

**DEPARTMENT RTP DOCUMENT
APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD**

Department:	Agribusiness & Food Industry Management
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	2022

DEPARTMENT

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

Dept. Chair:	<u>Jon C Phillips</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>4-15-19</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date
DRTPC Chair:	<u>Jon C Phillips</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>4-15-19</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE

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

1. Recommend Approval *Eileen M. Cullen 09/03/2019*

2. Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo.

3. Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached.)

CRTPC Chair:	<u>Eileen M. Cullen</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>05/23/19</u>
	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:	<u>Lisa Kessler</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>9-3-19</u>
	Printed Name	Signature	Date

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. Approved for the following years 2020/21 to 2024/25

2. Not Approved (Explanation attached.)

AVP for Faculty Affairs:	<u>Martin Sancho Madriz</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>8/5/20</u>
	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.

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

AGRIBUSINESS AND FOOD INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT/ AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT

AGRIBUSINESS AND FOOD INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

2020-2021to 2024-2025 Academic Years

SECTION I -- INTRODUCTION

The following criteria have been developed by the faculty members of the Agribusiness Management Program to provide guidelines for the recruitment of a quality faculty and for the evaluation and recognition of the contributions of faculty in all personnel actions involving reappointment, tenure and promotion. These criteria are in addition to the policies and procedures for personnel action mandated by the agreement between the Trustees of The California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (Contract) 2014-2017, extended until June 2020, in Article 12 (appointment), Article 13 (probation and tenure), Article 14 (promotion), and Article 15 (evaluation); and Cal Poly Pomona University Academic Manual Policy 1328, Policy 1329, Policy 1335 and the Cal Poly Pomona Affirmative Action Guide .

A. GOALS OF THESE CRITERIA

1. Provide faculty members and administrators involved in the appointment process meaningful and systematic criteria for determining the qualifications of prospective academic teaching employees in this department.
2. Provide all persons involved in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process with meaningful and systematic criteria for making recommendations and decisions concerning these matters.
3. Provide the candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion with meaningful and systematic criteria for measuring their own performance, growth, and qualifications concerning these matters.

B. THE DEPARTMENTAL RTP COMMITTEE (DRTPC)

1. The DRTPC will consist of a minimum of three tenured full-time CFA bargaining unit 3 employees and shall always have an odd number of members

The department chair may serve as a member of the DRTPC except when serving on the College RTP committee or the University RTP committee. The department chair may write a separate recommendation except when serving on the DRTPC, the College RTP committee, or the University RTP committee. Non-tenured department chairs are ineligible to serve on the DRTPC.

2. The DRTPC and the DRTPC Chair shall be elected by March 1 preceding the academic year in which they will serve. The committee will be elected by a majority vote by secret ballot of the probationary and tenured faculty unit employees. The procedure for the election of the DRTPC will

be as follows. Prior to March 1, the Department Chair will distribute ballots to all tenured/tenure-track faculty in the department. The Department Chair will instruct all tenured/tenure-track faculty in the department to submit ballots to the department Administrative Support Coordinator or other designated staff member. After assuring that the ballots are anonymous, the staff member who receives the ballots will provide them to the Department Chair. Then, the department chair will determine who is elected to the DRTPC. The candidates with the most votes will be elected to the DRTPC. The election of the DRPTC Chair will occur after the election of the DRTPC, but also before March 1. The procedure for the election of the DRTPC Chair will be the same as for the election of the DRTPC, except only members of the DRTPC will be eligible to vote. The department chair shall notify the college dean and the Office of Faculty Affairs of the composition of the DRTPC.

3. When candidates for early tenure or early promotion are being considered, the DRTPC shall be expanded to include all eligible full-time tenured members of the department except for those serving on the College RTP committee or the University RTP committee.

C. PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT

This section addresses probationary (Tenure Track) appointments. The tenured and probationary faculty members will be primarily responsible for judging the appropriateness of a candidate's qualifications for a position.

It is the policy of the Agribusiness and Food Industry Management program to employ the best qualified individual who is available for the full-time tenure track position under consideration. Best qualified means the best combination of formal education, professional experience, and other required and preferred qualifications listed in the relevant position description.

