

COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

Statement of Policy Regarding Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Preamble

- A. Policy for personnel actions will be discussed and acted upon in general department meetings. These meetings will be open to all instructional faculty and participation by everyone in the discussion of department policy will be encouraged. Changes, additions or deletions to this document may be made by a majority vote of all tenured and probationary faculty and full-time lecturers.
- B. The tenured faculty members, including the department chair except in cases of conflict of interest, will constitute the tenured committee. The tenured committee will adopt and follow procedural methods that conform to university requirements. At the beginning of each academic year, the tenured committee will select a chairperson and a secretary from its members.

I. GENERAL PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, TENURE

- A. Procedures
 1. Evaluation criteria and procedures (Parts I-A and B of this document) shall be made available to the faculty unit employee prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. There shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate a faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.
 2. All RPT actions will follow the timetable set forth by the university. At each level of review the candidate will have a seven calendar day period for response or rebuttal before the recommendation is sent to the next level of review. Other than reconsidering the original recommendation, there will be no reply to the candidate's rebuttal statements.
 3. Each faculty member subject to RPT evaluation will update his/her personnel file, using the faculty resume worksheet appearing in CAM Appendix XII as a guide (see Appendix A).
 4. Faculty presenting materials for evaluation must submit an index of such materials. A copy of the index will be forwarded to the dean for placement in the personnel action file.
 5. For each employee considered for RPT action (candidate), the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department shall elect a peer review committee (PRC). The PRC shall consist of three or more members chosen from the tenured committee, or from the tenured faculties of other departments where appropriate. The PRC may not include faculty involved in the review process of the candidate at another stage of RPT action (e.g. a department representative on a college peer review committee, or the department chair). Also, faculty applying for promotion are ineligible to serve on tenure or promotion PRCs of other candidates. Members of promotion PRCs must be of higher rank than the candidate.

6. Each PRC shall designate two or more members to act as a candidate subcommittee which will be responsible for coordinating various aspects of the action.
7. Each member of the PRC must study and sign the log for the working personnel action file (WPAF) in the department office and the personnel action file (PAF) in the dean's office, prior to the initial meeting of the PRC for the candidate. Anyone failing to do so will be ineligible to take part in the discussion and the vote.
8. Each member of the subcommittee must visit a class of the candidate's prior to the initial meeting of the PRC for the candidate. In addition, since teaching performance is important in evaluating the candidate, each member of the PRC is encouraged to visit representative classes of the candidate.
9. The PRC for each candidate will then meet to evaluate the candidate. The discussion will be led by the chairperson of the subcommittee. The discussion will be based upon a summary outline prepared by the subcommittee, material in the candidate's WPAF and PAF, and classroom visits.
10. At this meeting, the subcommittee will move the appropriate action for the candidate. A vote (yes or no) in support of the motion will be taken by secret ballot.
11. The subcommittee for a given candidate will prepare the PRC evaluation report (using the PRC evaluation form, Appendix B) based on this discussion, classroom visits, and the materials in the candidate's PAF and WPAF.
12. The PRC will reconvene to review the evaluation report. The subcommittee chair will be responsible for presenting the report, and for collecting the signatures of the PRC on the report. In cases of irreconcilable differences amongst the members of the PRC, a minority report may be made.
13. The PRC evaluation report and any minority reports, henceforth referred to as the evaluation document, will be given to the candidate.
14. The evaluation document is then sent to the department chair. If the department chair deems the information or evidence in the document insufficient he/she shall return it to the candidate's PRC for additional consultation and clarification.
15. The department chair shall provide a separate recommendation on Form 109 (See Appendix C). If the department chair's recommendation differs significantly from that of the PRC, the department chair will notify the PRC of this and state reasons for the difference.
16. The evaluation document and the candidate's entire WPAF are then forwarded to the dean.
17. If the dean's action differs significantly from the recommendations of the department, the dean will supply a written explanation of the reasons for the difference, and the department chair will relay this explanation to the members of the PRC.

B. Criteria

Evaluation criteria for teaching, professional development and service are attached as Appendix D.

