

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Academic year 2007-2008

Retention, Tenure and Promotion

I. INTRODUCTION

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

University policies including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Appendixes 10 and 16 of the University Manual define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

I.1. Definitions: For the purposes of clarity an expanded list of definitions – extracted from Appendix 16 of the University Manual- can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

I.2. Department Philosophy and Guidelines: Candidates will be evaluated for teaching performance, professional development, scholarly activity and service at any organizational level within the university and the community. In evaluating a candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion the review groups will consider these evaluation areas in light of the candidate's reappointment level, past performance, and improvement. However, a candidate whose performance during the current review cycle in teaching is deficient will not receive a positive recommendation.

In addition, the RTP criteria also address the following circumstances: consideration of performance in the area of student advising/mentoring; peer evaluation of teaching performance; provision for the evaluation of faculty serving in administrative positions or

performing administrative duties; provision for evaluation of faculty serving in academic governance, and consideration of the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution.

Candidates are required to assemble a RTP package which documents accomplishments and makes a positive case for the requested action. In preparation of this package and before submittal, the candidate is invited to seek counsel from the Department RTP Committee regarding the preparation of the RTP package.

II. PROCEDURES

II.1. Appendix 16 University Manual

Candidates are referred to Appendix 16 for detailed descriptions of RTP procedures.

II.2. The Roles of the Department Committee and Chair

The Department RTP Committee is responsible for insuring the integrity of the RTP process within the Department. The committee structure and function shall conform to Appendix 16, Section 305.301 of the University Manual. A minimum of three tenured faculty shall constitute the committee; however, all tenured faculty will be members of the DRTP Committee unless they specifically request not to be involved in the RTP process. Since all eligible faculty constitute the DRTP Committee no formal elections will be held. The Department Chair will also be a member of the committee and no separate Chair's evaluation will be submitted. Faculty on Professional Leave With Pay (sabbatical and difference in pay) may participate in committee activities. In the event an insufficient number (minimum of three) of departmental faculty are available, the College RTPC, in consultation with the DRTPC, will appoint the additional members from other departments within the College of Science.

No committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Also, in promotion considerations, the committee members must have higher rank than those being considered for promotion. Tenured, candidates being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on any committee considering promotion or tenure actions. However, tenured candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the committee.

The committee shall elect a chair – usually during winter quarter- who shall be responsible for ensuring the provisions of the Departmental RTP document and Appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual are carried out.

II.2.1 The Department RTP Chair shall perform the following duties:

- A. Give written notice to each candidate who is eligible for a regular RTP action;
- B. Insure that each faculty member has a copy of the current, approved RTP criteria;
- C. Present to the RTP candidates all appropriate forms;
- D. Shall post a copy of the current approved Department RTP document in the Department office or Department's WEB page;
- E. Provide each RTP candidate a copy of the University RTP Calendar for the current academic year;
- F. Provide a copy of the Department RTP Document to each RTP candidate and to new faculty who will need the document for preparation of their RTP package the following academic year;
- G. Retain copies of past, approved RTP criteria for the purposes of evaluating candidates who choose to be evaluated by criteria which were current at the time of the candidate's initial appointment; these will be made available to the DRTPC if required;
- H. Schedule, in concert with the RTP candidates, the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance;
- I. Be the official custodian of the candidate's RTP package between the submission of the package to the committee by the candidate and forwarding of the package to the Dean. In this period, the committee chair and only the committee chair shall be responsible for any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package and notification of the appropriate parties of any additions or changes.

II.2.2 The committee's duties include the following:

- A. Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to Department and University policy;
- B. Soliciting input from students by publicizing names of candidates for RTP action and names to whom signed statements may be submitted;
- C. Evaluating the candidate's request for a RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.

II.2.3 Committee Actions

The committee shall evaluate the candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions for each of the candidate's request for action:

- A. Reappointment to next probationary year,

- B. Reappointment with tenure,
- C. Reappointment with early tenure,
- D. Promotion to requested rank,
- E. Early promotion to requested rank,
- F. Termination (unavailable to candidates currently in 1st or 2nd probationary year),
- G. Reappointment with terminal year (available to candidates in 3rd, 4th, 5th or 6th probationary year),
- H. Deny promotion,
- I. Deny early promotion,
- J. Deny early tenure.

II.2.4 Committee Guidelines

Decisions must be supported and shall address all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the committee by the candidate or requested by the committee from the candidate. No conditions or contingencies can be attached to the decision.

