

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
College of Environmental Design
Department of Urban and Regional Planning

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Fall 2005 to End of Summer Quarter 2008 Academic Years

Section Number	Major Section Heading	Page Number
1.	Statement of Purpose	2
2.	Department RTP Committee Responsibilities	3
3.	Departmental RTP Procedures	6
4.	Departmental Evaluation of Candidate	8
5.	Candidate's Responsibilities	9
6.	Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion	11
7.	Evaluation of Faculty on Administrative Assignment, Serving in Academic Governance, or on Academic Leave	20
8.	Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty Members	23
9.	Reappointment and/or Review Criteria for Faculty on One, Two or More Year Contracts with Responsibilities that include Student Advising and Committee Assignments (hereafter referred to as "contract faculty")	24

1. Statement of Purpose

- 1.1. Candidates will be evaluated for Teaching, University Service, Community Service, Professional Participation/Practice, and Scholarly Activity. 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.
- 1.2. Reappointment means that the candidate is re-applying for the next probationary year – in the case of tenure-track appointees, and may be applying for another one, two or more year contract.
- 1.3. Reappointment, beyond the initial appointment period for any faculty, is not automatic and must be requested.
- 1.4. For tenure-track faculty, if the initial appointment allowed for one or two years service credit, then 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.
- 1.5. Tenure is the status conferred on the candidate by the University which grants continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations.
- 1.6. 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 a terminal year.
- 1.7. A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. However, a faculty unit employee in the rank of instructor or librarian equivalent may be considered for promotion after completing one (1) year of service in rank. Probationary faculty unit employees shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate. A probationary faculty unit employee shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time he/she is considered for tenure.
- 1.8. The promotion of a tenured faculty unit employee shall normally be effective the beginning of the sixth (6th) year after appointment to his/her current academic rank/classification. In such cases, the performance review for promotion shall take place during the year preceding the effective date of the

Comment [ghu1]: Later, 6.2 says faculty development instead of scholarly activity.

promotion. This provision shall not apply if the faculty unit employee requests in writing that he/she not be considered.

- 1.9. Tenure-track candidates are required to assemble a RTP package that 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.

2. Department Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee

- 2.1. The Department RTP Committee (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 of the University Manual.
- 2.2. The Committee shall consist of three full-time tenured faculty members elected by tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty; faculty on any other type of appointment may not participate in the proceedings of election. If too few qualified faculty members are available to form a Committee for all or some aspect of a Committee's work, the Committee shall consult with the College RTP committee and name faculty members from outside the Department to supplement the committee.
- 2.3. The Committee shall be elected by secret ballot during the winter quarter of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by majority vote of the tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty members of the Department.
- 2.4. The Chair of the DRTP Committee shall be elected no later than the third week of the Spring quarter.
- 2.5. The Committee's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the Committee's recommendations have been concluded. After the election of the Committee, the Department Chair will notify the Dean of its composition.
- 2.6. The tenured and tenure-track probationary faculty will decide annually whether the Department Chair will serve on the Committee. If the Department Chair is not a member of the Committee, then the Department Chair, if tenured, shall write a separate evaluation of the candidate.
- 2.7. No DRTP Committee member may simultaneously serve on the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during any given RTP cycle. Additionally, College RTP Committee or URTP Committee members may not

participate in Department RTP proceedings.

- 2.8. 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 promotion or tenure actions considered by the Committee. However, tenured candidates being considered for promotion are eligible for service on any reappointment actions considered by the Committee.
- 2.9. Faculty on professional leave with pay (sabbatical and difference in pay) may participate in Committee activities with permission. Faculty who know in advance that they will, during one quarter or more, be unavailable or ineligible should not be nominees for the Committee.
- 2.10. The Committee shall elect a chair 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. The Department RTP Chair shall perform the following duties:
 - 2.10.1. Give written notice to each candidate who is eligible for a regular RTP action;
 - 2.10.2. Present to the candidates all appropriate forms;
 - 2.10.3. Provide each candidate a copy of the University RTP Calendar for the current academic year;
 - 2.10.4. 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;
 - 2.10.5. Schedule, in cooperation with the RTP candidates and other faculty, the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance;
 - 2.10.6. 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.
 - 2.10.7. The Department's RTP Committee's duties include the following:
 - 2.10.7.1. Ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to Department and University policy;

