

# DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA: 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I	Structure of the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Document (associated with <i>Appendix A</i> )	2
II	General Principles – Purpose of the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Process (associated with <i>Appendix B</i> )	4
III	The Personnel Action File (PAF) and the RTP Package (associated with <i>Appendix C</i> )	5
IV	Department RTP Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Seeking Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and/or Early Action	6
V	Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave	16
VI	Reappointments, Tenure and Promotion of Faculty	19
VII	The Faculty Employee’s Responsibilities in the RTP Process	20
VIII	Department Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee Functions, Responsibilities and Process	22

## PART 1 – GENERAL CRITERIA

### I. STRUCTURE OF THE REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION DOCUMENT

(Definition of terms is in *Appendix A*)

This document is structured in two main sections.

1. The first section (Part 1) refers to the candidate's, Department's and University's responsibilities in the RTP process. Additionally, it contains general criteria for reappointment, promotion, tenure or early action. Amongst other important elements, it establishes the five areas of self-assessment a candidate must address. More detailed criteria associated with the general criteria are placed in Part 2 – Appendices.
2. Part 2, "Appendices A through D," expands in more detail the criteria and associated information necessary to produce an RTP package that is instructive to both the candidate and the Department Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee (DRTPC). To fully understand the RTP process, and the candidate's rights and responsibilities, it is important to become familiar with the entire document.

Additionally, this document references two very distinct sets of appendices: (1) Policy No 1329 and Policy No: 1328 refer to the official University manual which incorporates established policies, and (2) Appendices A through D, which are appended to this document – the RTP Criteria, and constitute Part 2.

Most policies applied in this document are derived from published Collective Bargaining Agreement Articles (CBA) and University "Appendices" – official University policies.

The CBA is available in hard copy format from the Campus CFA office (909-869-4818) or through this link: <https://ww2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Pages/unitscfa.aspx>

The candidate should become familiar with these policies. In cases where it is not clear whether CBA policies are or are not as important as policies set in University appendices, the University states the following policy:

"In any case of inconsistency, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) takes first precedence, the University Manual second precedence, and the approved Department RTP Document third precedence." (University Policy No: 1328, paragraph 2)

The CBA Articles referenced in this document include:

- Article 10 – Grievance Procedures
- Article 11 – Personnel Files
- Article 12 – Appointment
- Article 13 – Probation and Tenure
- Article 14 – Promotion
- Article 15 – Evaluation

The University Appendices used in this document include:

- Policy No: 1329 – Student Evaluation of Teaching and
- Policy No: 1328 – Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy and Procedures

Embedded parenthetical references are placed in this document for contextual review.

It is the candidate's responsibility to assess their own performance. While this document presents both general and specific criteria to address the candidate's performance, there is no formula that will serve everyone's goals and objectives. Candidates are expected to advocate for themselves; they are to demonstrate why their performance warrants a positive decision on reappointment, promotion, tenure and/or early action within the context of this document. The Department Chair and the RTP Committee can help with general advice and guidance. Candidates should take the initiative and make appointments with the Chair and/or the RTP Committee if assistance is needed. (CBA Article 10, Policy No: 1328, section 1.2)

## II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES – PURPOSE OF THE RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS

(Associated with *Appendix B*)

Probationary faculty and other faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion and/or early action are required to assemble a Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) package that documents accomplishments, marshals evidence and advocates for the requested action. In preparation of the self-assessment package and before submittal, the faculty candidate is invited to seek counsel from the Department RTP Committee and/or Department Chair regarding its preparation. The “Faculty Performance Review” form shall be the official document for developing a faculty self-assessment in addition to the Department’s RTP criteria. Temporary faculty may be expected to write a self-evaluation (focusing on teaching and other specific assignments, if any), established elsewhere in this RTP document. (CBA Articles 15.23-15.29).

Faculty members teaching online are subject to all rights and conditions set out in Article 15 and applicable campus evaluation policies. The collection and use of online course quantitative data for evaluation purposes shall only occur when required in campus evaluation policies and procedures. (CBA Article 15.3)

Explicit Department criteria must be preserved for the following actions: reappointment, tenure, early tenure, promotion (by academic rank), and early promotion. Reappointment criteria should clearly address the necessity of progress toward satisfying criteria for tenure; that is, they should establish a progressively more rigorous set of expectations during probation. For all candidates who are not yet tenured, the DRTPC will evaluate progress the candidate is making towards satisfying the Department’s RTP criteria for tenure. Department procedures must clearly identify the composition of the DRTPC (Policy No: 1328, section 3.1).

The Department Chair shall provide the DRTP Criteria document to all candidates no later than fourteen days after the start of the Fall semester. The Department Chair is responsible for assuring that faculty requesting reappointment, early action, promotion or tenure receive the Criteria. (Policy No: 1328, section 2.1)

The RTP Package “tracking” process of submitting the RTP document, receiving feedback, commenting on the feedback and continuing the process up to the final decision by the University President is in Appendix B (Policy No: 1328, sections 7.0-7.9).

A request for an external review of materials submitted by a faculty unit employee may be initiated at any level of review by any party to the review. Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an external reviewer and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the Provost with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee. (CBA 15.12d)

### **III. THE PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (PAF) AND THE RTP PACKAGE**

(Associated with *Appendix C*)

The RTP package is the “working Personnel Action File” (CBA Article 11). The working PAF is defined as that file specifically generated for use in a given RTP evaluation cycle (CBA article 15.8, 15.9 and 15.12c). The RTP package shall include all required forms and documents, all information specifically provided by the employee being evaluated, and information provided by other faculty employees, Department Chair, Department RTP Committee, students, external reviewers, University RTP Committee and academic administrators. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. While the “working” PAF is used for self-evaluation, there may be more information in the candidate’s “full PAF” on file in the Dean’s office (assuming there is a difference from the working PAF) that may be used by Department, College, University committees and University administrators in the faculty employee’s evaluation. It is the candidate’s responsibility to review the “full PAF” for additional relevant materials (CBA Article 11). The contents of the Working Personnel Action File may be compiled and reviewed in electronic format, pursuant to campus policy. (CBA Article 15.8).