The committee, in their evaluation of the candidate's request, shall consider information from the following sources:

II.2.4.1 Summaries and interpretations of student's evaluations in accordance with Appendix 10 and Appendix 16 Section 305.302 of the University Manual;

II.2.4.2 Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Appendix 16, Section 305.303 of the University Manual;

II.2.4.3 Self evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);

II.2.4.4 Signed material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the candidate's RTP package);

II.2.4.5 Material requested from the candidate by the committee including requests for clarification, corrections to or augmentation of any section/part of the RTP package;

II.2.4.6 Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the committee before the closing date.

II.3. METHODS OF EVALUATION

The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria set forth in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless by mutual documented agreement by the candidate, the committee, the University RTP Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost).

Criteria for reappointment decisions shall be the criteria that were in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus. Candidates for tenure or promotion may use either the Departmental RTP criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of probationary service on this campus or the Departmental RTP criteria in effect in the year the candidate requests action. If a candidate requests simultaneous consideration for both promotion and tenure, the candidate must select a single set of criteria. Once the evaluation process has started, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the candidate.

The deliberations of the committee shall remain confidential. Each committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the committee. The committee shall not assign any of its duties to any other group or individual.

The candidate is evaluated in three areas; **teaching, scholarship, and service**. Teaching is considered the most important component of a candidate's evaluative qualities.

II.3.1. Evaluation of **teaching** includes the following items:

II.3.1.1 Pedagogy

II.3.1.2 Content

II.3.1.3 Organization

II.3.2. Evaluation of **Professional Growth and Development** includes the following items:

II.3.2.1 Research

II.3.2.2 Grants

II.3.2.3 Other

II.3.3. Evaluation of **Service** includes the following items:

II.3.2.4 Department Service

II.3.2.5 College Service

II.3.2.6 University Service

II.3.2.7 Service Learning Activities

II.3.2.8 Community Service

III. CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTIONS

The committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place near the Department office, of the names of candidates requesting a RTP action, the type of request made, and the name of the individual to who signed comments or recommendations can be given. This posting will take place within one (1) week of notification of the DRTPC chair by the candidate that he/she will request a RTP action. Signed comments will be accepted up to the time the committee starts its evaluation of the candidate's request.

The committee will make its evaluation of the candidate's request in writing on University approved forms. The chair of the committee will review with the candidate the results of the committee's evaluation. The candidate will then be given the opportunity to either accept the committee's recommendation, or to submit within seven (7) working days either a response/rebuttal or request a reconsideration (Section 305.703E, Appendix 16 of the University Manual). If the candidate does not acknowledge the recommendations of the committee, the Department Chair shall forward the RTP package to the next level of review along with notification that the candidate was told of the committee's evaluation and recommendation and refused to acknowledge them.

The request for reconsideration of the committee's recommendation must address only the issues raised by the committee. The committee cannot refuse a request for reconsideration.

In the request for reconsideration, the candidate must clearly deal with each issue raised by the committee and show how the facts clearly show that the original opinion of the candidate must be sustained, and where the committee was in error when it examined the same or related facts. Brevity and clarity are encouraged since this request for reconsideration will become part of the RTP package and be examined by the committee and other review groups.

If the committee does not act favorably upon the candidate's request for reconsideration, the candidate has five working days, from the receipt of notification, to appeal to the College RTP Committee for reconsideration of the *DRTP* committee's decision. Appeal is not obligatory. The candidate is advised to consult Appendix 16, Sections 305.703E and 305.801 of the University Manual. In addition to, or in lieu of a formal appeal to the College RTP Committee, the candidate may submit a response or rebuttal statement to the committee's final recommendation to be included in the RTP package.

The Geological Sciences Department requires student evaluations for courses taught by RTP candidates. The approved procedures for carrying out these evaluations can be found in section III.1.1.1 and in Appendix 2. This appendix contains copies of the approved student evaluation forms.

The student evaluation policy shall be uniformly enforced for all candidates. That policy requires a minimum of yearly evaluations for each specific course taught by the candidate and encourages evaluations in each and every class. If the committee or Department do not enforce the student evaluation policy, then the candidate is responsible for two student evaluations per academic

year. The results of the evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personal Action File.