1. Recruitment procedures will be initiated in the department in compliance with the guidelines specified by Cal Poly Pomona Policy #1311 Recruitment and Appointment Procedures for Tenure-Line Faculty.
2. The department will develop appropriate position descriptions, announcements and advertisements and obtain appropriate approval before proceeding with the recruitment process.
3. All applications will be measured against the job description to insure that the most qualified person to fill the position responsibilities is identified.
4. The department chair will make recommendations for appointment after consultation with the entire faculty and the approval by a simple majority of the tenured faculty.
5. The persons deemed most qualified for the position as described by the position description will be recommended for appointment to class and rank based upon the following guidelines:

Assistant Professor

Ph.D. or other agribusiness-related doctoral degree from an accredited university, completed before the appointment commences,

Associate Professor

Ph.D. or other agribusiness-related doctoral degree from an accredited university, and appropriate teaching and/or professional experience; or a

Professor

Ph.D. or other agribusiness-related doctoral degree from an accredited university, and at least six years of appropriate teaching and/or professional experience.

D. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEWS:

1. A performance review of a faculty unit employee is required for (1) the reappointment of a probationary faculty unit employee; (2) the award of tenure; and (3) promotion.
2. The normal period of probation before the granting of tenure is six years of credited service and/or full-time probationary service. Candidates eligible for tenure must apply for tenure at the beginning of the sixth year.
3. Up to two years full-time service credit for probation may be granted by the President or his/her designee, upon the recommendation of the department, at the time of initial appointment based on previous service of university teaching or comparable experience.
4. The President or his/her designee based on a recommendation from the department, the dean, and the University RTP committee, may grant early tenure and/or early promotion. Specific requirements and performance levels for various personnel actions including early tenure and early promotion appear in Section I.J. below.
5. A year of service for an academic year employee is two consecutive semesters.
6. The term "tenure" refers to the right of a faculty unit employee awarded tenure to continued permanent employment at the campus as a faculty unit employee.
7. Candidates applying for reappointment will demonstrate in their applications that they are making progress towards satisfying department RTP criteria for tenure.
8. Candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion must address, in their self-evaluation, progress made on addressing suggestions for improvement made in previous RTP cycles.
9. Promotion to the rank of Professor is not possible without tenure.

E. RTP PROCESS:

1. When the Vice President for Academic Affairs has made available the list of the faculty members (on the first day of the Fall semester) considered eligible for RTP consideration, the chair of the DRTPC shall verify the list with the Dean of Agriculture and review the candidates' previous evaluation documents in the office of the Dean.
2. Each faculty member eligible for RTP action shall notify in writing the Chair of the DRTPC as to

whether action will be requested, and which action(s) requested. This notification must occur during the first full week of classes during the Fall semester. When allowed by applicable university policy, a faculty member who declares intent to apply may later decide not to submit an RTP package.

3. The names of candidates for personnel evaluation actions and deadlines for student evaluations will be posted on department bulletin boards by the DRTPC chairperson.
4. The DRTPC Chair shall serve as custodian of the RTP package during the time that it is under consideration at the departmental level.
5. DRTPC members will evaluate personnel action candidates for teaching performance, scholarly activity, and service to the university and community.

Candidates for reappointment to the second probationary year will be evaluated primarily on the basis of teaching performance because there may be insufficient time for these candidates to establish a significant record of achievement in the areas of scholarly activity and service to the university and community. Thereafter, the three areas of performance will be teaching performance, scholarly activity, and service to university and community.

The DRTPC will consult with the tenured faculty members of the department when evaluating candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Only tenured faculty members of the candidate's department that are higher in rank than the candidate will be consulted for promotion evaluations. (That is, only Associate and Full Professors will be consulted concerning an Assistant Professor requesting a promotion to Associate, and only Full Professors will be consulted in regards to an Associate Professor requesting the rank of Full Professor.)

