faculty member's accomplishments. Faculty members are expected to make intellectual and/or creative contributions that extend and/or develop new knowledge or creative inquiry, discover, integrate or apply facts, theories, or design to practice in their disciplines. All forms of professional scholarly activities in the discipline or in mathematics education or science education will be considered.

Faculty are encouraged to engage in the process of seeking, obtaining, and administering grants or contracts from outside agencies. The preparation of grant or contract proposals for outside agencies, whether funded or not, shall be considered as scholarly/creative activity if said preparation involves scholarly activity. The candidate will document the scholarly/creative nature of the proposal and the importance of the effort to CEMaST's programs, to the college or university, or to the candidate's area of specialization in the self-report. The above conditions may also apply for the administration of a grant or contract project insofar as documentation is presented at to the intellectual component of the administration. The research, scholarly, or creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by grant or contract activities alone. The candidate will document contributions to their area of specialization or cognate discipline through research, scholarly work, or creative activity.

Faculty are expected to 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. This dissemination may be to students or participants in programs, among practitioners, or to a wider community and may include electronic publications.

- 5.2.3. Discussion of Service to the Department, College, University and Community. This includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, advising, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, the steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed. Refer to Section 4.6.

CEMaST faculty are expected to provide service to the Center, the College of Science and its departments, CEIS, and the university in general. In addition, the faculty are expected to work with the pre-college schools in Cal Poly Pomona's service area to help them improve their mathematics and science education programs. CEMaST faculty are encouraged to participate in professional associations related to the candidates' specialty or with state-wide or national agencies related to issues in mathematics or science education.

- 5.3. Each candidate is solely responsible for the content of his/her RTP package.
- 5.4. It is the intention of CEMaST to assist candidates in achieving their RTP goals by making available mentoring and other appropriate help, at the request of the candidate. It is the candidate's choice to utilize these resources. The candidate is solely responsible for reaching the level of achievement necessary for a requested RTP action and for all of the materials contained in the RTP package.
- 5.5. The candidate initiates all RTP requests. Each candidate will be given written notification from the Office of Faculty Affairs of eligibility for a regularly scheduled RTP action. Candidates contemplating application for an early action should contact the Office of Faculty Affairs to ascertain eligibility.
- 5.6. At all times, the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups.
- 5.7. The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered and make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the DRTPC and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should consider an Appendix to the evaluation package which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, laboratory manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.). These supplemental materials can be located in the faculty member's office, department office, the Dean's office, or the office of the DRTPC chair. Only an index to the Appendix specifying where the supplemental material is located is then included in the RTP package.

- 5.8. The candidate is responsible for including copies of all required CPP student evaluations. Only the results from the approved school student evaluation forms may be used in the RTP package. The candidate must sign all pages included in the package.
- 5.9. Candidates need to work closely with the DRTPC in order to schedule the required number of peer reviews of teaching performance. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond the minimum required. The candidate should have ready during a peer review session (or at some other prearranged time) a course syllabus and other relevant teaching materials. Peer reviews must be included and addressed in the candidate's RTP self-evaluation. The candidate must sign all included pages.

6. Criteria for RTP Actions

- 6.1. Criteria for specific RTP actions are discussed below. These criteria do not represent minimum faculty workloads. Faculty workload is determined by the appropriate supervisor and manager as specified by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- 6.2. In order to receive a positive recommendation for an RTP action, the candidate must: (1) meet the standards discussed below under Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service; (2) provide evidence that deficiencies in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, or Service noted in previous RTP packages have been corrected; and (3) perform at a satisfactory level in all aspects of all assignments. For all RTP actions it is the candidate's responsibility to integrate evidence of activities and accomplishments in each of the three categories. This is done with a careful summary and analysis of the evidence in the self-evaluation section of the candidate's RTP package.
 - 6.2.1. Standards of acceptable performance in each of the three categories are based on several types of evidence. Evaluation of teaching performance is based on student evaluations, workshop evaluations, peer evaluations, signed student and faculty input, and additional activities and accomplishments such as those listed in Appendix B. Evaluation of scholarly and creative activities is based on documentation of dissemination of scholarly work and additional activities such as those listed in Appendix C. Evaluation of service activities is based on documentation of activities such as those listed in Appendix D. Candidates may meet the standards in each category with different combinations of activities and accomplishments. However, failure to meet the standards in any of the three categories may result in a negative recommendation on an action by the DRTPC. Detailed requirements for specific actions are described in Sections 7 through 11.
 - 6.2.2. It is expected that candidates will address all deficiencies noted in student evaluations, peer evaluations, and evaluations at all levels of the RTP review process as long as suggested actions are consistent with the requirements of the CEMaST RTP document. Failure to correct deficiencies noted during previous RTP cycles may result in a negative recommendation on an action by the DRTPC.
 - 6.2.3. Failure to perform assignments in a satisfactory manner, as documented by evidence in the PAF and/or RTP package, may result in a negative recommendation on an action by the DRTPC.