The Department requires peer review of teaching performance. Peer evaluation of teaching performance shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught by the candidate. Only peer evaluations conducted either prior to or during the period under consideration may be used for that period's deliberations. Exceptions may be allowed if the candidate does not have the minimum number of evaluations. See III.1.1.2 below.

III.1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION

Appropriate maximum point values have been agreed upon and assigned to each of the component activities within the major categories above. When a faculty member is subject to one of the RTP evaluations, the Department committee will assign points germane to the category, based on a professional judgment of the quality of the activity and how well it meets the intent of the given criteria.

The point values assigned by the evaluators as well as the justification for the awarded points will be used to rank order and make final recommendations. In the event two RTP candidates for the same action have similar point totals, teaching points will determine the final ranking.

For the Reappointment process, points are earned on a yearly basis and minimum criteria are reported as per year values the candidate is expected to achieve. The criteria used shall be those in effect at the time of the candidate starts the first year of probationary service. For the Tenure and Promotion processes, the points assigned, in all categories except Teaching, are given as **cumulative** totals for the cycle. An exception is made for Early Promotion or Tenure when the candidate can provide data only for a partial cycle. In this case, the points required would be attained by the time the Early Action is requested.

It is important for the candidate to recognize that this document describes standards of performance. While points must be accumulated in all areas, the goals specified below are considered by the Department to be appropriate levels of performance. It is important to understand that the Department RTP process evaluates and makes judgments of the candidate overall. The evaluators recognize under certain circumstances the candidate could earn point values less than the stated minimum in a particular category and still be recommended for the subject action except as specified below. This would be justifiable if point values in the other categories are above those normally required. A hypothetical case might be a candidate who writes and receives a major grant in his or her field. During the period of active grant-funded research it is possible that his or her university service may be less than the norm yet the candidate could receive a positive recommendation. However, under no circumstances will positive recommendations for requested actions be made if the candidate's *teaching points* fall below the specified minimum.

The Geological Sciences Department requires that a candidate for Tenure or Promotion attain a specified *average* of teaching points for the pertinent RTP action. However, the Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) also recognizes that it is equally important for a candidate to show progressive improvement in teaching skills as demonstrated by the quality of yearly evaluations during the RTP cycles.

Existing university policy allows candidates to apply for *early actions*. Requests for Early Actions are not treated as routine personnel matters. Although allowed under the regulations governing RTP matters, requests for actions in advance of the normal cycle(s) will be entertained only under the most exceptional circumstances. Candidates for early actions must document *extraordinary performance in all areas of evaluation*.

III.1.1. Teaching

A maximum of 30 points may be earned per year for teaching. Three avenues will be used to evaluate the candidate's teaching. These are: 1) student evaluations (both formal course evaluations and signed, written comments, 2) classroom visitations by Department faculty, and 3) self evaluation. In each of the three areas immediately above up to 30 points may be assigned. A weighted average using percentages specified in each of the sections below is then calculated with a 30 point maximum award (as above).

III.1.1.1. Student evaluations - Formal student evaluations are required by the Department for classes taught by probationary faculty (See Appendix 2). In addition, students are permitted to submit signed written comments on faculty performance to the Department Chair in accordance with the guidelines established in Section 5. Written comments will be evaluated by the DRTP committee. **(45% of Teaching points).**

Guidelines for carrying out course evaluations can be found on the evaluation forms. The following information should be announced to the students participating in the evaluations:

- a. No written comments on class evaluation forms can be considered by the RTP committee. Written comments may be made, but they will be read only by the course instructor. No form of student identification is permitted on course evaluation forms.
- b. The evaluations will not be available to the evaluated faculty member until after final course grades have been submitted.
- c. The evaluations will be collected by a designated student (or another faculty member) from the class and will be delivered to the Department secretary who in turn will deliver them to the computer center for processing.

Candidate's are responsible for including summaries of all courses evaluated during the RTP cycle in the Appendix of their RTP document. The DRTP committee will examine those summaries and award the pertinent points. The procedure for awarding points is as follows:

- All summaries will be entered in a spreadsheet and an overall average for the evaluation period calculated for Questions 1-5 and 8. Questions 6 and 7 will not be considered.
- Points will be awarded relative to the calculated averages:
 - 1-1.5 = 4 points
 - 1.51-2.5 = 3 points
 - 2.51-.3.5 = 2 points
 - 3.51-4.5 = 1 point
- These points will then be summed (maximum would be 24 points) and normalized to account for 45% of the teaching points.