Recommendations and actions regarding faculty, at any level, shall be based solely on approved Department RTP criteria. It is the candidate, in the RTP package, who must collate and analyze the PAF information and that of other relevant sources to use in identifying strengths, weaknesses and goals for the next RTP review cycle. See Appendix C for greater articulation on the PAF and faculty employee’s rights; also, review Appendix D – California Faculty Association Recommendations of “Records that Lecturers and New Faculty Should Have in Their PAF.”

The RTP package is the working PAF for the purposes of RTP evaluation. However, evaluating committees and administrators should consult the full PAF for additional relevant materials. (Policy No. 1328, 1.5)

#### IV. DEPARTMENT RTP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY SEEKING:

- Reappointment to any year up to and including the sixth year, where the decision is made for or against tenure.
- Promotion
- Tenure
- Early Action

The DRTPC shall evaluate probationary faculty and faculty seeking promotion, early action and/or tenure. The Department Chair shall write a separate evaluation of faculty members under review. The evaluation of the candidate under review shall be comprehensive - following the Department's evaluation criteria and shall terminate with a final decision by the University President (CBA 15).

The RTP document must recognize the primary importance of teaching and the maintenance of appropriate academic standards. (CBA Article 15).

The RTP package shall address accomplishments in the following five self-assessment categories:

1. Teaching
2. Service to the University
3. Scholarly Activities (the use of the term scholarly activities is broad and the Department RTP Committee, the Department Chair and the faculty candidate should define the term ad hoc for the specific strengths and interests of the candidate).
4. Professional Participation/Practice
5. Service to the Community

The ratings necessary for all reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions are set out in Table 2. Within the five self-assessment categories, the candidate's efforts will be awarded an "assessment level" by the DRTPC with related points (Table 1).

TABLE 1	
Assessment Level	Point Scale "Scores"
Outstanding	9-10
Excellent	7-8
Good	5-6
Fair	3-4
Poor	0-2

The candidate will be awarded specific points for Teaching, University Service, and Scholarly Activities, and overall points for Professional/Community Service which are considered together. Specific definition and ratings examples are set out in this section of the DRTP Criteria.

Table 2 shows the minimum scores a candidate must achieve as they move toward a tenure decision. For example, reappointment to a fourth probationary year of employment requires that the faculty employee achieve a rating of “Good” (5 points) in “Teaching.” Additionally, the candidate must achieve a “University Service” rating of “Fair” (3 points) and an average rating of “Good” (5 points) for the three non-teaching areas.

<b>TABLE 2</b>				
<b>Requested Action</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>University Service</b>	<b>Scholarly Activities</b>	<b>Professional/Community Service</b>
Reappointment To 3 <sup>rd</sup> Probationary Year	Fair (3)	---	---	---
Reappointment To 4 <sup>th</sup> Probationary Year	Good (5)	Fair (3)	Good (5)	Good (5)
Reappointment To 5 <sup>th</sup> And Succeeding Probationary Year	Good (6)	Good (5)	Good (6)	Good (5)
Tenure	Excellent (7)	Good (6)	Excellent (7)	Good (6)
Promotion To Associate Professor	Excellent (7)	Good (6)	Excellent (7)	Excellent (7)
Promotion To Professor	Excellent (8)	Excellent (7)	Excellent (8)	Excellent (8)
Early Action	Excellent (8)	Excellent (8)*	(8-9)*	(8-9)*

\* For early action there must be an outstanding rating for both scholarly activities and professional/community services.

## **The Five Self-Assessment Categories**

### **1. Teaching**

The DRTPC shall indicate in writing whether the candidate is making adequate progress toward tenure in the category of teaching. The DRTPC shall review faculty seeking reappointment, promotion, tenure and/or early decisions. Teaching is the most important criterion for the reappointment and promotion of faculty members (Policy No: 1328, section 2.1, CBA Article 15.15-15.19). The faculty employee shall engage in a variety of teaching methods, including some or all of these: lectures, discussions, service learning, and studios. It is the candidate’s responsibility to demonstrate to the DRTPC how well they have done in the various assessment categories and outline their goals for the following year and how they are to be achieved. There is no formula for

this, each candidate is different and are expected to be creative within the strictures of the RTP criteria.

The DRTPC's review and rating shall be based on:

- a) Standardized student class evaluations
- b) Peer reviews In the classroom
- c) Assessments of the quality of instructional materials and exams
- d) Consideration of signed, dated, and bronco numbered student comments on teaching
- e) Candidate's self evaluation and materials

Candidates shall address a – d above in the self-evaluation of:

1. Quality of teaching
2. Quality and organization of instructional materials
3. Method for assessing learning outcomes and results
4. Innovation in teaching technique, development of new courses, substantial revisions of courses, multidisciplinary courses, service learning courses, on line courses
5. Effective student advising, senior project and/or master's thesis supervision.

Based on its review of all materials discussed in this section, the DRTPC will develop an assessment of the candidate's teaching.