- 2.10.7.2. Soliciting input from students by publicizing names of candidates for RTP action and names to whom signed statements may be submitted;
- 2.10.7.3. Evaluation of candidate's request for a RTP action by using only the approved RTP criteria.
- 2.10.7.4. The Committee shall evaluate the tenured and probationary candidate's RTP package and render only one of the following decisions – as appropriate – for each of the candidate's request for action:
 - 2.10.7.4.1. Reappointment to next tenure-track probationary year,
 - 2.10.7.4.2. Reappointment with tenure,
 - 2.10.7.4.3. Reappointment with early tenure,
 - 2.10.7.4.4. Promotion to requested rank,
 - 2.10.7.4.5. Early promotion to requested rank,
 - 2.10.7.4.6. Termination,
 - 2.10.7.4.7. Reappointment with terminal year (available for candidates in either third, fourth, fifth or sixth probationary year),
 - 2.10.7.4.8. Deny promotion,
 - 2.10.7.4.9. Deny early promotion,
 - 2.10.7.4.10. Deny early tenure.
- 2.10.7.5. Decisions must be supported and shall address, in writing, all applicable criteria. Decisions shall be based on evidence supplied to the Committee by the candidate or requested by the Committee from the candidate.
- 2.10.7.6. The Committee, in their evaluation of the candidate's request, shall take into account information from the following sources:
 - 2.10.7.6.1. Summaries and interpretations of student evaluations in accordance with Appendix 10, Appendix 16, and Section 305 of the University Manual;
 - 2.10.7.6.2. Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluation of teaching performance shall also be considered in accordance with Appendix 16 and Section 305 of the University Manual;
 - 2.10.7.6.3. Written self evaluation provided by the candidate (including reference to any supplementary material necessary to corroborate candidate's statements);
 - 2.10.7.6.4. Signed and dated material received from other faculty, administrators, and students (which are to be added to the

Comment [ghu2]: Is this what we want. CPP DOES allow conditions.

candidate's RTP package);

- 2.10.7.6.5. 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;
- 2.10.7.6.6. Other material in writing identified by source submitted to the Committee before the closing date.

3. Departmental RTP Procedures

- 3.1. The Department Chair shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy of the current, approved RTP criteria, and shall post a copy of the current approved Department RTP document in the Department office. The Department Chair will also 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. Copies of these past RTP documents shall be made available to the Committee and faculty.
- 3.2. The Committee shall post an announcement, in a prominent place(s) 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 whom signed comments or recommendation can be given. This posting will take place within one 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 five days prior to the day that the Committee starts its evaluation of the candidate's request. The five days ensure that the candidate will have sufficient time to respond to the signed comments.
- 3.3. 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 working days either a response/rebuttal or request a reconsideration (Section 305, 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 and document the fact 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. It is important for the candidate to realize that new evidence can be introduced at this stage. The Committee can not 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 final recommendation. Appeal is not obligatory. The candidate is advised to consult Appendix 16, Section 305 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.

- 3.4. The Department Chair, if tenured and not a member of the Committee, shall make a separate recommendation that will be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. The candidate will receive a copy of the Department Chair's recommendation when the original is incorporated into the RTP package.
- 3.5. It is the policy of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning to collect student evaluations for every course offered in every quarter. The candidate should include an analysis of all student evaluations conducted during the period of review in his or her self evaluation. The DRTP Committee will review this analysis and the evaluations as part of its deliberations and recommendations.
- 3.6 The Department has established a policy on the peer review of teaching performance and a copy of this policy along with approved forms is in the Appendix of this document. In summary, the peer evaluation of teaching performance shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught by the candidate.
 - 3.6.1 Also, the peer evaluation shall include classroom visits and a review of course syllabus and relevant course materials.
 - 3.6.2 A minimum of two peer reviews per year, in different quarters, is required.
 - 3.6.3 A written report of the classroom visit shall be placed in the candidate's PAF within two weeks of the class visit.
 - 3.6.4 A copy of the written report will also be given to 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.

4. Departmental Evaluation of Candidate

- 4.1. The candidate shall be evaluated according to the criteria stated in this document. No other criteria are applicable, unless stated in writing, to the agreement of the candidate, the Committee, the University RTP Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- 4.2. Appendix 16 prescribes the department RTP criteria document that a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion is entitled to use. The candidate will be informed by the Office of Faculty Affairs in September of the criteria documents available to him or her. Candidates are responsible for ensuring that they use the appropriate criteria documents. 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.
- 4.3. 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.