Candidates for early actions are also subject to ranking based on Student Evaluations. For instance, a candidate for early tenure must not only achieve the specified point total to qualify for the requested action, but must also document a consistent ranking in the top 10% of the discipline. The candidate must tabulate data for the evaluation cycle and show that the mandated performance level has been obtained.

III.1.1.2. Peer Evaluations - Peer evaluation shall include classroom visits and a review of course syllabus and relevant course materials. As a courtesy to the candidate classroom visits should be scheduled at least a week in advance unless the candidate agrees to other arrangements. A minimum of two peer reviews per year, in different quarters, is required. It is the responsibility of the RTP candidate in consultation with the DRTP Chair is schedule the appropriate evaluations. In the event a candidate teaches upper division courses, one of the two required visitations must be to an upper division class. A written summary of the classroom visit shall be placed in the candidate's PAF within two (2) weeks of the class visit (see Appendix 3). A copy of the summary will also be given to the candidate. Any GSC Department faculty member may make classroom visitations to evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness. Comments should address the criteria outlined below. Teaching points are to be awarded in accordance with these guidelines. Peer evaluators may not award more than 30 teaching points to a candidate. Since the evaluation of teaching is as much a qualitative process as a quantitative one, written comments can make useful additional contributions to the DRTPC summaries of teaching effectiveness. **(50% of Teaching points).**

Peer evaluators will utilize the form from Appendix 3 of this document. The categories of evaluation and points to be awarded will be discussed below. There will be eight areas of evaluation and points will be awarded

on the basis of the Very Good (4pts), Good (3pts), Satisfactory (2 pts), Poor (1pt) and Very Poor (0pts). These are the same evaluation ratings utilized for student evaluations. While it is not the purpose of this document to dictate the assignment of points by peer evaluators the following criteria should be kept in mind for each rating category:

Very Good: The candidate should exceed the expectations the of peer evaluator. He/she should clearly demonstrate outstanding effectiveness in communicating and elucidating course content.

Good: The candidate meets the expectations of the evaluator. He/she should be an effective classroom teacher and be able to convey the material to the students in a manner they can comprehend. Good should be taken as the minimum standard all GSC instructors strive for. For the evaluator, a “good” instructor must be up to the standards you would set for your own courses.

Satisfactory: A satisfactory rating should be given when the candidate is adequately addressing the evaluation criteria, but where there is room for improvement. Peer evaluators should use the comments section of the form to suggest improvements to the candidate’s performance.

Poor: A poor rating implies that the RTP candidate has serious deficiencies that require immediate attention and/or mitigation. These shortcomings should be addressed by the evaluator with suggestions for improvement. The DRPT Committee will monitor the candidate to make sure corrective actions are undertaken. Consistently poor ratings are unacceptable for promotion and tenure.

Very Poor: A rating of “very poor” implies that the candidate’s efforts are unacceptable. This rating is reserved for the most egregious, unprofessional conduct. A documented history of very poor ratings will jeopardize reappointment, tenure and promotion.

The following areas will be addressed by peer evaluators utilizing the form from Appendix 3.

III.1.1.2.1. Instructor Preparation – evaluate the instructors preparation for the class. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.2 Organization - organization and logical development of lecture topics, clarity of presentation. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.3. Effectiveness of Communication – how well are the concepts communicated to the students, is there interest and comprehension. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.4. Enthusiasm – does the instructor effectively engage the student and project overall enthusiasm for the course material. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.5. Knowledge of Subject– does the candidate display a breadth of knowledge and answer student questions effectively. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.6. Teaching Innovation– how well does the candidate incorporate technology and innovative teaching techniques into the course. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.7. Student Participation– do the students participate freely, ask questions and display enthusiasm for the instructor. **(Utilize the ratings of Very Good (4), Good (3), Satisfactory (2), Poor (1), or Very Poor (0))**

III.1.1.2.8. Advising/Guidance and Career Planning – these are areas that are best evaluated informally with students before and after the formal class meeting; such as does the instructor offer advice and assistance with homework assignments and career-related decisions. **(Because the opportunities to access these criteria are limited, please utilize only the ratings of Satisfactory (2), or Poor (1).**

III.1.1.3. Self-evaluation - The candidate must include a self-evaluation. In the self-evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references, item by item, to the Department RTP criteria. If the candidate is requesting reappointment then there must be clear and explicit evidence that there is progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the evaluation shall explicitly discuss teaching, scholarly activities and university service. See Section II.3. **(5% of Teaching points).**

III.1.2. Professional Growth and Development

To guide the RTP candidate in the area of Professional Growth and Development the following are the guidelines, listed in order of importance, the DRTPC considers when awarding points for research activities and successful grant proposals:

III.1.2.1 Originality of research – Does each publication represent an original “new” concept? Is the research a continuation of an ongoing effort? Does the research demonstrate a broad knowledge of an interdisciplinary nature?