6. Candidates will be evaluated according to the following procedure.
 - a. The DRTPC will meet to discuss and evaluate the candidate's performance based on the criteria described elsewhere. The committee will consider the information supplied by the candidate and information in the **candidate's Personnel Action File**, as well as evaluation data that may be submitted from students and tenured faculty members in relation to the approved Department RTP criteria. The committee will also consider how the candidate met suggestions for improvements made by the DRTPC in the previous cycle.

The DRTPC members will thoroughly read, review, and discuss the information available. After discussion, each member will assign a rating (discussed below) for each of the three areas of performance. The committee will then calculate the arithmetic average of the committee members' ratings for each of the three areas.

- b. Performance in each of the areas above will be according to the following scale:

1 = Very Good	2 = Good	3 = Satisfactory
4 = Poor	5 = Very Poor	

- c. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated as follows: The DRTPC members will each assign a rating of 1-5 for teaching effectiveness, considering all that the members know about the candidate's teaching (in-class peer evaluations, written evaluations from students,

and everything that is in the candidate's **Personnel Action File** or has been submitted by the candidate including syllabi and teaching material).

The average of the ratings given by the members is then multiplied by .6 and added to the product of .4 multiplied by the average of all students' ratings on the "Instructional Assessment Form," (the average of all questions for all courses being evaluated). For example, if the average of all DRTPC members' ratings is 1.2 and the average of all students' ratings is 2, the rating for teaching effectiveness would be as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &.6(\text{DRTPC Assessment}) + .4(\text{Student Assessment}) = \text{rating for teaching effectiveness} \\ &.6(1.2) + .4(2) = 1.52 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is the weighted average of the DRTPC's rating and the student assessment.

- d. Scholarly activity will be rated based on number of points. The point system for scholarly activity is defined in Section H below. Minimum number of points for various RTP actions are specified in Section J below.
- e. The ratings for service to the university and community will be the average of the ratings by each of the individual members of the DRTPC for each of the areas. Additional information about scholarly activity and service to the university and community is provided in Sections I and J below.
- f. Reappointment: In addition to reporting the numerical score, the DRTPC will provide a rationale for the score and, being as specific as possible, improvements needed to receive positive recommendations for reappointment and/or tenure in the succeeding RTP cycle(s).
- g. Tenure: In addition to reporting the numerical score, the DRTPC will provide a rationale for the score and the positive or negative recommendation for reappointment with tenure.

F. PROCESS FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

1. Student evaluations will be included in RTP evaluations. The Process is to be as follows:
 - a. Written student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. In accordance with the CBA and University policies, all lecture, laboratory, activity, and seminar classes; including face-to-face, hybrid, and online; for each faculty unit employee shall be evaluated. (Exceptions are independent study classes and internship classes.)
 - b. The Instructional Assessment Form to be used for this purpose is attached as Appendix II. The In-class evaluation is to consist only of the questions shown; there are to be no student comments collected as part of the in-class student evaluation process. See letter "c".
2. At any time, students from any discipline may also submit written input per Policy #1329

about a faculty member's teaching. Students will be notified that they have this option and process by the Department Chair or appropriate administrator, as needed. The receiver of the input (i.e., the Department Chair or appropriate administrator) will assure that student input is processed in accordance with university policy. Such evaluations must include the student's signature and student Bronco ID number. Faculty members must be given 10 days to provide a response, in accordance to the CBA and University policies.