5. Candidate's Responsibilities

- 5.1. 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 Committee 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.
- 5.2. 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.
- 5.3. 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, there must be clear and explicit evidence of progress toward the successful attainment of tenure. Furthermore, the evaluation shall explicitly contain the following items:
 - 5.3.1. 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.
 - 5.3.2. Discussion of scholarly and creative activities. This includes specific citation of all peer reviewed publications, dates of attendance of all professional meetings, and explicit reference to all duties and assignments in professional organizations. Works in progress and ongoing activities shall be addressed. If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in previous evaluations, steps taken or progress made toward remedying them must be addressed.
 - 5.3.3. Discussion of service to the University, College, Department and community. This includes specific citation of Committee assignments and duties and contributions/accomplishments, 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.
 - 5.3.4. The candidate shall establish attainable short and long term goals in all evaluative areas, and clearly state them. The candidate should attempt to build these goals around the desired outcomes listed in Section 6. To be realistic, there shall be a brief discussion regarding how these goals will

be met. In the next RTP cycle, the candidate shall clearly state whether or not the short term goals have been met and report on the progress made on the long term goals. The candidate is required to establish both short and long term goals in order come up with an individualized plan which when realized will make a strong case for the granting of tenure and/or promotion. The candidate needs to examine whether or not goals need to be altered and clearly note any alteration. The candidate is expected to seek advice from other faculty, administrators, etc. in generating these goals. The Committee shall pay particular attention to the goals of the candidate and shall comment upon their appropriateness, evaluate whether they are applicable for the granting of tenure and/or promotion, and provide this feedback to the candidate in their recommendation.

- 5.3.5. The period of time covered by the self-evaluation should be that which has passed since the last application was made for the same or similar action. Reappointment evaluations are normally based on the previous year's performance; promotion evaluations, on the period since the last request for promotion or since original appointment; tenure on the period since the original appointment to the probationary position.
- 5.3.6. 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, art work, etc.). These supplemental materials should be located in the faculty member's office, Department office, or dean's/director's office. Only an index to the Appendix (that specifies where the supplemental material is located) is then included in the RTP package.
- 5.3.7. The Candidate is responsible for making sure all classes have student evaluations completed. Appendix 10 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on student evaluations of teaching performance. The candidate may administer more evaluations than the minimum. The only professional means of soliciting student opinion on teaching performance for use in faculty performance review is to reach student 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 unprofessional and is prohibited. This does not mean that the candidate cannot use other forms of evaluation. However, candidates who intend to include anything other than Department approved student evaluation forms and the results from

the use of these forms in the RTP package must conform to the requirements for such laid out in Appendix 10, section 1.5. Candidate needs to work closely with the Department in order 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 initiated by the Committee and such requests are to be directed to the Committee chair. All original, Department-approved peer review forms 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 of the University Manual articulates policy and procedures on peer review of teaching performance.

6. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

6.1 Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be evaluated in five categories of accomplishment: Teaching, University Service, Community Service, Professional Participation/Practice, and Scholarly Activities.

6.1.1. Teaching

Teaching is the most important criterion for the reappointment and promotion of faculty members. Faculty must be able to engage in a variety of teaching methods, including lectures, discussions, service learning, and studios. Although candidates will demonstrate varying strengths in each sub area enumerated below, the Department requires competency in all areas. The DRTPC review and rating shall be based on student class evaluations, direct observations by peers in the classroom, assessments of the quality of instructional materials and exams, consideration of signed student comments on teaching, an assessment of student advising and supervision, and an assessment of the candidate's submitted self evaluation and materials.

The DRTPC shall summarize and interpret student class evaluations and peer reviews in its review and also comment on the faculty member's performance in the following sub-areas:

- 6.1.1.1. Ability and diligence as a teacher.
- 6.1.1.2. Quality and relevance of course contents.
- 6.1.1.3. Structure and organization of courses.
- 6.1.1.4. Level of learned information.
- 6.1.1.5. Innovation in teaching technique, development of new courses,

substantial revisions of courses, multidisciplinary courses, service learning courses, on line courses.

6.1.1.6. Effective student advising and student project or thesis supervision.

Based on its review of all materials and sub areas discussed in this Section and the examples provided in Section 6.4, the DRTPC shall develop a composite rating of teaching for each candidate based on the rating scale in Section 6.2. The DRTPC shall indicate whether a probationary candidate is making adequate progress toward tenure in the category of teaching.