### **Ratings:**

#### **Outstanding (Rating of 9 or 10)**

The faculty employee must have outstanding class evaluations. In multi-year assessments, the classification of "outstanding" indicates that the candidate scored a rating of 9 or 10, on average during the period under review. Outstanding means a very high average on the following: overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.0, strong peer reviews, demonstrated competence in all sub areas indicated previously in this document. Additionally, outstanding teaching demonstrated by at least one of the following accomplishments:

- Successful innovation in teaching methods such as combining new technologies or approaches to technology with studio or service learning courses,
- Development of courses in new areas of planning,
- Development of multidisciplinary courses in conjunction with other departments or the extension of service learning courses to new areas,
- Exceptional classroom techniques that clearly engage high student interest in the good overall peer reviews, and demonstrated competence in most sub areas.

#### **Excellent (Rating of 7 or 8)**

The faculty employee must have high student class evaluations; in multi-year assessments, the classification of "excellent" or higher (7 or 8) on average, for the period under review. The typical overall average on student evaluations for all questions should be below 2.2, strong peer reviews, demonstrated competence in all sub areas in this section, and excellent teaching demonstrated by such accomplishments as:



- Continual updating and improvement of courses, use of new technologies in the classroom
- Development of new classroom techniques,
- Good overall peer reviews, and demonstrated competence in most sub areas.

### **Good (Rating of 5 or 6)**

The candidate must have good class evaluations; in multi-year assessments, the classification of “good” or higher (5 or 6) – on average, for the period under review. The label “good” means an overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.5, good overall peer reviews, and demonstrated competence in most sub areas.

### **Fair (Rating of 3 or 4)**

This rating is the minimum required for reappointment to the 3rd. probationary year and is unacceptable for any succeeding action. In the classification of “fair” the “period under review” means one academic year. There can be no other years with this classification. A candidate receiving a fair rating has student class evaluations indicating significant areas of weakness, peer reviews indicating the need for substantial improvement in more than one of the three sub areas and a demonstrated lack of competence in more than two sub areas. Scores of “fair” or lower are cause for concern by the Department faculty. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

### **Poor (Rating of 0, 1 or 2)**

This rating is unacceptable for reappointment to the 3rd and succeeding probationary years and constitutes a rating by the DRTPC that indicates an unacceptable level of teaching as demonstrated in poor student class evaluations and peer reviews and an overall lack of competence in most sub areas. A score of “poor” is highly problematic; the candidate should seek the guidance of the Department RTP Committee members and the Department Chair. The faculty candidate should develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed in the future.

## **2. University Service**

University service includes activities that increase the quality of University governance, advance University initiatives, and/or increase the standing of the University in the larger community. It is the candidate’s responsibility to show how the goals listed in this category have been achieved and how they plan to address future goals. All faculty are expected to actively participate in the activities of the Department, College, and University and to show progressive involvement in them. The faculty employee must enumerate and indicate the significance of various contributions in the self-evaluation. Examples of contributions include Department, College, and University wide governance, administrative work, service on task forces, external committees, fund raising efforts, efforts to increase faculty and/or student diversity, and multidisciplinary activities. As in all categories, the DRTPC shall indicate whether the candidate is making adequate progress toward tenure.

## **Ratings:**

### **Outstanding (Rating of 9 or 10)**

Substantial service at the Department, College, and University level. In the case of comprehensive multi-year reviews, “outstanding” means that the candidate rates on average a 9 or 10 over the period of review. The classification of outstanding includes: lead role in at least one major University committee, task force, program, or project. Examples would include chairing a major University level committee or initiating a significant multidisciplinary University project. A rating of Outstanding indicates a leadership role and service well beyond what is expected that includes a very substantial time commitment.

### **Excellent (Rating of 7 or 8)**

Substantial service at the Department and/or College level for each year of the period under review, with active participation in at least one major University committee, task force, program, or project. In comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “excellent” means that the candidate has scored an average of 7 or 8 over the period of review. Examples would include chairing an important Department or College committee with participation on other Department committees while also serving on the University Faculty Senate or a major University committee.

### **Good (Rating of 5 or 6)**

Leadership (chairing) responsibilities in at least one Department committee and active participation in one or more additional College and/or University committees. In comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “good” means that the candidate has scored an average of 5 or 6 over the period under review. Examples would include chair of a Department committee such as the Curriculum Committee or any other committee where decisions may have a substantive effect on instruction or mission of the Department. Additionally, it would include service on one or more College and/or University committees.

### **Fair (Rating of 3 or 4)**

Membership and active service on one or more Department level committees with a similar level of participation in one or more committees at the College or University level. This rating is the minimum required for reappointment to the 4th probationary year and would indicate the need for substantial improvement in this area for further reappointments. In comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “fair” means that the candidate on average has scored 3 or 4 during the period of review, which is highly problematic in continuing the appointment. Scores of “fair” or lower are cause for concern by the Department faculty. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

### **Poor (Rating of 0, 1 or 2)**

Lack of active participation at all levels. A score of “poor” is highly problematic. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

### 3. Scholarly and Creative Activities

Faculty are expected to be leaders in their particular areas of interest. They should engage in research and other activities that enhance their knowledge and teaching ability, and that advances the state of knowledge in planning. As appropriate to their area of curricular specialization, faculty should seek funded research to enhance their capabilities, increase the base of externally funded support, and provide students with research and practice opportunities. Some examples of scholarly activities include attendance at academic conferences, presentations of papers at academic conferences, service as a referee for scholarly publications, and publications of articles, book chapters, book reviews, manuals, reports, and studies. Scholarship activities related to teaching and planning practice are welcomed along with basic research. Examples of creative activities include various forms of art and expression that document, comment on or seek to change the urban conditions.

#### **Ratings:**

##### **Outstanding (Rating of 9 or 10)**

A level of research and publication that brings national and/or international attention to the Department. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “outstanding” suggests a level of performance with scores – on average of 9 or 10 during the period of review. Examples would include receipt of a major externally funded research grant, publication of a new book concerning planning, a creative activity that garners national or international attention, an award from international, national competition, or publication of an average of more than one of the following for each year of the period under review: peer reviewed journal article, book chapter, professional study or report. Another form of evidence the candidate may provide is Google Scholar citation rates compared to peers in similar level institutions (e.g., teaching universities).