III.1.2.2 Technical merit – To what level of the scientific community is the research intended for? What level of technical detail and analysis is involved? How large a contribution does the research make to the scientific world?

III.1.2.3 Contribution to the geological sciences – Does the contribution advance geologic knowledge? Is the contribution broad or narrowly focused?

III.1.2.4 Involvement of students – Are students co-authors of research papers? Are students active participants in the research effort? Was outside financial support provided to students?

III.1.2.5 Significance to the general academic community and residents of California – (For general interest research with a broad base of community application) Did the research contribute to the general academic community? Did the research stimulate interest and/or participation by faculty and students in other disciplines? Did the research significantly improve the welfare of California residents?

III.1.2.6 Research - To be considered in the RTP evaluation process, research activities must manifest themselves as one of the following. (Note: coauthor status results in the points awarded being halved.)

III.1.2.1.1. Publication of results of research in refereed journal.

Points = 18.

III.1.2.1.2. Oral presentation with accompanying published abstract at any acceptable geological, mining, or petroleum-related organization.

Points = 6.

III.1.2.1.3. Poster session at one of the above organizations.

Points = 6.

III.1.2.1.4. Published abstract with no oral presentation. Point awards are based on originality, student participation and merit. Candidate must provide an explanation of why no presentation accompanied the abstract.

Points = 4.

III.1.2.1.5. Publication of results of research in a non-refereed scientific journal.

Points = 9.

III.1.2.1.6. Publication of results of research in a popular medium.

Points = 5.

III.1.2.1.7. Continuing research without publication. Candidate should include a timeline for completion of research and an outline of the research goals.

Points = 5.

III.1.2.1.8. Senior thesis research supervision. List all senior theses that are or have been supervised during the evaluation cycle.

Points = 2.

III.1.2.2. Grants

III.1.2.2.1. Grant proposal submission either unsuccessful or in review. In general, points will be awarded on the basis of the nature of the grant request.

Maximum points = 5.

III.1.2.2.2. Successful receipt of grant for equipment and/or research. Add to maximum points for submission of proposal. Points awarded on the size of the grant (no specific dollar amount can be provided, but to obtain the maximum would necessitate receiving a multi-million dollar grant).

Maximum points = 36.

III.1.2.3. Other Activities - Some activities of the Geological Sciences faculty may not fit into the categories above. Points can also be earned in the following performance areas:

III.1.2.3.1 Consulting activities. Point values based on the size and complexity of the consulting job.

Maximum points = 8

III.1.2.3.2. Publishing specialty-related textbooks. More points would be awarded for an advanced text and fewer for lab manuals or study guides.

Maximum points = 15.

III.1.2.3.3. Chairing sessions at professional meetings.

Points = 2 per session.

III.1.2.3.4. Membership on regional or national advisory boards/committees.

Points = 2 per membership.

III.1.2.3.5. Participation in teacher workshops and teacher retraining activities.

Points = 4.

III.1.2.3.6. Participation in science education either within the college community or local community.

Points = 4.

III.1.2.3.7. Other professional activities not covered by any of the above sub-categories.

Maximums to be determined by the evaluators.

III.1.3 University Service

III.1.3.1 Department Service

III.1.3.1.1. Service as Dept. Chair. (The position of Department Chair is not a full-time appointment and therefore points awarded are less than those for other departments.)

Points = 9.

III.1.3.1.2. Schedule coordinator.

Points = 4.

III.1.3.1.3. Department RTP Committee Chair.

Points = 5.

III.1.3.1.4. RTP Committee member.

Points = 3.

III.1.3.1.5. Curriculum Coordinator.

Points = 5.

III.1.3.1.6. Advisor to any ASI chartered club.

Points = 3.

III.1.3.1.7. Student Advising and Mentoring.

Points = 5.

III.1.3.2 College Service.

III.1.3.2.a. College RTP Committee.

Points = 3*.

III.1.3.2.b. College Curriculum Committee.

Points = 3*.