6.1.2. 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. All faculty are expected to actively participate in the activities of the Department, College, and University and to show progressive involvement in College and University service during their probationary years. Candidates shall enumerate and indicate the significance of their contributions in their self evaluations. Examples of contributions include Department, College, and University wide governance and administrative work, continuing education and extension work, service on task forces and external committees, fund raising efforts, efforts to increase faculty and/or student diversity, and multidisciplinary activities. The DRTPC shall indicate whether a probationary candidate is making adequate progress toward tenure in the category of Contributions to the University based on the required ratings in Section 6.3.

6.1.3 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 or 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 class based work of the candidate.

6.1.4 Professional Participation/Practice

This category includes active participation and/or practice that furthers 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.

6.1.5. Scholarly Activities

Faculty are expected to be leaders in their particular areas of interest. They should engage in research and other scholarly work that enhances 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.

6.2. The DRTPC will rate the candidate's performance in each of the five categories, using the following rating scale:

Outstanding	9-10
Excellent	7-8
Good	5-6
Fair	3-4
Poor	0-2

The ratings necessary for all reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions are set out in Section 6.3. These necessary ratings are broken into a rating for Teaching, a minimum rating for University Service, and an average of the ratings for the four categories other than Teaching. Teaching is considered separately because of its preeminent importance; certain levels of achievement must be met in this single category for each action to be taken. At least a minimum level of University Service and progressively greater University Service is expected of all candidates for reappointment and tenure and ratings for these minimum levels are indicated in Section 6.3. The averaging of the ratings in the four categories other than Teaching recognizes the diversity of faculty strengths among these categories. A candidate may, for example, have a very strong record in University Service and Scholarly Activities, but have done little in the other categories. The DRTPC must find that the ratings required for Teaching, University Service, and for the average of the four categories have been met or exceeded by the candidate for the action requested to be

taken. Examples of what is considered outstanding, excellent, etc. for each category are set out in Section 6.4.

6.3 The minimum ratings required for reappointment, tenure and promotion actions are as follows:

4Areas	Teaching	Service	
Reappointment to 3 rd . Probationary Year	Fair	*	*
Reappointment to 4 th . Probationary Year	Good	Fair	Good
Reappointment to 5 th . and succeeding Probationary Years	Good	Good	Good
Tenure	Excellent	Good	Good
Promotion to Associate Professor	Excellent	Good	Excel.
Promotion to Professor	Excellent	Good	Excel.
Early Tenure and/or early Promotion	Excellent	Excellent**	**

*Because the candidate will be reporting on just the initial year, a University Service rating and an average rating will not be calculated or used at this point. In addition to the required rating for Teaching, the DRTPC will review the activities of the candidate and the candidate's plan and must find evidence that the candidate is making or intends to make adequate progress in University Service and toward an acceptable average in the four areas other than Teaching for reappointment to be recommended.

** Overall, the average must be 8 and the DRTPC must rate the candidate's work in either or both University Service and Community Service as Outstanding (10) and further must rate the candidate's work in either or both Professional Participation/Practice and Scholarly Activities as Outstanding (10). A recommendation for early tenure and/or early promotion requires a finding and full explanation by the DRTPC that the candidate's performance is exceptional in both service and scholarly/practice activities.

6.4. Examples of performance expected for different ratings.

The following sections provide the minimum required for each rating in each category plus examples of accomplishments that would be expected for that rating in that category. The examples are intended as a guide for candidates and for the DRTPC in its review.

6.4.1. Teaching

6.4.1.1 Outstanding

The candidate must have high student class evaluations (the typical overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.0), strong peer reviews, demonstrated competence in all sub areas indicated in Section 6.1, and outstanding teaching demonstrated by at least one of such accomplishments as:

- successful innovation in teaching method 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 course.

6.4.1.2 Excellent

The candidate must have high student class evaluations (the typical overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.2), strong peer reviews, demonstrated competence in all sub areas indicated in Section 6.1, 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,

6.4.1.3 Good

The candidate must have good student class evaluations (the typical overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.5), good overall peer reviews, and demonstrated competence in most sub areas indicated in Section 6.1.

6.4.1.4 Fair

This rating is the minimum required for reappointment to the 3rd probationary year and is unacceptable for any succeeding action. 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 sub area of Section 6.1 and a

demonstrated lack of competence in more than two sub areas indicated in Section 6.1.