- a. A faculty member may, for his/her own teaching effectiveness and or course learning outcomes self-evaluation, design and administer to a class a special evaluation: the standard department instrument should not be used for this purpose. The results of such an evaluation are for the private use of the faculty member and cannot be considered by an RTP committee. The results of such an evaluation cannot be placed in the Personnel Action File, nor can they substitute for any required formal evaluation.
- b. A person other than the faculty member being evaluated shall conduct each evaluation; this person preferably will be another faculty member in the department. Completed evaluation instruments shall be delivered in a closed envelope to the department administrative support coordinator who will forward them to the appropriate office for processing. When the evaluations and printout are returned to the department, they are provided to the faculty member, and DRTPC Chair.
- c. [Intentionally left blank to preserve later provision references in this document.]
- d. Departmental standards of expectation including minimum levels for various RTP actions are listed in Section J below. **Average score for any one question should be < or = 2.5** (on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is the highest score). Scores greater than 2.5 indicate areas for concern. Candidates should explain all scores greater than 2.5 or indicate plans to address the area. Evaluators consider each RTP case individually. The performance of a candidate is compared to the standards specified in this document, notwithstanding the performance of other faculty teaching in the department. Evaluators shall not consider the "Subject Average Score" and "Subject Standard Deviation" in the evaluation of faculty subject to these criteria, therefore.
- e. Upon receipt of the faculty member's RTP package at the department level as per Faculty Affairs calendar timeline, the DRTPC will consider the evaluations for all courses evaluated during the previous academic year, or since the most recent personnel evaluation, as applicable. For faculty applying for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the analysis will be prepared as part of the department's comments on the standard university performance evaluation. In their evaluation of teaching, the DRTPC will consider results of student and faculty evaluations of teaching for each semester as well as progressively across years during the applicable probation/evaluation period.
- f. [Intentionally left blank to preserve later provision references in this document.]
- g. Any solicitation to students for teaching evaluation content/nature by a faculty member on his/her own behalf, or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is unprofessional and is prohibited.
- h. The names of candidates for personnel evaluation actions and deadlines for student evaluations will be posted on official department physical and electronic

information venues by the DRTPC chairperson. The student evaluation deadline needs to be at least 10 days before the deadline for RTP packet submission so that the faculty member has time to produce a response that can be added to the RTP package.

Only those student evaluations and written comments submitted prior to the posted deadlines will be considered in the current performance evaluation process.

J. EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

Teaching performance will be evaluated on the basis of the instructor's:

1. Knowledge of the subject matter,
2. Ability to transmit this knowledge to the students,
3. Ability to stimulate and motivate students to learn,
4. Ability to meet the instructional objective and goals of individual courses, the department and the university, and
5. Ability to evaluate student achievement fairly, and

Student evaluations, in-class peer evaluations, the candidate's self-evaluation, and signed comments by students and tenured faculty will provide this information. The faculty member conducting the in-class peer evaluation will use the In-Class Peer Evaluation Form (Appendix I).

Class visitations (i.e., peer evaluations) must be conducted by two eligible tenured faculty in two courses per year preferably in two different semesters for all probationary faculty. Also, the DRTPC will conduct two classroom visitations per year for a tenured faculty who will be requesting consideration for promotion. The candidate may request that additional peer evaluations be conducted. The DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and the findings reported to the faculty member observed within two weeks of the class visit.

Only peer evaluations conducted during the period under review should be included in the RTP package. Exceptions will be made when the candidate does not have the minimum number (2 per year) of peer evaluations. This includes those in administrative positions, on temporary leave from their teaching duties, or assigned to outreach programs (sections L, and M).

The candidate shall supply to the DRTPC copies of syllabi, etc. for the courses visited by the peer evaluator. Candidates shall submit other course material (e.g., tests, assignments, handouts, etc.) to the evaluator upon request. Candidates may submit material by giving the peer evaluator access to Blackboard. Course materials shall be submitted prior to the visitations so that the peer evaluator will have them to refer to for the visits.

There shall be consultation between the candidate being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. The candidate being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) working days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place

H EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY:

Scholarly activity is essential to enrich and upgrade faculty knowledge and skills, stimulate intellectual and professional growth, and enhance the learning experience of students. The highest standard for scholarly activity is external validation. External validation can take many forms including peer-reviewed publications, receipt of competitive grants and contracts, invited and competitively accepted papers/presentations, national or regional publication of educational materials such as textbooks and software, and productive collaborations with the public or private sector. Publications and other external validations of scholarly work must occur while the candidate is at Cal Poly Pomona.

All candidates applying for a DRTPC action must earn points based on the nature of intellectual contributions described below for Categories A, B, and C. In the candidate's self-evaluation, she/he must discuss his/her individual contributions to the achievements made through these activities. A minimum of seven (7) points must be earned from Categories A, B, and C in the period from the date of appointment until the time of application for RTP action. At least four (4) points must be earned for publishing refereed scholarly publications, i.e., from Category A below. Following tenure and promotion to associate professor, a minimum of eight (8) points from Categories A, B, and C including two additional peer-reviewed publications will be required for promotion to full professor.