II. APPOINTMENT OF NEW FACULTY MEMBERS

- A. When it is necessary to fill one or more positions, the department will elect an Appointment Committee, usually consisting of all tenured faculty members, including the department chair. The term of this committee will be one year. The Appointment Committee will elect a Screening Subcommittee. After consultation with the department chair and the tenured committee, the Screening Subcommittee will advertise for the positions. The Screening Subcommittee will screen applicants, and report its recommendations of leading candidates to the Appointment Committee and department chair. The screening committee will also coordinate the interviewing process. All materials and information concerning applicants for appointments will be made available for review by all tenured and probationary faculty members of the department. The evaluation of the applicant's potential for teaching, professional development and service will be determined through interviews, information supplied by the applicant, and recommendations from people familiar with the applicant's qualifications.
- B. The credentials and letters of recommendation of all candidates involved in the above screening will be made available to the tenured members of the department at least three days prior to the meeting at which action is to be taken.
- C. The Screening Subcommittee will prepare a list of candidates to be considered for telephone and on-campus interviews. The list will be presented to the Appointment Committee and department chair for approval before any invitations to interview are made.
- D. The Appointments Committee may meet to consider a candidate any time after his or her interview. Prior to the meeting, there will be an open discussion on the candidate. The discussion will be open to any member of the CSC community (faculty, staff, lecturers, students). After review and discussion of the candidate's qualifications, the Appointment Committee will vote by secret ballot on its recommendations on each of the following, separately, and in that order:
- (a) appointment
 - (b) the rank to be offered
 - (c) the number of years of service credit, if any, to be credited towards tenure eligibility. The vote to recommend appointment requires a 2/3 vote of those voting. The votes on rank and number of years of service credit require a majority vote. The department chair will forward the recommendations of the Appointment Committee to the dean.

The minimum academic qualification for appointment to a probationary or tenured position will normally be the doctorate in computer science or computer engineering.

- E. Upon arrival, each probationary (tenure track) faculty member is assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty of the department. The mentor assignment is made by the chair, based on her or his knowledge of the tenured faculty, and who among them is best suited to provide guidance to a particular probationary faculty member.

The mentor has an initial meeting with the probationary faculty member to provide an overview of the department's RPT process. There is also a meeting following each formal RPT review, to discuss the outcome of the review and to provide detailed feedback to the probationary faculty member for how to progress successfully towards tenure. In addition, the mentor and probationary faculty member will

typically meet informally throughout the academic year, so that the mentor can answer questions and provide helpful career guidance.

III. REAPPOINTMENT

A. Requirements for recommendation of reappointment.

1. **Teaching Performance.** A faculty member must be an effective teacher. A faculty member should be able to work cooperatively on instructional matters with other members of the department and the department chair.
2. **Professional Development.** A faculty member should have demonstrated the capacity for additional professional development and the potential for achieving tenure.
3. **Service to the University.** A faculty member must have demonstrated the capacity to make constructive contributions to the activities of the department, college or university.

For more detail see Appendix D, Evaluation Criteria for Teaching, Professional Development and Service.

B. The procedure for making a recommendation concerning reappointment shall be as described under I-A.

IV. TENURE

A. The probationary period for faculty is six (6) years. Faculty may apply for early tenure but their probationary period may not exceed six (6) years in any case. (That is, at the end of six years they may be granted tenure or get a terminal year notice.) Exceptions, see MOU 13.7.

The procedure for making a recommendation concerning tenure shall be as described under I-A.

B. Requirements for recommendation of tenure.

1. **Teaching Performance.** A faculty member must be an effective teacher. A faculty member must have demonstrated the ability to make a strong contribution to the instructional program of the department.
2. **Professional Development.** A faculty member must either hold a doctorate in an appropriate field, or hold a master's degree in an appropriate field and have had professional experience of a length, nature, and depth which makes the contribution to the department equivalent to that of a faculty member who has a doctorate. A faculty member must have demonstrated the capacity for additional professional development in the future.
3. **Service to the University.** A faculty member must have demonstrated constructive contributions to the activities of the department, college or university.

For more detail see Appendix D, Evaluation Criteria for Teaching, Professional Development and Service.

- C. Tenure may be recommended earlier than the sixth year in the case of faculty who in addition to meeting department (college) criteria for normal tenure, also provide evidence of outstanding performance in each of the areas of: teaching, professional development, and service to the university and community.
- D. Up to two years of service may be credited toward tenure based on previous service at a postsecondary education institution, previous full-time CSU employment, or comparable experience. Persons who have served as lecturers on a full-time basis for several years may request to have up to two years of such service counted as years toward tenure at the time of initial appointment to a tenure track position. The tenured committee will consider the request and recommend that zero, one, or two years of such service be counted towards tenure. The department chair will transmit that recommendation, together with his/her recommendation, to the dean.

V. PROMOTION

- A. The procedures for making a recommendation for promotion are as described in I-A.

After one year of service in the highest step of his/her rank, a faculty member is eligible for promotion to the next rank.

Promotion of an assistant professor to the rank of associate professor may be considered along with his/her request for tenure, though tenure is not a precondition for such a promotion.

Tenure is not required for promotion to associate professor, but is required for promotion to professor.