7. Criteria for Reappointment

7.1. Teaching (Also refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix B)

- 7.1.1. A candidate for reappointment is expected to exhibit effective teaching or an improving level of effectiveness as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation of activities such as those listed in Appendix B. The successful candidate will include a section in each self report that details the candidate's activities and accomplishments related to teaching effectiveness that also includes a reflective piece on the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The DRTPC recognizes the teaching load of candidates may be less than the typical number of WTUs required by the center because of approved assigned time for professional or service activities. In some cases, candidates may teach only one or two different courses during a given year because of assigned time and the specific teaching needs of the center.

- 7.1.2. All candidates for reappointment must have the percentage of Very Good and Good scores (combined) within or above the range specified in Table 1 (7.1.3). All candidates must also address all peer evaluations conducted during the review period, as described in Section 7.1.4. The DRTPC will consider additional evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of signed student or faculty input (7.1.5.) and additional teaching-related activities, as described in Section 7.1.6 and listed in Appendix B.
- 7.1.3. Instructional assessment by students and workshop participants (student and participant evaluations). Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting the standards for student and workshop evaluations described in this section. The general expectation for teaching performance is that student and participant evaluation scores should improve as candidates gain experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial standard of 55% or more student responses in the Very Good and Good categories for new faculty. The standard increases to 70% or more in the Very Good and Good categories for faculty seeking reappointment to their final probationary year. Student evaluation scores below these standards but within the range specified in Table 1 may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 7.1.4, 7.1.5, and 7.1.6. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in student and/or workshop evaluations conducted during the review period.

Table 1. Minimum range of Very Good and Good responses for student evaluations during probationary years.

Reappointment to Probationary Year (PY)	Probationary Year For Student Evaluations	Minimum Percentage Responses in the Very Good and Good Categories Combined
PY 2	N.A.	N.A.
PY 3	PY 1	45% - 55%
PY 4	PY 2	50% - 60%
PY 5	PY 3	55% - 65%
PY 6	PY 4	60% - 70%

- 7.1.4. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the review period. In addition, candidates must document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous RTP cycles have been corrected (6.2.2).
- 7.1.5. Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.
- 7.1.6. Additional activities and accomplishments, such as those listed in Appendix B, including integration of teaching and scholarship, may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, provided that student evaluation scores are within or above the range specified in Table 1. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of additional activities and accomplishments for candidates whose student evaluation scores are at the low end of the range specified in Table 1.

7.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities (Also refer to Section 4.5 and Appendix C)

- 7.2.1. The candidate must have made progress toward establishing a program of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by documented evidence of accomplishments in several of the categories listed in Appendix C.
- 7.2.2. Although there are no specific requirements for scholarly and creative activities for each probationary year, the DRTPC recommends the following schedule of activities to prepare candidates for tenure and promotion. By the end of the third probationary year, candidates are expected to have submitted at least one proposal for external funding, to be conducting research, and to be active in at least one of the other categories listed in Appendix C. In later probationary years, candidates are expected to obtain grants and/or to continue seeking external funding for research, to involve students in their research, to submit at least one manuscript for

publication/dissemination of work, and to be active in one or more of the other categories listed in Appendix C, which includes integration of scholarship and teaching. Throughout the probationary period, the candidate should be engaged in scholarly and creative activities that will make it possible to meet the requirements for tenure and promotion (8.2.1).

7.3. Service (Also refer to Section 4.6 and Appendix D)

- 7.3.1. Candidates are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic governance including active participation in the work of CEMaST and at least two years membership on college committees, or university committees, or task forces. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and/or task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.
- 7.3.2. Candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in short-term activities and events such as student orientation and advising, and community outreach events. Candidates will document their contributions in these activities as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package.
- 7.3.3. Documentation of additional service activities, such as those listed in Appendix D, will be considered by the DRTPC.

8. Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

8.1. Teaching (Also refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix B)

- 8.1.1. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is expected to exhibit effectiveness in teaching as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other documentation provided by the candidate. Although the candidate is expected to average a minimum of 12 semester WTUs taught per year during the review period, the DRTPC recognizes that this may not always be possible because of assigned time for professional or service activities. In some cases, candidates may teach only one or two different courses during a given year because of approved assigned time and the specific needs of the center.
- 8.1.2. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must have a percentage of Very Good and Good scores (combined) within or above the range specified in 8.1.3. All candidates must also address all peer evaluations conducted during the review period, as described in 8.1.4. All candidates must also include a reflection about teaching effectiveness. The DRTPC will consider additional evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of signed student and faculty input (8.1.5) and/or additional teaching-related activities, as described in Section 8.1.6 and listed in Appendix B.
- 8.1.3. Instructional assessment by students and workshop participants (student and participant evaluations). The departmental expectation is that candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will receive 70% responses in the Very Good and Good categories combined. Student and workshop evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 60% to 70% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 8.1.4, 8.1.5, and 8.1.6.
- 8.1.4. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period. In addition, candidates must document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years have been corrected (6.2.2).
- 8.1.5. Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.

- 8.1.6. Additional activities and accomplishments, as listed in Appendix B, including integration of teaching and scholarship, may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, provided that student evaluation scores are within the range specified in 8.1.3. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of additional activities and accomplishments for candidates whose student evaluation scores are at the low end of this range.

8.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities (Also refer to Section 4.5 and Appendix C)

- 8.2.1. The successful candidate must have established a program of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by: (1) documented dissemination of two of their works beyond the Cal Poly Pomona community; and (2) other accomplishments while employed at Cal Poly Pomona in scholarly and creative activities such as those listed in Appendix C (8.2.3).
- 8.2.2. CEMaST believes that dissemination of scholarly and creative work is the best single form of evidence of professional activity. Dissemination of work beyond the Cal Poly Pomona community is the expected culmination of scientific and educational research endeavors and represents a synthesis of many different scholarly and creative activities. Faculty members are expected to make intellectual and/or creative contributions that extend and/or develop new knowledge or creative inquiry, discover, integrate or apply facts, theories, or design to practice in their disciplines and disseminate these contributions. All forms of professional scholarly activities in the discipline or in mathematics education or science education will be considered. Faculty are also encouraged to engage in the process of seeking, obtaining, and administering grants or contracts from outside agencies.
- 8.2.3. Additional activities and accomplishments, such as those listed in Appendix C, including integration of scholarship and teaching, will be considered as further evidence of scholarly and creative activity. Although it is understood that a candidate who has met the publication requirement will have engaged in several of these activities, it is the candidate's responsibility to document these activities in the self-evaluation portion of the RTP package.

8.3. Service (Also refer to Section 4.6. and Appendix D)

- 8.3.1. CEMaST faculty are expected to provide service to the Center, the College of Science and its departments, CEIS, and the university in general. In addition, the faculty are expected to work with the pre-college schools in Cal Poly Pomona's service area to help them improve their mathematics and science education programs. CEMaST faculty are encouraged to participate in professional associations related to the candidates' specialty or with state-wide or national agencies related to issues in mathematics or science education.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic governance including active participation in the work of CEMaST and at least two years membership on college committees, or university committees, or task forces. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.

- 8.3.2. Candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in short-term activities and events such as student orientation and advising, and community outreach events. Candidates will document their contributions in these activities as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package.
- 8.3.3. Documentation of additional service activities, such as those listed in Appendix D, will be considered by the DRTPC.
- 8.3.4. The candidate's service activities should indicate effective participation and the ability and willingness to assume a leadership role as a tenured faculty member.

9. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

9.1. Teaching (Also refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix B)

- 9.1.1. A candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to exhibit effectiveness in teaching, and to have made significant contributions to teaching such as innovations in existing courses or the development of new courses. Although the candidate is expected to average a minimum of 6 semester WTUs taught per year during the review period, the DRTPC recognizes that this may not always be possible because of assigned time for professional or service activities. In some cases, candidates may teach only one or two different courses during a given year because of approved assigned time and the specific teaching needs of the center.
- 9.1.2. All candidates for promotion to Professor must have a percentage of Very Good and Good scores (combined) within or above the range specified in 9.1.3. All candidates must also address all student, workshop, and peer evaluations conducted during the review period, as described in 9.1.4. The DRTPC will consider additional evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of signed student and faculty input (9.1.5) and/or additional teaching-related activities, as described in Section 9.1.6 and listed in Appendix B.
- 9.1.3. Instructional assessment by students and workshop (student and workshop participant evaluations). The expectation is that candidates for promotion to Professor will receive 75% responses in the Very Good and Good categories combined. Student evaluation scores below this standard but within the range of 65% to 75% may also result in a favorable recommendation for RTP action, depending on the strength of other evidence that the candidate is committed to teaching excellence, as described in Sections 9.1.4, 9.1.5, and 9.1.6. Candidates must document specific steps that have been taken to address weaknesses identified in student and workshop participant evaluations and submit a reflective analysis of their teaching effectiveness.
- 9.1.4. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluators identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement. All candidates must document the specific steps that have been taken or will be taken to address weaknesses identified in peer evaluations conducted during the most recent year of the review period. In addition, candidates must document that weaknesses noted in peer evaluations conducted during previous years of the review period have been corrected (6.2.2).
- 9.1.5. Signed student and faculty input. The DRTPC recognizes that candidates have little control over signed student and faculty input. Candidates with an exceptional record of teaching performance may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the DRTPC in making its recommendation.
- 9.1.6. Additional activities and accomplishments, as listed in Appendix B, including integration of teaching and scholarship, may be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness, provided that student evaluation scores are within the range specified in 9.1.3. The DRTPC will rely heavily on evidence of additional activities and accomplishments for candidates whose student evaluation scores are at the low end of this range.

9.2. Scholarly and Creative Activities (Also refer to Section 4.5 and Appendix C)

- 9.2.1. The successful candidate must have established a program of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by: (1) peer reviewed dissemination of intellectual work and/or (2) other accomplishments while employed at Cal Poly Pomona in scholarly and creative activities such as those listed in Appendix C (9.2.3). Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have maintained an active research program resulting in dissemination of their scholarly work since their promotion to Associate Professor. This work should be based on work conducted since the candidate was promoted to Associate Professor. All candidates are required to document these activities in the self-evaluation portion of the RTP package. For candidates who have not met the publication requirement, it will be necessary to document substantial activity in several of the categories listed in Appendix C.

9.3. Service (Also refer to Section 4.6 and Appendix D)

- 9.3.1. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic governance including active participation in the work of CEMaST and at least two years membership on college committees, or university committees, or task forces. Candidates will document their contributions on each committee and task force as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package. The DRTPC may request evaluations of the candidate's contribution from committee chairs.

- 9.3.2. Candidates must have served as chair of at least one of the committees or task forces during the review period.
- 9.3.3. Candidates will regularly attend faculty meetings and participate in short-term activities and events such as student orientation and advising, faculty retreats, and community outreach events. Candidates will document their contributions in these activities as part of their self-evaluation in the RTP package.
- 9.3.4. Documentation of additional service activities, such as those listed in Appendix D, will be considered by the DRTPC and may substitute for a deficiency in one of the requirements listed above.
- 9.3.5. The candidate's service activities should indicate effective participation and leadership.

10. Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion to Associate Professor

In addition to satisfying all the requirements for regular tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor (Section 8), the candidate must satisfy the following requirements, which supersede the corresponding requirements for regular tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. CEMaST believes that satisfying these requirements provides evidence that the candidate is Exceptional.

- 10.1. Instructional assessment by students and workshop participants (student and workshop participant evaluations). The candidate must have at least 75% of the responses on student evaluations in the Very Good and Good categories combined.
- 10.2. The candidate must have made two or more major contributions to their field based on work conducted while employed at Cal Poly Pomona.
- 10.3. The candidate must have made notable contributions during at least three years of service to qualifying committees or task forces or other service to STEM education. Written documentation of the candidate's contributions on committees and task forces must be provided in the candidate's self evaluation and/or by signed faculty input to the RTP package.

11. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor

In addition to satisfying all the requirements for regular promotion to Professor (Section 9), the candidate must satisfy the following requirements, which supersede the corresponding requirements for regular promotion to Professor. CEMaST believes that satisfying these requirements provides evidence that the candidate is Exceptional.

- 11.1. Instructional assessment by students (student evaluations). The candidate must have at least 80% of the responses on student evaluations in the Very Good and Good categories combined.
- 11.2. The candidate must have made four or more major contributions to their field where at least three contributions are based on work conducted since promotion to Associate Professor.
- 11.3. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate regular participation in academic governance including having made notable contributions in the work of CEMaST and at least three years membership on college committees, or university committees, or task forces since promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate must have served as chair of at least one of the committees or task forces. Written documentation of the candidate's contributions on committees and task forces must be provided in the candidate's self evaluation and/or by signed faculty input to the RTP package.

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

- 12.1. The DRTPC must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the university, reassigned time for faculty leadership duties, and visiting professor/scholarship at another institution. Faculty on leave shall be

evaluated using the above stated criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity and service with suitable modification listed below.

- 12.2. Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. Candidates may provide their RTP requests electronically and must provide a remote way of contact to be used for sending recommendations to candidates. Alternative electronic means of transmission are acceptable providing signatures appear on all necessary pages. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.
- 12.3. Individuals who accept positions outside of CEMaST while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand the department's expectations during the time they are away. The department may articulate expectations for these exceptional situations in the RTP document. If these exceptions are not explicitly and individually addressed in the department criteria, then the candidate and the DRTPC must commit to writing an interpretation of the department criteria in light of the special circumstances. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

12.4. Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment

- 12.4.1. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to teach an average of 12 semester WTUs per year (this average includes supervisory WTUs). Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to teach an average of 6 semester WTUs per year. For each course taught, student evaluations must be administered. All student evaluation summaries for every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package.
- 12.4.2. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure in the department.
- 12.4.3. Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by completion of their administrative duties.
- 12.4.4. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty serving an administrative assignment without the written consent of the DRTPC, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This consent should be a memorandum of understanding that explicitly defines a renegotiated weighting of the RTP requirements for the candidate.

12.5. Faculty on Approved Leave

- 12.5.1. Only faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President of the university are on approved leave. Normally, this is with pay from this university and thus, for tenure track candidates, the probationary status is still active and the following paragraphs in this section apply. If the approved leave is professional leave of absence without pay from the university then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate may remain active for a maximum of one year, in which case the following paragraphs in this section would apply during that period. If the approved leave is personal leave of absence without pay, then whether or not the probationary status of the tenure-track candidate is inactive ("the clock has stopped") will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the President of the university. In cases where the probationary status of the candidate becomes inactive the following paragraphs in this section do not apply.
- 12.5.2. Student evaluations for every course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution, whether a Cal Poly Pomona class or not, will be considered as part of the candidates teaching if teaching the class is part of the candidates CPP work load for that semester.
- 12.5.3. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standards as any other candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion in the department. Research and scholarly activity done at another institution, whether done alone or in collaboration with others, can be examined by the committee for the purposes of fulfilling the department's criteria in the area of scholarly activity.

- 12.5.4. Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirements specified in the department criteria for the requested RTP action.
- 12.5.5. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty on approved leave without the written consent of the DRTPC, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This consent should be a memorandum of understanding that explicitly defines a renegotiated weighting of the RTP requirements for the candidate. However, if any of these requirements conflict with provisions or interpretation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the latter shall govern.

12.6. Faculty Serving in Academic Governance

- 12.6.1. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to teach an average of 12 WTU per year (this average includes supervisory WTUs). Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to teach an average of 6 WTU per year. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving in academic governance and on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall provide student evaluations for every course taught during the evaluation period in the RTP package.
- 12.6.2. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving in academic governance and on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall provide evidence of scholarly activity and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion in the department.
- 12.6.3. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by completing their academic governance duties.
- 12.6.4. There can be no deviation from the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of the DRTPC, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This consent should be a memorandum of understanding that explicitly defines a renegotiated weighting of the RTP requirements for the candidate.