##### **Excellent (Rating of 7 or 8)**

A level of scholarly work that establishes the candidate’s influence in the profession, such as presentation of more than one significant paper at scholarly conferences, organizing a panel or roundtable at a state or national scholarly conference, publication of an article in a peer reviewed journal related to planning or of a book chapter, a research-based op-ed or social commentary that achieve national or state attention, a research-based magazine article or essay, a creative activity that garners statewide attention, an award from state or regional competition, or the completion of advanced training in the candidate’s curricular specialization or in a new area of research for each year of the period under review. Another form of evidence the candidate may provide is Google Scholar citation rates compared to peers in similar level institutions (e.g., teaching universities).

In multi-year reviews, the label of “excellent” means that the candidate – on average scores 7 or 8 during the period under review.

**Good (Rating of 5 or 6)**

A level of scholarly work that shows active scholarly participation, such as the presentation of a paper at conference related to planning related, juried or curated creative activities, participation in competitions at various levels, or completion of training that improves the candidate's use of technology or teaching techniques. It may include active participation as a peer reviewer for a major national journal or national. In multi-year reviews, the label of "good" means that the candidate has scored, on average 5 or 6 over the period under review.

**Fair (Rating of 3 or 4)**

Attendance at conferences and/or attendance at training sessions for faculty. In multi-year reviews, the label "fair" means that the candidate has scored, on average 3 or 4 over the period under review. Scores of "fair" or lower are cause for concern by the Department faculty. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

**Poor (Rating of 0, 1 or 2)**

A lack of active scholar activity. A score of "poor" is highly problematic. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

**4. Community Service**

Community service includes those activities that provide service to the regional and local community and increase the role of the Department and University in addressing community problems. The Department takes a proactive stance toward social equity, community change, and responsiveness to community needs, pursuing entrepreneurial initiatives where appropriate. This category of activity can include responsible positions in public, non-profit planning organizations, appointed or elected positions on boards and commissions, or consistent volunteer work with an organization. Contributions may also be the result of service learning, studio, or other instructional-based work of the candidate.

**Ratings:****Outstanding (Rating of 9 or 10)**

A level of service that is widely recognized in the community and has direct benefits to the Department and the University for each year of the period under review. Examples would include a position or appointment with significant decision-making responsibility, such as being a member of a city planning commission or advisory committee to a government agency, being a board member of a significant non-profit institution, or the initiation and continued participation in a significant community project. A rating of Outstanding indicates a leadership role and a substantial commitment of time. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the

label of “outstanding” suggests outstanding performance (an average of 9 or 10) for the period under review.

**Excellent (Rating of 7 or 8)**

A high level of responsible community service for each year of the period under review such as membership on an advisory board, substantial work on community service projects or neighborhood planning activities, or significant participation or advocacy on major public policy issues. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “excellent” suggests an average score of 7 or 8 during the period of review.

**Good (Rating of 5 or 6)**

Significant community service through work on community service projects or planning activities beyond mere dues paying or occasional participation. Examples also include significant public speaking to service organizations and participation in community affairs. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “good” suggests a score of 5 or 6, on average for the period under review.

**Fair (Rating of 3 or 4)**

Active membership or participation in community service organizations or projects. A rating of Fair indicates a lack of any leadership roles and a lack of substantial work in this area. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “fair” suggests a score of 3 or 4 – on average for the period under review. A consistent level of fair performance is highly problematic. Scores of “fair” or lower are cause for concern by the Department faculty. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

**Poor (Rating of 0, 1 or 2)**

Little if any active community service. A score of “poor” is highly problematic; the candidate should seek the guidance of the Department RTP Committee members and the Department Chair. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

**5. Professional Participation/Practice**

This category includes active participation and/or practice that advances the profession of planning at any scale. It includes work for professional planning organizations and organizations related to planning that are in the faculty member’s particular area of interest as well as innovative planning practice that furthers the profession of planning. Service with the American Planning Association or the American Institute of Certified Planners, presentations at professional forums, or AICP exam reviews are examples of participation and practice. Also, relevant are continuing education and extension work related to duties at the Department, College or University.

## **Ratings:**

### **Outstanding (Rating of 9 or 10)**

A level of professional participation that makes a significant contribution to the profession for each year of the period under review, such as successful service as an elected member of a national or state professional organization related to planning. Examples also include a professional project that is widely recognized (perhaps award winning) as innovative and as an outstanding contribution or example for the profession. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “outstanding” suggests a score of 9 or 10 – on average for the period under review.

### **Excellent (Rating of 7 or 8)**

Significant responsible participation in a national, state, or local branch of a professional organization for each year of the period under review, such as leading a task force or acting as a board member in an area related to the candidate’s curricular specialization or organizing and conducting a professional workshop or forum, such as the AICP exam workshop. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “excellent” suggests a score of 7 or 8 – on average for the period under re

### **Good (Rating of 5 or 6)**

Full participation in Department professional participation activities, such as being a speaker at a workshop or responsible involvement in a professional organization. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “good” suggests a score of 5 or 6 (on average) during the period under review.

### **Fair (Rating of 3 or 4)**

Some participation in Department professional participation activities and active membership in one or more professional organizations related to planning. In cases of comprehensive multi-year reviews, the label of “fair” suggests fair performance – on average of 3 or 4 during the period under review. Scores of “fair” or lower are cause for concern by the Department faculty. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.

### **Poor (Rating of 0, 1 or 2)**

Lack of active professional participation. A score of “poor” is highly problematic. The faculty candidate should consult the DRTP Committee and Department Chair to develop a plan of action on how this problem will be addressed over the next year.