- B. If a priority ordering of those recommended for promotion is required, then the recommending group shall rank them by secret ballot in a priority list as follows:
 - 1. Each member of the PRC will rank all n candidates from 1 (top rank) to n (bottom rank).
 - 2. A rank value for any particular candidate shall be obtained by taking the average for all the ranks for that candidate, as obtained in (1).
 - 3. The n candidates shall be ranked in order according to the rank values obtained in (2).
 - 4. If two or more PRCs take part in the rankings, as in the case of applicants to associate professor and to professor, then the tenured professors will interleave the previous lists to make a single list according to the above procedure.
- C. Requirements for recommendation of promotion from instructor to assistant professor are the same as those for reappointment.
- D. Possession of the doctorate or other normal terminal degree from an accredited institution is a usual prerequisite for promotion beyond the rank of assistant professor. Exceptions may be made where the candidate is uniquely qualified according to approved college and department criteria.

- E. Requirements for recommendation of promotion from associate professor to professor include the requirements in IV-B. In addition, a faculty member should show excellence in teaching, continue to demonstrate growth in professional development, and contribute to the department, college or university.

VI. POST TENURE REVIEW

Tenured faculty who have not been evaluated for personnel action within the previous five years are to be subject to a review according to the following procedures. The chairperson of the tenured committee is responsible for scheduling the reviews.

A. Review Committee Selection

Each review committee shall consist of two tenured members of the Computer Science Department – one selected by the person being reviewed and the other selected by a lottery conducted by the chairperson of the tenured committee.

All tenured members of the department are eligible to serve on a review committee. However, any faculty member subject to future personnel actions is not obligated to serve on a committee for a faculty member senior in rank.

B. Review Process

1. The review committee will request a summary of the faculty member's professional activities since his/her last review or personnel action, including student and peer evaluations. The summary should emphasize instructionally- related activities and currency in the field. A brief description of professional goals would also be appropriate. The summary must include formal student evaluations for all courses taught during the two quarters prior to the post tenure review.
2. Upon reviewing the faculty member's professional activities, the committee will meet with the faculty member and discuss his/her instructional performance, currency in the field, professional growth, and immediate future professional goals, as appropriate. Any observations or suggestions resulting from the review will be made directly to the faculty member being reviewed.

C. Report

Upon completing the review process, the review committee will submit the summary of the faculty member's professional activities to the department chair along with the following statement (signed by the committee members):

“The review of the professional activities of _____ was conducted by a committee of the tenured faculty according to the procedures developed by the Computer Science Department as required by the trustees. The review of his/her instructional performance, currency in the field, and other professional activities and goals was discussed with him/her, and appropriate observations or recommendations were made.”

The department chair and chair of the review committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and will forward the above summary and the accompanying evaluative statement to the dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. The dean will provide his/her evaluation to the faculty member after considering the material provided by the faculty member, as well as the summary report and the accompanying evaluative statement from the department.

VII. APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

A. Objectives

The objectives of the Computer Science Department in hiring temporary employees (lecturers) are to:

1. provide support and teaching experience for CSC graduate students as teaching associates.
2. provide opportunities for the department to interact with computer scientists from other institutions and industry, on a short-term basis, by hiring computer scientists on sabbatical leave.
3. meet the instructional needs of the department in specialized areas by using part-time lecturers.
4. Meet temporary staffing needs created by leaves of absence, and other unexpected events.

B. Appointment Criteria

- Teaching Associates — Must be making satisfactory progress (15 units per year) towards, and enrolled in, a Cal Poly masters program . This will typically include completing at least six courses per year in the MS program. A graduate student who has been on academic probation (AP) may not teach again until the student removes the AP. Evaluation of applicants for reappointment to teaching associate positions shall include teaching ability as evidenced by student evaluations and peer review committee input as available. A teaching associate should not be reappointed for more than a total of three years.
- Visitors on leave from other institutions or industry – Minimum academic qualifications, except in unusual circumstances, shall be an MS in computer science or computer engineering, or a distinguished record of accomplishment in the discipline. In addition, applicants must have demonstrated teaching ability.
- For other full-time temporary positions or for part-time temporary faculty teaching core or upper division courses, hiring criteria shall include both teaching ability, and significant evidence of ongoing professional development and competence. Minimum academic qualifications, except in unusual circumstances, shall be an MS in computer science or computer engineering or a distinguished record of accomplishment in the discipline at another institution, with a Ph.D. in computer science or computer engineering preferred.
- Applicants for specialized positions should have a minimum of a MS degree and experience appropriate to the course for which they are being hired.

C. Procedure

1. The department chair will provide the tenured faculty with an analysis of needs for both permanent and temporary faculty, as necessary. This will include an analysis of the current budget for faculty salaries, the percentage of tenured and probationary faculty vs. temporary faculty, the anticipated number of leaves and assigned time units, and projected enrollment demand.

2. The department chair and the Appointments Committee, in consultation with the tenured faculty, will develop announcements for temporary appointments.
3. The department chair will review applications for temporary appointments and make decisions on the hiring of temporary faculty, with input from the Appointments Committee.