III.1.3.2.c. College of Science Budget Advisory Committee.

Points = 3*.

III.1.3.2.d. Any other recognized College-based committee.
Points = 3*.

*** Double assigned numerical weight if Chair.**

III.1.3.3 University Service

III.1.3.3.a. URTP Committee.
Points = 5*.

III.1.3.3.b. Academic Senator.
Points = 5*.

III.1.3.3.c. Any regular University standing committees.
Points = 3*.

III.1.3.3.d. Any ad hoc committee requiring participation at regular meetings.

III.1.3.3.e. Service learning activities
Points = 2.

***Double assigned numerical weight if Chair.**

III.1.3.4. Community Service

Non-specialty related. The Department encourages faculty to be good citizens. Service to the community clearly benefits all involved. However, community service must not be done in lieu of or as substitute for Department, College or University duties. A faculty member may demonstrate service to the community by assuming leadership roles in any of a number of various civic groups or functions. Examples are: service clubs, youth activities and organizations, and any activity resulting in media exposure. These activities should reflect favorably upon Cal Poly and increase public awareness of the University and whenever possible focus attention upon the activities of the Department. **(1 point per function to a maximum of 5 points per year).**

III.2. Specifications for Qualifying for Reappointment

The candidate may request reappointment during the probationary period. While candidate evaluation commences immediately, there is no need for the candidate to prepare a formal RTP package during their first year.

III.2.1. Third – Sixth Year Reappointment (Note: point totals required for Tenure are higher)

Teaching - 18 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development (*PG&D*) – 20 points

University Service (US) - 12 points

III.3. Specifications for Qualifying for Tenure

The probationary candidate applies for tenure during sixth year.

Teaching - 20 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development (PG&D) - 120 points

University Service (US) - 75 points

A total of 195 points for both categories (PG&D and US) will be acceptable if either falls below the minimum.

III.4. Specifications for Qualifying for Promotion to Associate Professor

Request for promotion to Associate Professor is made after the candidate reaches Assistant Professor rank.

Teaching - 22 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development (PG&D) - 150 points

University Service (US) - 80 points

A total of 230 points for both categories (PG&D and US) will be acceptable if either value falls below the minimum.

III.5. Specifications for Qualifying for Promotion to Full Professor

Request for promotion to Full Professor is made after the candidate reaches Associate Professor rank.

Teaching - 24 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development (PG&D) - 175 points

University Service (US) - 80 points

A total of 255 points for both categories (PG&D and US) will be acceptable if either value falls below the minimum.

III.6. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Tenure

Early tenure may be requested at any time following the second full year of service. **Early tenure is awarded in only the most exceptional cases.**

Teaching - 23 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development (PG&D) - 120 points

University Service (US) - 75 points

To apply for Early Tenure the minimum must be attained in both categories (PG&D and US) .

III.7. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Promotion - Request for early promotion can be made at any time after completion of two years of full-time service at the current rank.

III.8. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Promotion to Associate Professor

Teaching - 26 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development - 150 points

University Service - 80 points

III.9. Specifications for Qualifying for Early Promotion to Professor

Teaching - 26 points per year (average)

Professional Growth and Development- 175 points

University Service - 80 points

IV. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

All RTP requests are initiated by the candidate. If the candidate is eligible for an RTP action then there will be written notification from the DRTP Chair. The candidate must respond that either there will or will not be a request for consideration. If the candidate is requesting early promotion or tenure, then the candidate must notify the committee chair in writing that there will be a request for an early action.

At all times the candidate should monitor the progress of the request through the various review groups. The candidate can withdraw the request, without prejudice, at any level of review.

The candidate must include a self evaluation. In the self evaluation, the candidate must explicitly address the Department's criteria for the action(s) requested. The evaluation shall be structured so as to make very explicit references, item by item, to the Department RTP criteria.

If the candidate is requesting reappointment then there must be clear and explicit evidence that there is progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:

- A. Discussion of teaching performance - This includes an evaluation of the student and peer evaluations, and activities relating to student advising and/or mentoring. All deficiencies noted in the student and peer evaluation shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- B. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities - This includes citations of publications, dates of attendance of professional meetings, reference to grant submittals and duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
- C. Discussion of service to the University, College, Department and community - This includes citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.

The period of time covered by the self evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the previous cycle. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last promotion or since original appointment; tenure on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position.