Scholarly Activities

Category A: Refereed Scholarly Publications (2 points each)

- Peer-reviewed journal articles in the faculty member's discipline with 10 or fewer authors. (If more than 10 authors, the publication counts for 1 point.) Order of authorship does not matter.

Category B: Books, Grant Awards, and mentoring graduate students (2 points each)

- Scholarly book, trade book, or textbook relevant to the candidate's discipline, not including self-published.
- Principal Investigator on an awarded grant, contract, or fellowship from a U.S. national funding agency (e.g., USDA, Farm Foundation, Fulbright, NIH, etc.) foundation, or on-U.S. equivalent.
- Successful mentoring of graduate students in candidate's discipline to degree completion, resulting in thesis document.

Category C: Other Scholarly/Creative Activity (1 point each)

- Co-Principal Investigator or collaborator on an awarded competitive grant or fellowship from a U.S. national funding agency (e.g., USDA, Farm Foundation, Fulbright, NIH, etc.) foundation, or non-U.S. equivalent. Candidate must receive wages, salary, and/or reassigned time for activities in this category.
- Principal Investigator on an awarded grant, contract, or fellowship from a funding agency that is not national in scope (e.g. CFDA, ARI, etc.). Internal grant awards (e.g., RSCA, SIRG, SPICE, Provost's Teacher-Scholar) for at least \$2,000 are also included in this category.
- Organizing a professional conference (workshops/short courses) related to candidate's area of expertise.

- Editorships in scientific, educational, and trade journals.
- Receiving patents or other awards.
- Consulting experiences with industry, business or government agencies related to candidate's area of expertise which provides significant intellectual growth in the discipline.
- Principal Investigator on a grant, contract, or fellowship proposal that was developed and submitted to a U.S. national funding agency (e.g., USDA, Farm Foundation, Fulbright, NIH, etc.) foundation, or non-U.S. equivalent.
- Presentation of paper or poster at a professional meeting.
- Development of a website for instructional or outreach purposes.
- Development of instructional software in the candidate's discipline.
- Publications related to the candidate's discipline in newspapers, magazines, or popular journals.
- Grant and manuscript reviews including proposals, conference presentations or research programs.
- Publication of case studies in the candidate's discipline for classroom use.
- Conducting a seminar/workshop including a faculty development program.
- Obtaining a new academic/professional certification (e.g., Certified Public Accountant, Certified Management Accountant, Chartered Financial Analyst, Certified Financial Planner, etc.) related to the candidate's expertise and the ABM program.

In addition to the requirements specified above, the following activity must be documented. No points are assigned to such activities.

- Attendance at meetings or conferences of professional associations/societies at international, national, regional, or local levels on a periodic basis.

I. EVALUATING SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

Continuing interest in and active participation in departmental, college, university, and community matters is considered an essential element in overall faculty effectiveness. Service means contributing to the activities of the department, the Huntley College of Agriculture, and the university in a significant manner. Candidates who engage in professional activities that enhance the visibility and stature of Cal Poly Pomona should demonstrate how these activities benefit the university in tangible ways. These professional activities, while important, cannot substitute for required student academic advising, ongoing committee work, and leadership in faculty governance.

Examples of other activities that could provide evidence of service include, but are not limited to, those listed below. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide substantiation of active participation in the activities submitted for this category. The DRTPC will determine the relative merits as to the quantity and quality of the candidate's contribution. Following are examples of areas for service contributions.

1. Participating in student recruitment.
2. Securing gifts, donations and scholarships from industry and other private donors.
3. Securing internships from industry.
4. Contributing to the career placement of students and graduates.