## **V. EVALUATION OF FACULTY ON ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENT, SERVING IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE, OR ON ACADEMIC LEAVE**

The RTP Committee must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave with pay from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution. This specifically excludes faculty on leave with no pay. There can be no deviation from these policies for faculty serving in any of these extracurricular assignments without the written consent of DRTPC, Department Chair, Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and University President. The on the acceptability of any deviation from these policies.

Qualifying faculty are those who are seeking promotion, early action, tenure or are probationary. Standard self-assessment RTP packages addressing the DRTP criteria shall be submitted on the normal assessment cycle for probationary candidates, candidates seeking promotion, tenure or early action. Assignments may include one or more of the following for faculty who are:

1. Serving an administrative assignment
2. Serving in academic governance
3. On approved leave with pay from the University
4. On leave with no pay from the University (this is a highly unusual request from a faculty employee and is negotiated with the Department chair, Dean, Vice President for Faculty Affairs and the University President).

### **1. Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment**

For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of:

- Scholarly Activity,
- Professional Participation
- Service To The Community

and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department. Their University Service component may be satisfied by working on their administrative duties. Considerations are:

#### **a. Promotion**

For promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught Department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations for all courses taught in the previous year must be included in the RTP package.



**b. Reappointment or Tenure**

The candidate serving an administrative assignment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department. At least 8 of the WTU's must be for courses where the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations for all courses taught in the previous year must be included in the RTP package.

**2. Faculty Serving in Academic Governance**

For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment shall provide evidence of:

- Scholarly Activity,
- Professional Participation
- Service To The Community

and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their academic governance duties. Considerations are:

**a. Promotion**

For promotion, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught Department courses equivalent to 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTU's must be for courses where the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations must be included in the RTP package.

**b. Reappointment or Tenure**

The candidate serving in academic governance and has reassigned time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department. At least 8 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

**3. Faculty on Approved Leave with Pay from the University**

Faculty on leave with pay that has been approved by the President of the University are on "approved leave." For purposes of this section, qualifying faculty may be on full-time or part-time leave from the University.

**a. Probationary Tenure Track Candidates**

The probationary status is still active and the tenure track "clock" is still active. This means that the DRTPC, Dean, URTPC, Vice President for Academic Affairs will make

a recommendation for or against tenure to the sixth year (assuming no early action is requested). Faculty Seeking Promotion

For promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at this University, Department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.

**b. Faculty Seeking Reappointment or Tenure**

The candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the Department at this University. At least 8 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirement at this University.

**c. Faculty on Leave with no Pay from the University**

The purpose for this unusual request from the Department and University administration may be to stop the probationary assessment cycle "clock." Thereby allowing the candidate to return in the near future assuming the responsibilities of a tenure track faculty at the probationary year status in which they left. This is a negotiation between the candidate, Department Chair, Dean, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University President. The status of the probationary assessment process (clock) is the decision of the President.

For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty on approved leave shall provide evidence of (a) Scholarly Activities, (b) Professional Participation/Practice and (c) Service to the Community. These faculty shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department. Research and scholarly activity done at another institution, whether alone or in collaboration with others, can be examined by DRTPC for the purposes of fulfilling the Department's criteria. Visitation to another institution does not relieve the candidate of the service requirement at this University.

## **VI. REAPPOINTMENTS, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY**

### **Probationary Faculty**

Reappointment means that the candidate is re-applying for the next probationary year – in the case of tenure-track appointees. Reappointment, beyond the initial appointment period for any faculty, is not automatic and must be requested.

### **Tenure Track Faculty**

Reappointment must take place at the beginning of the last year of the initial appointment period.

- Tenure-track candidates successful in obtaining reappointment will be reappointed to the next probationary year.
- Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their first or second tenure-track probationary year will be granted termination effective at the end of the current academic year.
- Candidates who are unsuccessful in obtaining reappointment and are currently in their third, fourth, fifth year will be granted reappointment with terminal year.

Tenure is the status conferred on the candidate by the University which grants continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Tenure must be requested at the beginning of the sixth probationary year or earlier if the candidate seeks early tenure. Candidates successful in obtaining tenure will be reappointed with tenure. Failure to obtain tenure at the end of the sixth probationary year results in the granting of reappointment to a terminal year.

### **Promotion**

A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. However, a faculty unit employee in the rank of instructor may be considered for promotion after completing one year of service in rank. Probationary faculty unit employees shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate Professor. A probationary faculty unit employee shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time they are considered for tenure. The promotion of a tenured faculty unit employee shall normally be effective the beginning of the sixth (6th) year after appointment to their current academic rank/classification. In such cases, the performance review for promotion shall take place during the year preceding the effective date of the promotion. This provision shall not apply if the faculty unit employee requests in writing that s/he not be considered (CBA Articles 14.2, 14.3 and 14.4).

### **Temporary Faculty**

Reappointment for temporary faculty unit employees means that the employee is applying for another one, two or more year contract (consisting of one or more quarters per year). It includes faculty currently on a three year contract and seeking another three year contract.

## VII. THE FACULTY EMPLOYEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

All RTP requests are initiated by the candidate. If the candidate is eligible for an RTP action (e.g. reappointment, early promotion, tenure) she/he is expected to notify in writing the DRTPC and Department Chair of the request for consideration. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then it is the responsibility of the faculty employee to notify the RTP Committee and Department Chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action. Associated with these responsibilities, the candidate also should become familiar with CBA Article 10: Grievance Procedures).