6.4.1.5 Poor

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 indicated in Section 6.1.

6.4.2 University Service

6.4.2.1 Outstanding

Substantial service at the Department, College, and University levels with a 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.

6.4.2.2 Excellent

Substantial service at the Department and/or College level with active participation in at least one major University committee, task force, program, or project. 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.

6.4.2.3 Good

Full and active participation at the Department level with significant participation at the College and/or University level.

6.4.2.4 Fair

Service at the Department level with an absence of acceptable participation at the College and/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.

6.4.2.5 Poor

Lack of active participation at all levels.

6.4.3 Community Service

6.4.3.1 Outstanding

A level of service that is widely recognized in the community and has direct benefits to the Department and the University. 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.

6.4.3.2 Excellent

A high level of responsible community service 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.

6.4.3.3 Good

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.

6.4.3.4 Fair

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.

6.4.3.5 Poor

Little if any active community service.

6.4.4 Professional Participation/Practice

6.4.4.1 Outstanding

A level of professional participation that makes a significant contribution to the profession, such as successful service as an elected member of a

national or state professional organization related to planning. Examples would also include a professional project that is widely recognized (perhaps award winning) as innovative and as an outstanding contribution or example for the profession.

6.4.4.2 Excellent

Significant responsible participation in a national, state, or local branch of a professional organization, 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.

6.4.4.3 Good

Full participation in Department professional participation activities, such as being a speaker at a workshop, or responsible involvement in a professional organization.

6.4.4.4 Fair

Some participation in Department professional participation activities and active membership in one or more professional organizations related to planning.

6.4.4.5 Poor

Lack of active professional participation.

6.5.5 Scholarly Activities

6.5.5.1 Outstanding

A level of research and publication that brings national or international attention to the Department. Examples would include receipt of a major externally funded research grant, publication of a new textbook concerning planning or publication of more than one of the following: peer reviewed journal article, book chapter, professional study or report in the one year period under review.

6.5.5.2 Excellent

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, or the completion of advanced training in the candidate's curricular specialization or in a new area of teaching or research.

6.5.5.3 Good

A level of scholarly work that shows active scholarly participation such as the presentation of a paper at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning conference or completion of training that improves the candidate's use of technology or teaching techniques. Active participation as a peer reviewer for a major national journal or national

6.5.5.4 Fair

Attendance at conferences and/or attendance at training sessions for faculty.

6.5.5.5 Poor

Lack of active scholar activity

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

7.1. The committee must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignment for the University, and visiting professor/scholar at another institution. Faculty on leave shall be evaluated using the above stated criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity and service with suitable modifications listed below.

7.2. Faculty Serving an Administrative Assignment:

7.2.1. 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, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

7.2.2. For 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 for which the

candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

- 7.2.3. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving an administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- 7.2.4. Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.
- 7.2.5. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving an administrative assignment without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean, and University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

7.3. Faculty Serving in Academic Governance:

- 7.3.1. For promotion, faculty serving in Academic Governance on release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment 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, per Department policy, must be included in the RTP package.
- 7.3.2. For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in academic governance and has release 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.
- 7.3.3. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the Department.
- 7.3.4. Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their academic governance duties.
- 7.3.5. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic

Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

7.4. Faculty On Approved Leave

- 7.4.1. Faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President of the University are on approved leave. Normally, this is with pay from this University and thus, for tenure track candidates, the probationary status is still active and next several paragraphs apply. If the approved leave is without pay from the University then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate is inactive (the clock has stopped) and the next several paragraphs do not apply.
- 7.4.2. 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.
- 7.4.3. For 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.
- 7.4.4. For reappointment, tenure or promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same 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 the committee for the purposes of fulfilling the Department's criteria in the area of scholarly or creative activity.
- 7.4.5. Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirement specified in the Departmental criteria for the requested RTP action. Visitation to another institution does not relieve the candidate of the service requirement at this University.
- 7.4.6. There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving on approved leave without the written consent of DRTPC, Dean, and the