5. Chair or member of the RTP Committee (Department, College, or University).*
6. Chair or member of the Department Scholarship, Internship, and Employment Committee.*
7. Chair or member of the Department or College Curriculum Committee.*
8. Chair or member of the Department Assessment Committee or College of Agriculture Learning Measurement (CALM) Committee.*
9. Departmental or College graduate or research coordinator.
10. Serving on a graduate Masters Thesis Committee.
11. Chair or member of any Faculty Senate Committee.*
12. Advisor, ABM or National Agri-Marketing Association Club.
13. Preparing departmental brochures.
14. Chair or member of a Search Committee.*
15. Academic Senate Representative.
16. Advisor of other student clubs or organizations.
17. Organizing field trips, domestic and overseas, other than as part of a regular lecture class.
18. National Agri-Marketing Association, Food Distribution Research Society, or National Grocers Association Student Competition Advisor.
19. Chair or member of committees for Ag Field Day, Poly View Open House and/or Fall Conference.*
20. Chair or member of special committees.*
21. Active member of the board of directors, or administrative committee of a professional, industry, or commodity organization or foundation.

*Chairperson is weighted more heavily than membership.

J. MINIMUM LEVELS REQUIRED FOR VARIOUS PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Action	Teaching	Scholarly Activity*	Service
1st Reappointment*	2.25	N/A	N/A
2nd Reappointment*	2.25	1 point	2.9
3rd Reappointment*	2.25	2 points	2.8
4th Reappointment*	2.25	3 points	2.7
5th Reappointment*	2.25	5 points	2.6

*Before tenure or promotion.

Tenure	2.00	7 points	2.5
Early Tenure and Early promotion to Assoc. Prof.	1.50*	9 points	1.70
Promotion to Assoc. Prof.	2.00	7 points	2.5
Early promotion to Full Prof.*	1.30	10 points	1.50
Promotion to Full Prof.	2.00	8 points	2.0

*The maximum rating is 1.0 thus a rating of 1.50 or better, (i.e., equal to or less than 1.50) qualifies for early promotion to Associate Professor and a rating of 1.30 or better, (i.e., equal to or less than 1.30) qualifies for early promotion to full professor. To obtain early action, candidates must also maintain a level of rigor appropriate to a university education; use well organized syllabi and handouts; use exams that include essays and approaches other than objective and short answer questions; and use interactive and group in-class activities where appropriate, i.e. approaches other than lectures must be integrated into the classroom. Note that the average of 1.50 or better on student evaluations is calculated as specified in Sec. E.6.c. above.

Early Tenure and promotion decisions shall place emphasis on teaching and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession. The numeric point score system ensures exceptional and extraordinary performance ensures an emphasis on teaching. The required minimum teaching scores for early tenure and early promotion are more rigorous than for service. The difference between the required scores for regular and early action is proportionately greater for teaching than it is for scholarly activity.

K. EVALUATION OF FACULTY IN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

Faculty in some but not all management positions are subject to performance evaluation as outlined in University Academic Manual Policy 1325. In addition, academic rank administrators and those in positions of academic governance holding return rights under Policy #1313 are subject to RTP policies and procedures as specified in Policy 1328.

Faculty unit employees in administrative and academic governance positions and subject to RTP action shall be evaluated primarily on performance as related to job/position description and responsibilities. Services to the university and community and scholarly activity will also be taken into consideration. Teaching performance will be evaluated provided the candidate has taught a course since the last RTP action.

Faculty unit employees in fractional administrative and teaching positions will be required to adhere to the policies and procedures outlined above this section.

L. EVALUATION OF FACULTY ON TEMPORARY LEAVE FROM TEACHING DUTIES

Faculty members on temporary leave from teaching duties and subject to RTP action shall: 1) adhere to the policies and procedures as outlined in this document, Policy 1328, and the CBA; and 2) be evaluated in accordance with the appropriate RTP action requested as referenced in this document. In addition, the candidate must provide sufficient documentation/evidence: 1) of the contributions of

the leave to the department, college and/or university; 2) of professional growth; and 3) that the goals of the leave/assignment were fulfilled during the period of time of temporary leave from teaching duties. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to allow sufficient correspondence time in order to meet applicable deadlines.