Prior to the beginning of the review process, the faculty unit employee subject to review shall be responsible for the identification of materials s/he wishes to be considered as well as materials required by campus policy and for the submission of such materials as may be accessible to him/her. Evaluating committees and administrators shall be responsible for identifying and providing materials relating to evaluation (not provided by the employee.) required by campus policy but not accessible to the employee. (CBA Article 15.12a)

In the self-evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references to the Department RTP criteria. If the faculty employee is requesting reappointment, there must be clear and explicit evidence of progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. A useful resource for this item may be the goals established elsewhere in the RTP criteria document.

### **Setting Professional/Academic Goals in the RTP Package**

In addition to the narrative self-assessment in the five areas previously noted, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide clear and attainable goals (short and long term) for the five assessment areas. When realized, the goals will make a strong case for the granting of tenure and/or promotion. This shall be done in ALL self-evaluations up to the tenure decision. Each self-assessment will refer to the previous year's goals and demonstrate how they were or were not achieved and establish new evolving goals that respond to the candidate's history and the Department's needs. At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups. A candidate for promotion or early tenure may withdraw the request, without prejudice, at any level of review.

### **Deadlines**

A specific deadline before the recommendation is made at the first level of evaluation shall be established by campus policy, at which time the Working Personnel Action File is declared complete with respect to documentation of performance for the purpose of evaluation. Insertion of material after the date of this declaration other than faculty and administrative evaluations generated during the evaluation cycle and responses or rebuttals by the faculty unit employee being evaluated must have the approval of a peer review committee designated by the campus and shall be limited to items that became accessible after this declaration. Copies of the added material shall be provided to the faculty unit employee. Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee for review, evaluation and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review. If, during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the Working Personnel Action File shall be

returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.

Relevant deadlines are published by the University in the RTP process calendar; which is distributed early in the Fall Semester by the Office of Faculty Affairs. Faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion or early action are apprised of deadlines in the RTP Criteria document distributed by the Department Chair in early Fall Semester (see the Section IX – Department's responsibilities).

## **VIII. DEPARTMENT REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCESS**

The Department RTP Committee is responsible for ensuring the integrity of the RTP process within the Department. The Committee structure and function shall conform to Policy No: 1328, section 3.1. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (15.2) restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members and, if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). The RTP committees shall not be solely comprised of faculty participating in the FERP. The CBA permits consideration of information from other faculty, students, and academic administrators. Those eligible for RTP committee membership shall be full-time tenured faculty and, if requested by the department and approved by the President, faculty participating in FERP. This group is hereinafter called the "full-time tenured faculty and FERP faculty."

### **Department RTP Document/Criteria**

The Department Chair shall make available, no later than 14 days after the first day of Fall Semester, to all RTP candidates and the DRTPC the Department RTP Document that the candidate is eligible to use. Copies of these documents are available in the Faculty Affairs Office. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the candidate during the evaluation process. (CBA, Article 15.3)

The DRTPC is responsible for ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and that a copy of each written evaluation is submitted to the faculty member within two weeks of the class visit. (Policy No. 1328)

The individual faculty member being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place unless, at the request of the faculty member being evaluated, a shorter time is provided. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits.

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

- Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations.
- Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Policy No: 1328.
- Written self-evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements).
- Signed and dated material received from other faculty, administrators, and students; students must also add their Bronco ID number (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package). The faculty member shall be allowed at least ten calendar days to provide a rebuttal. Comments received after a RTP cycle deadline would be taken into consideration in the next evaluation cycle.

- Material requested from the candidate by the Committee which include requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package.
- Other material, in writing, identified by source (submitted to the Committee before the closing date).

It is the DRTPC's responsibility to ensure the integrity of the process and to provide arguments for each rating with concrete suggestions for improvement.

### **Appeal of Department and College Dean's Recommendations**

Only when a candidate believes the recommendation of the DRTPC to have been based upon a violation of Department RTP procedures and/or upon a misapplication of Department RTP criteria may he/she appeal as indicated in below.

Within ten calendar days after receiving notification of the DRTPC's recommendations, the candidate may submit his/her appeal to the College RTP Committee. The appeal shall consist of a written statement, with supporting evidence that addresses violation(s) of Department procedures and/or misapplication(s) of Department RTP criteria by the DRTPC.

The College RTP Committee, after receipt of all documentation on the candidate and from the DRTPC, shall weigh the evidence. The CRTPC shall arrange, upon request of the candidate, for a meeting with the DRTPC and the candidate. If the CRTPC determines that there has not been a violation or misapplication, the candidate and the DRTPC concerned shall be so informed. If the CRTPC determines that there has been a violation or misapplication, the CRTPC will notify the DRTPC of the nature of the violation. If the DRTPC acknowledges the alleged error, it shall take the necessary steps to correct the violation or misapplication and shall forward to the CRTPC all pertinent data, including corrections in procedures involving criteria or changes in recommendations. If the DRTPC alleges that no error exists, the CRTPC will forward its recommendation along with the DRTPC's recommendation to the College Dean. (Policy No: 1328).

The Dean will make comments and recommendations, which may be appealed to the University RTP Committee. If an appeal is made, the candidate shall have ten calendar days in which to do so.

The University RTP Committee shall review the RTP package and make comments and recommendations to the Provost who as the President's designee makes final decisions on all packages.

In summary, candidates, shall be given all comments and recommendations at all levels of review for comment, but appealed only at the Department and/or College Dean level.

## PART 2 – APPENDICES

### Appendix A

#### Definition of Terms

**Advising/mentoring** – All faculty are assigned a group of students who will need “academic advising” specifically about the Department’s curriculum and sometimes about the “General Education” portion of the curriculum. They may have general questions about their GPA’s, course transfers from other Universities, progress through the University curriculum, how to change grades, repeating courses to replace an “F” grade, etc. The sources for this information are other Department faculty (especially the Department Chair) and the official University Catalog.