13. RTP Document Changes

- 13.1. The DRTPC shall, at least once every five years, review the RTP Document and draft proposed revisions. These revisions shall include, but not be restricted to, any changes necessary to bring the Document into conformity with the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement and University Policy 1328. Any revisions must be presented to the tenured and probationary faculty for ratification by March 1st.
- 13.2. The Draft RTP Document will be reported to all the tenured and probationary faculty members of the department. Adoption of the Department RTP Document shall be accomplished by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in CEMaST. Following departmental approval, the draft document will be forwarded to the Dean and College RTP Committee no later than April 1st.
- 13.3. The Director shall make available a copy of the current approved Department RTP Document in the center's office and shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy prior to the beginning of the evaluation process. There shall be no changes in criteria or procedures used to evaluate a faculty member during the evaluation process.

Appendix A: Instructional Assessment by Students: Procedure for Administering Assessment Forms

Department-approved Instructional Assessments by students will be conducted according to the current university policy.

Appendix B: Other Supporting Evidence for Quality of Teaching.

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

Courses

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

Improving pedagogical techniques

- Written description of techniques or methods used, including written materials detailing innovative practices. A reflection on the effectiveness of any innovative practices should be provided.
- Analysis, supported by data, of the candidate's efforts to incorporate various innovative practices.
- Attending professional development seminars/workshops to enhance teaching and learning
- Observing teaching by other instructors and incorporating active learning techniques.
- Collaborating with a colleague to improve teaching performance
- Incorporating assessment techniques into teaching

Assessment of teaching and learning activities

- Assessing novel curricular materials
- Assessing teaching and learning techniques

Enhancement of educational experiences for students

- Tutoring students
- Holding review sessions

Integration of teaching and scholarship

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

Teaching at other institutions

- Giving guest lectures at other universities or schools
- Visiting professorship
- Providing workshops and institutes for K-12 teachers or students

Service learning activities, honors course participation, and contributions to the training of teachers

Any other activity that enhances teaching or improves learning.

Appendix C: Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities

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

Grants and contracts

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

Research

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

Publications

- Professional publications (refereed and/or non-refereed specified)
- Authoring or editing books and/or chapters of books appropriate to his/her specialty
- Other publications: software, instructional materials, manuals, popular articles, web pages, etc.
- Co-authoring of publications and presentations with students
- Authorship of documents, reports, etc. pertinent to the department, college, or university

Presentations

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

Professional organizations

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

Professional services

- Consulting work in some area of STEM education
- Consulting work in other areas of expertise (e.g. computer technology, web page construction)

Professional training

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

New course development

- Developing course syllabi, and providing supplemental course material: outlines, handouts, etc.
- Developing and offering a new course
- Significantly revising an existing course
- Contributing to course development related to the mission of the department

Peer review

- Serving as reviewer for peer-reviewed journal or similar publication
- Serving as ad hoc reviewer or on review panel for grant proposals
- Serving on review or selection committee to review candidates for fellowships and awards
- Peer review of faculty teaching

Leadership role in organizing activities, meetings or events

- Organizing activities, events or meetings for a professional society or organization
- Organizing activities, events or meetings for CEMaST
- Organizing activities, events or meetings for the College of Science or the university

Participation in scholarly and creative activities and events

- Attending certain departmental, college or university activities or events
- Attending conferences, symposia, workshops, seminars and science fairs

Honors, awards and recognition of candidate's contributions to science

- Election to honor societies
- Receipt of professional awards
- Invitations to speak at other institutions or at professional society meetings
- Number of citations of the candidate's work in other author's peer-reviewed works or books

Integration of scholarship and teaching

- Directing student and postdoctoral research
- Serving on or chairing graduate student thesis committees
- Incorporating information from workshops or professional meetings into research training
- Publishing in a peer-reviewed journal the results of assessment of teaching and learning
- Presenting the results of assessment of teaching and learning at professional meetings

Assessment of teaching and learning activities

- Assessing novel curricular materials
- Assessing teaching and learning techniques

Any other scholarly activity that enhances professional development.

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

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

Service to students

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

Service to CEMaST

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

Service to College of Science

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

Service to Cal Poly Pomona University

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

Service to Community

- Working closely with professional organizations and nearby schools offering outreach programs
- Representing the department through speaking engagements at colleges, schools, clubs & other organizations
- Working with pre-K-12 institutions to improve STEM education

Any other activities that provide service to the students, CEMaST, College of Science, University or community.