M. EVALUATION OF FACULTY ASSIGNED TO CENTERS

Faculty appointed to a center shall be evaluated on performance related to the position's responsibilities as described in the position description and an updated yearly work plan. Also, the performance evaluation shall be cross-referenced to the respective criteria outlined in the RTP document. Because such faculty are primarily engaged in center activities, emphasis may be placed on the categories of service to the university and community and scholarly activity.

APPENDIX I

IN-CLASS PEER EVALUATION FORM

IN-CLASS PEER EVALUATION FORM

INSTRUCTION: Please observe the faculty member to be evaluated in a classroom environment without distracting/disrupting the class. Course syllabus, and other materials upon request (to be provided by the candidate to the evaluator) should be reviewed prior to your classroom visitation. Peer evaluator and faculty member being evaluated may also include comments/responses on the reverse of this form. Attach additional sheets, as necessary.

INSTRUCTOR: _____ SEMESTER/YEAR/DATE OF VISIT: _____

COURSE: _____ EVALUATOR: _____

A. INSTRUCTOR'S PREPARATION & ORGANIZATION	<u>VERY GOOD</u>	<u>GOOD</u>	<u>SATIS- FACTORY</u>	<u>POOR</u>	<u>VERY POOR</u>
1. Knowledge of subject.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Organization and preparation of the course.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Written course objectives, requirements, assignments, and grading policy.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Adds to the textbook material rather than repeats what is in the textbook.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. PRESENTATION					
1. Presents materials clearly and coherently.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Uses methods of instruction that are suited to the objectives of the course and promote effective instruction.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Makes assignments/exams that correspond with course with the course objectives and goals.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Makes the class interesting.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. ACCEPTANCE OF STUDENTS VIEWS					
1. Encourages classroom discussion as appropriate.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Provides an atmosphere in which students are encouraged to ask questions.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Encourages an atmosphere of openness and trust.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
WHAT OVERALL RATING WOULD YOU GIVE THIS TEACHER	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS (CONTINUE ON REVERSE, AS NEEDED):

Signature of Evaluator	Date	Signature of Candidate	Date

APPENDIX II

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM (IN-CLASS OR ONLINE)

Agribusiness and Food Industry Management
Student Instructional Assessments --- Directions

Before conducting a student assessment in a face-to-face or hybrid class, the evaluator, other than the instructor being evaluated, should read the following information to the class.

“Students,

The Department Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) and Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committees are asking you to participate in an assessment activity for both the instructor for this class and the content of the course. This assessment is intended to benefit the instructor and the department.

The assessment information pertaining to your instructor will be used in your instructor’s Personnel Action File. Additionally, the assessment information will provide the instructor with information about what is successful and what can be improved in the class.

You are being asked to complete the following form:

Instructional Assessment Rating (“Bubble”) Form – all students will be asked to complete this form. This will be used for Instructor Evaluation.



Please follow the instructions at the top of the “Bubble Form”:

- Read each question and bubble in your response.
- Remember that 1 is the highest score (very good) and 5 is the lowest score (very poor).
- If you are unable to answer a question, if you do not understand a question, or if you had no opportunity to form an opinion, then respond by bubbling in the “not appropriate” choice.
- If you write on the back of the form, your written comments will be seen only by the instructor.

Your instructor will receive all of the assessments and written comments after grades are submitted this semester.

Thank you for your input.”

DRAFT

Class Climate	CPP - Agribusiness - Student Evaluation	
TERM:	CLASS NBR:	
INSTRUCTOR:		
COURSE:		

Mark as shown: Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.
 Correction: Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

1. Student Evaluation

	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor		Not Appropriate
1.1 Preparation for class meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Conduct of class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Knowledge of subject	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 Ability to answer questions in class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 Assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 Examinations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7 Fairness in grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 Ability to stimulate independent thinking and work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9 Treatment of student opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.10 Ability to interest students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.11 Attitudes towards students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.12 Students' involvement in the learning process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.13 Amount learned in course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.14 Availability of instructor for individual, out-of-class, help during posted office hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
1.15 Overall rating of course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX III

WRITTEN STUDENT EVALUATION FORM (OUT OF CLASS)