**Appendix 10 and Policy No: 1328** – refers to portions of the official University Policy regarding a wide variety of personnel actions, definitions, constraints, etc. In instances of disagreement with University policy, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (California Faculty Association – “union” contract) takes precedence in evaluation of faculty. See Collective Bargaining Agreement, below.

**Article** – refers to various numbered portions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (California Faculty Association – “union” contract) that relate to evaluation of faculty.

**Candidate** – interchangeable with “faculty employee,” “faculty unit employee,” or “employee.”

**Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)** – a binding contract between the California Faculty Association and the California State University system.

**College Reappointment Tenure and Promotion Committee (CRTPC)** – composed of associate and/or full professors who review RTP documents only when there is disagreement between the DRTP committee and the probationary faculty member; they make recommendations to the Dean.

**Department Reappointment Tenure and Promotion Committee (DRTPC)** – composed of associate and/or full professors who review RTP documents and make recommendations to the Dean.

**Early Action** – when a candidate requests promotion or tenure before the generally allotted time frame created by the University. An example of this is when a candidate requests a decision on tenure before the sixth year reappointment (which includes a decision on tenure).

**Lecturer** – See “Temporary Faculty.”

**Probationary Faculty Employee** – a faculty member who is not tenured, but has all the committee assignment that a tenured faculty member has.

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching Performance** – Policy No: 1328 and more generally the CBA (15) specifically require probationary faculty to be assessed in teaching performance by a “peer” evaluation. This includes faculty applying for promotion, tenure and tenure. It requires that a tenured



faculty member visit at least two of the candidate's classes (one class visit per course) in the span of one academic year. The candidate may request additional peer reviews. The faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five days in advance that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es).

**Period of Review** – depends on the candidates' requested action. In requests for reappointment to the 3rd, 4th or 5th probationary year (specifically excluding request for tenure, promotion or early action), the period of review shall be the previous academic year in which the request is made. An example of the previous academic year is if a requested action is made in Fall 2020, the previous academic year includes:

1. Summer and Fall semesters – 2019
2. Spring semesters – 2020.

The period of review for promotion (specifically excluding a request for tenure or early action) should be the time period that has passed since the last application was made for the same or a similar action. For example, if a candidate is requesting a promotion from associate professor to full professor in Fall 2020, the period of review starts in the semester they began serving in the rank of associate professor.

The application package includes all material for the entire period, including student course evaluations.

Application packages for tenure or early action are comprehensive, beginning in the first quarter the candidate began teaching at the University.

At all levels of review it serves the candidate well to reflect on progress made (on the five areas of review, including teaching, service to the community, etc.) beyond the minimum number of academic years requested.

**Personnel Action File (PAF)** – the “working Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion file” holds all relevant documents used in an assessment of a faculty employee's professional efforts while on this campus. This is the most important file with which a faculty employee should become familiar. Information in the PAF can be used in a candidate's assessment. Information not in the PAF may not be used in the evaluation of a faculty employee. See also, CBA Articles 2.17, 11 and 15 for a more comprehensive list of definitions and rights of faculty.

**Probationary Faculty** – The term probationary faculty unit employee refers to a full-time faculty unit employee appointed with probationary status and serving a period of probation. This position specifically excludes faculty who are tenured.

**Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Package** – It is the “Working Personnel Action File” (PAF). It is used for a self-evaluation and is used by the DRTP Committee, Department Chair, dean, University RTP Committee, Vice President for Academic Affairs and University President when reviewing a faculty employee's professional efforts.

**Service Learning** – Integrating field work with a “client” (City, non-profit organization, etc.) into the syllabus with a final product produced by the students.

**Service Area** – there are five service areas a candidate will be assessed on. They are:

1. Teaching,
2. Service to the university community and three other areas that are referenced elsewhere in this document as “three non-teaching areas.” These are:
  - a. Scholarly Activities,
  - b. Professional Participation/Practice, And
  - c. Service To The Community.

**Temporary Faculty** – non-tenure track faculty with temporary appointments for periods of a quarter, parts of a year, one or more years. They may be teaching full or part-time (CBA Article 12). This includes faculty who have taught two or more quarters, irrespective of a break in service. Or, a faculty member with a three-year appointment (full or part-time) who is not on a tenure track position, but taught during the prior academic year. Additional responsibilities may be conveyed on any person that is classified as a temporary faculty member. These responsibilities may go beyond teaching, such as student advising, committee and/or administrative assignments.

**University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC)** – a University wide committee; composed of professors who make recommendations to the Provost and President.

## Appendix B

### RTP Package Tracking Process

At every level of review, the candidate will receive comments and recommendations based solely on the Personnel Action File (an RTP package is considered a “working” Personnel Action File).

At all levels of review, the candidate shall see comments and recommendations; s/he may comment in return. Appeals are reserved for the DRTPC comments and recommendations and Dean’s comments and recommendations. All recommendations and comments shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation.

The candidate shall have the right to comment or submit an appeal in writing no later than ten calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all responses and/or appeals shall accompany the package as it is forwarded to higher levels of review.

The candidate may request an opportunity to discuss the recommendation with the recommending group or individual, who shall honor such a request  
(CBA Article 15.5).

1. Candidate writes self-evaluation based on the Department’s RTP Criteria and submits it to the Department Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee (DRTPC).
2. The package is returned to the candidate for review who may comment or appeal the DRTPC’s comments and recommendations to the College RTP Committee. The candidate has up to ten calendar days to do this.
3. The candidate reviews the College RTPC comments and recommendations and may choose to comment in return. There is no appeal at this level.
4. If the College RTPC finds a misapplication in Department Criteria or other error in process or procedures, the package is returned to the DRTPC for corrective action. If there is no appeal to the DRTPC’s assessment of the candidate’s performance, the package is forwarded directly to the College Dean.
5. The Department Chair independently reviews the RTP package based on the DRTP Criteria and makes comments and recommendations. These are returned to the candidate who has 10 days to comment, if he/she chooses. The Department Chair forwards his/her review and any response from the candidate directly to the College Dean for inclusion in the candidate’s package.