University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

8. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty Members

- 8.1. The evaluation committee of full-time and part-time faculty members shall consist of the DRTP Committee members.
- 8.2. The Department Chair shall write, at his/her discretion a separate evaluation of every temporary faculty member or becomes a member of the DRTP Committee and joins in writing a collective evaluation.
- 8.3. The evaluation of full-time temporary faculty members shall terminate at the Dean's level.
 - 8.3.1. The evaluation of part-time temporary faculty members shall terminate at the Department Chairs level.
 - 8.3.2. A copy of the evaluation results as well as all responses and rebuttal statements as described in Section 305.11 shall be placed in the temporary faculty member's Personnel Action File.
 - 8.3.3. A "Personnel Action File" shall be generated for all full-time and part-time faculty members, regardless of the number of quarters or number of courses taught in an academic year.
- 8.4. Part-time faculty members appointed for two quarters or less shall be evaluated every quarter by the DRTP Committee and the Department Chair.
- 8.5. Evaluation of temporary faculty members shall only include an assessment of teaching performance and/or other assigned duties specifically defined and described in the letter of appointment or contract. The evaluation criteria and procedure shall include the following:
 - 8.5.1. Summaries and interpretation of the student evaluations of the faculty member being evaluated.
 - 8.5.2. Evaluation of teaching performance based on syllabi, outlines, handouts and other course material.

- 8.5.3. A statement prepared by the Department Chair which shall also include an assessment of the faculty member's performance with regard to the assigned and related duties, if any, in addition to an assessment of the teaching performance.
- 8.5.4. In the case of full-time temporary faculty members (full-time teaching load for three quarters during the academic year) a statement prepared by the dean/director.
- 8.6. Periodic evaluation of temporary faculty members shall be reported on the standard Department RTP forms; but, only the relevant teaching and assigned duties sections will apply in the evaluation. It shall include all applicable elements as specified above, including signatures of all evaluators.
- 8.7. Timeline for conducting periodic evaluation of lecturers.
 - 8.7.1. Part-time temporary faculty who are teaching three quarters or less, in an academic year shall receive a written evaluation by the DRTP Committee and Department Chair by the sixth week of the quarter following the relevant teaching quarter. In the case of temporary part-time faculty who teach in the Spring quarter, a written evaluation by the DRTP Committee and Department Chair will be generated no later than the sixth week of the Fall quarter in the next academic year.
 - 8.7.2. Full-time temporary faculty who are teaching three quarters in an academic year shall receive a written evaluation by the sixth week of the Fall quarter in the next academic year.
9. Reappointment and/or Review Criteria for Faculty on One, Two or More Year Contracts with Responsibilities that include Student Advising and Committee Assignments (hereafter referred to as "contract faculty")
 - 9.1. This section specifically excludes tenure-track probationary faculty members.
 - 9.2. Contract faculty shall be evaluated under the normal RTP process (see University Manual, Section 305).
 - 9.2.1. The DRTP Committee shall provide all contract faculty members with copies of the Department RTP criteria no later than September 30 of the initial year of the faculty member's appointment.
 - 9.2.2. Within one week of receiving the student evaluations for the Winter quarter (this usually occurs early in the Spring quarter of the faculty member's initial year of appointment), the contract faculty member shall

submit to the Department RTP Committee in the form of a Faculty Performance Review form, a statement consisting of three parts, as follows:

- 9.2.2.1. A self-evaluation of teaching – reviewing all courses taught or co-taught, and
 - 9.2.2.2. A self-evaluation of professional accomplishments and service responsibilities performed since arrival on campus; and
 - 9.2.2.3. A plan toward satisfying the RTP criteria for reappointment.
- 9.3. The minimum ratings required for reappointment are as follows:
- 9.3.1. Teaching:

A rating of "good" or greater by the majority of DRTP Committee members.
 - 9.3.2. University Service, Community Service, Professional Participation, and Faculty Development:

The DRTP will by majority vote decide on a rating for each of the listed categories. The unweighted average of those points must equal or exceed 5.0.
- 9.4. During the ninth or tenth week of the Winter quarter the Candidate's evaluations for all courses taught (including those for Fall quarter) are obtained by the Department Chair. Summaries of the questionnaires become available early in the Spring quarter; these summaries shall be forwarded along with any signed student comments to the DRTP Committee.
- 9.4.1. The DRTP Committee summarizes the signed student comments and interprets both the questionnaire summary and the comment summary. Based on this consideration, the DRTP Committee confirms or modifies their original recommendation on the contract.
- 9.5. The minimum rating for reappointment is a very good rating for teaching effectiveness as judged by a majority of the DRTPC.