The candidate shall identify all materials to be considered, and to make available copies of those not already available in the candidate's Personal Action File (PAF). Completeness must be balanced against the consideration for the time commitment required of the committee and other evaluators. If material can be summarized or cited rather than included, this is preferable. The candidate should consider an Appendix to the evaluation package which contains originals (reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, lab manuals, letters of thanks, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, etc.). These supplemental materials are to be located in the Department office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the RTP package.

The candidate is responsible for carrying out student evaluations in the specified number of classes. Appendix 10 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on student evaluations of teaching performance.

The only professional means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in faculty performance review is to reach students collectively, not individually. Any solicitation by the candidate on his/her own behalf or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is prohibited. This does not mean that the candidate cannot use other methods of evaluation for self-improvement, rather only Department-approved student evaluation forms and the results from the use of these forms can be included in the RTP package.

The candidate must work closely with the Department faculty and DRTP Chair to schedule the minimum number of peer reviews of teaching performance. The minimum number of peer reviews is two in different quarters. A candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those carried out by the committee. All peer review documentation must be included in the RTP package. The candidate should have ready during the peer review session (or at some other prearranged time) a course syllabus and other relevant teaching materials. Appendix 16, Section 305.303 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on peer review of teaching performance.

Appendix 1

Candidate refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.

Reappointment means that the candidate is re-applying for the next probationary year. Reappointment, beyond the second year, is not automatic and must be requested. If the initial appointment is granted for one or two years credit, then reappointment must take place at the beginning of the last year of the initial appointment period. 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 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 a status conferred on the candidate by the University granting continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Tenure is 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 terminal year.

Promotion means the candidate seeks a change in rank commensurate with accomplishments deserving merit and recognition. The candidate is eligible for regular promotion if he/she has four years in his/her current rank and may apply at the beginning of the fifth year. The candidate is eligible for early promotion if he/she has less than four years in his/her current rank and may apply at the beginning of any RTP cycle. Candidates successful in obtaining a promotion will be in the new rank beginning the next academic year.

RTP Committee members must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing. A tenured faculty member who will be a candidate for promotion may be elected, but may only participate on reappointment cases – may not participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. (see also Appendix 16 sections 305.114, 305.300, 305.400, 305.500).

Criteria are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in Appendix 16. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP Criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his designee. (see also Appendix 16 section 305.200)

A probationary year of service is any three quarters in a period of four consecutive quarters. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment.

A faculty member is eligible to apply for tenure at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for early tenure.

A faculty member is eligible to apply for the first promotion at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is eligible for a subsequent promotion after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for early promotion.

Criteria for early actions shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to professional activities, and university service.

Student evaluation of teaching is governed by Appendix 10 of the University Manual.

Peer evaluation of teaching is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes a classroom visit, review of course syllabus & other teaching materials, and a written report.

A candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.

A candidate for tenure or promotion may choose between the criteria in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, current procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

APPENDIX 2

STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Instructors asking their students to evaluate a class should leave at least ten minutes at the end of the class for completion of the evaluations. The instructor must designate one of the students of the class to collect and transport the evaluations to the Department's office where the forms will be placed in the hands of the Department secretary. The instructor must leave the classroom during the evaluations. The department must provide a method for securing the forms after completion so no tampering is possible. Also see section III.1.1.1. for additional guidelines.

A sample student evaluation form is attached.

APPENDIX 3
California State Polytechnic University
Geological Sciences Department

Class Visitation Report

Instructor _____ Evaluator _____
 Course Number _____ Evaluator's Signature _____
 Course Title _____ Date _____
 Quarter and Year _____

	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very Poor</i>	<i>Points</i>
Instructor Preparation						
Organization						
Effectiveness of Communication						
Enthusiasm						
Knowledge of Subject						
Teaching Innovation						
Student Participation						
Advising/Guidance and Career Planning						
Total Points:						

Point Assignments 4 = Very Good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor, 0 = Very poor

Comments (attach additional pages as necessary)

Evaluators please attach suggestions for improvement for any/all Satisfactory/Poor/Very Poor ratings. For Poor and Very Poor ratings please specify areas that need immediate attention. For Very Good ratings, evaluators comments are encouraged as they may be incorporated in the DRTP summary evaluation of teaching.

Additional Comments

Any evaluation of syllabus, projects, homework not covered during your actual class visitation. These DO NOT require point values or ratings, but will be examined by the DRTP Committee when making RTP decisions.