6. The package is forwarded to the College Dean. The College Dean makes comments and recommendations.
7. The package is returned to the candidate for review, who may comment and appeal the Dean's comments and recommendations. The candidate may take up to ten calendar days to do this.
8. The package is submitted to the University RTP Committee. The URTPC reviews, comments and make recommendations.
9. The URTPC's comments are sent back to the candidate for review and comments, if any. There is no appeal at this level. The candidate may insert a written response into the package and may also request a meeting with the URTPC.
10. The package is submitted to the Provost who as the President's designee shall make the final decision on reappointment, tenure and/or early action.

## Appendix C

### Personnel Action File

Documents in the PAF may be placed there by the faculty employee, RTP Committee, Department Chair, College or University official reviewing the faculty member. The most common document in the PAF is the candidate's self-evaluation. See Appendix D for CFA recommended contents that faculty employees may want in their official PAF. Recommendations or decisions relating to reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall be based entirely on the PAF (*CBA Articles 11.1, 15.12c and 15.8*)

Consequent recommendations and actions – at any level shall be based solely on approved Department RTP criteria. The University president shall make final decisions on reappointment, tenure and promotions (*CBA, Article 15.47*).

The primary responsibility for the achievement of RTP goals lies entirely with the faculty employee for a specific action like reappointment, promotion, tenure or early action (Policy No. 1328). The employee is responsible for the identification of supplementary materials they wish to be considered for review, such as a teaching portfolio and publications. All of this supplementary information must be in the PAF – before evaluation deadlines. Material placed in the file after deadlines by anyone may not be considered in the evaluation. An index of all supplementary materials may be placed in the PAF instead of the actual documents. Letters received by the DRTPC from students, faculty, and administrators of RTP actions shall also be included in the PAF, as well as the candidate's responses to such letters. Evaluating committees and administrators shall be responsible for identifying and providing materials relating to evaluation not provided by the faculty employee. Any such materials shall be placed in the candidate's RTP package. All material in the PAF supplied by students, faculty, committees or administrators must be dated and signed by the candidate. Documents that are not dated and signed by the employee may still be used in the evaluation if the employee saw the documents and chose not to sign them. An employee's signature on a document in the RTP package does not suggest approval, but only that they have seen the information. It is entirely the responsibility of the faculty employee to comment on any information placed in the PAF or "working PAF – RTP package.

## Appendix D

### California Faculty Association Recommendations of Records that Lecturers and New Faculty Should Have in their PAF

Source: [www.cpp.edu/~cfa/faculty\\_info.html](http://www.cpp.edu/~cfa/faculty_info.html)

#### 1. Lecturers

Records each Lecturer should maintain:

- Letter of appointment
- Letter(s) of reappointment
- List of courses taught in the department, by semester; the list should include the course number and title, and the number of WTUs for each course.
- Up-to-date Vita
- Departmental Criteria for Evaluation
- Periodic Evaluations , include any rebuttals you made
- All letters of commendation, particularly letters referencing excellent teaching
- For each class taught, by semester:
  - Course Syllabus
  - All Assignments
  - All Tests, Quizzes; Final Exam Include Some Samples Of Your Grading Of These
  - Grades
  - Student Evaluations, (If Administered)
  - Peer Evaluations (Classroom Visits), If Conducted, And Rebuttals, If Any

#### 2. All RTP Candidates In General

- Letter of appointment.
- Letter(s) of reappointment.
- List of courses taught in the department, by semester; the list should include the course number and title, and the number of WTUs for each course.
- Up-to-date Vita.
- Departmental Criteria for Evaluation.
- Periodic Evaluations , include any rebuttals you made.
- All letters of commendation, particularly letters referencing excellent teaching.
- Complete RTP packages for each year , include a copy of the President's letter
- For each class taught, by semester:
  - course syllabus
  - all assignments
  - all tests, quizzes; final exam include some samples of your grading of these grades
  - student evaluations, (if administered)
  - peer evaluations (classroom visits), if conducted, and rebuttals, if any
  - Department RTP document in effect your first year
  - All Peer Reviews , include any rebuttals you made.

### 3. RTP Candidates; in Particular – New Faculty

#### For This Year

- Use the correct department RTP document.
- Verify eligibility for action(s) requested: If there is any conflict between the information provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and your department, check with an administrator in the Faculty Affairs office.
- In your self-evaluation, address the criteria in your department's RTP document.
- Your self-evaluation of teaching should include a discussion of your teaching philosophy.
- Your self-evaluation of both service and professional growth should include a discussion (in narrative form) of how your activities satisfy your department's criteria. A list of activities is not sufficient.
- For professional activities give complete citations, particularly for presentations you make and for all publications.
- REMEMBER, the final decision will be made by the President (or Provost). You must convince him/her that you deserve the action(s) you are requesting.

#### Documents To Keep For Future Reference:

- Letter of appointment.
- Any additional correspondence about your position or your work at Cal Poly
- Complete RTP packages for each year.
- Include all Peer Reviews – include any rebuttals you made.
- For each class taught, by semester:
  - Course Syllabus;
  - All Assignments;
  - All Tests, Quizzes; Final Exam; And
  - Grades (Copy Of Grade Sheet).
- Student evaluations, (if administered).
- Peer evaluations (classroom visits), if conducted; [and your response, if any].
- Any correspondence with administrators or chairs regarding students or teaching issues