D. Each appointment of a lecturer is an act independent of previous appointments of that individual, and carries no commitment, explicit or implicit, for future appointments. It is expected, however, that appointments will be consistent in rank-equivalence and step with those previously received by the appointee. To be appointed to a higher rank an individual should meet the requirement of the higher rank, and should be subjected to the same scrutiny given tenured candidates for promotion.

E. Evaluation

Evaluation of temporary employees appointed for greater than half-time shall proceed as with other probationary employees except that the PRC and the "subcommittee" shall be one and the same (typically consisting of from one to three people). If reappointment of a temporary employee for whom such a PRC review is available is contemplated, the PRC advice should accompany the list of candidates as submitted by the department chair. This report may then be reflected in recommendations and comments of the tenured faculty.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of sections in these criteria and procedures for Appointment-Retention-Promotion-Tenure, if the MOU entered into pursuant to the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act is in conflict with the provisions in these criteria and procedures, the terms of the MOU, and not the provisions of these procedures and criteria shall govern. Similarly, the provisions of these procedures and criteria regarding Teaching Associates shall be subject to the definitions and standards as given in the CSU Classification and Qualification Standards for Teaching Associate, effective June 1, 1991.

Appendix A

Faculty Resume Worksheet

This worksheet is intended to assist you in preparing your resume. Included are many categories of professional activity which may be appropriate. There may be other activities which should also be included in individual cases. The form of your resume is not prescribed. It might be appropriate to index the entries on the resume to any supporting material which also appears in your file.

Please keep in mind that the supporting materials that you submit should be thorough but not extraneous. They should be concise and appropriate to the period in rank (promotion candidates) or the period of your probationary tenure-track appointment at Cal Poly. Please endeavor to keep these materials as brief and as organized as possible, while ensuring that your application is thoroughly documented.

Evaluation Categories

I. BACKGROUND

- Education
- Certification or Licensing
- Academic Experience
- Related Professional Experience

II. TEACHING RELATED ACTIVITIES

- Courses and Laboratories Taught
- New Course Preparation
- Major Revisions and Innovations in Existing Courses
- Curriculum Development
- Senior Projects or Student Research Supervised
- Student Advising
- Current Instruction Related Projects
- Other

III. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

- Activities Completed (with primary emphasis on activities completed since coming to Cal Poly for probationary faculty, and for period in rank for candidates for promotion)

Be specific including dates, about activities such as research; consulting; commissions; patents; copyrights; creative or artistic achievement; relationships with business and industry; projects completed; publications; editorial work, including refereeing; papers presented; reviews; professional workshops offered; professional conferences/workshops attended, etc.

- Participation in Professional Associations and Organizations
- Grants, Contracts, Fellowships, Honors
- Current Projects and Activities

IV. SERVICE

- University
- College
- Department

- Community (activities related to professional expertise)

NAME: _____ FACULTY RANK: _____ DATE: _____

COLLEGE: _____ DEPARTMENT: _____

This is an evaluation for (check applicable action):Retention to a 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th probationary year. Tenure Promotion Periodic Review

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1A7)

Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

- *I. **Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- II. **Professional Growth and Achievements:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification and licensing.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

III. Service to University, Students, and Community: Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, co-curricular activities, diversity-related activities, placement follow-up, department, college and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

IV. Other Factors of Consideration: Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

V. Vote:

Yes: _____ No: _____

VI. I have read the above evaluation:

Signature of person being evaluated

Date

COMMENTS OF PERSON BEING EVALUATED:

NAME: _____ FACULTY RANK: _____ DATE: _____

COLLEGE: _____ DEPARTMENT: _____

This is an evaluation for (check applicable action):Retention to a 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th probationary year. Tenure Promotion Periodic Review

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1A7)

Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

- *I. **Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- VI. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification and licensing.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

VII. **Service to University, Students, and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, co-curricular activities, diversity-related activities, placement follow-up, department, college and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

IV. **Other Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

V. **Summary:**

On the basis of the foregoing evaluation, I believe that _____:
(person being evaluated)

1. *has reached a high level of professional development and is making an outstanding contribution to the university which is readily recognizable.*
2. *fully meets the requirements of the present assignment and is making a valuable contribution to the university.*
3. *meets the requirements of the present assignment adequately and by following the preceding suggestions for improvement may make a greater contribution to the university.*
4. *does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment.*

I RECOMMEND:
(recommendations not required for Periodic Evaluations)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tenure | <input type="checkbox"/> Nontenure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> Nonpromotion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Retention to a _____
probationary year | <input type="checkbox"/> Nonretention |

for the following reasons:

Department Head/Chair or Director's Signature

Date

I have read the above evaluation:

Signature of person being evaluated

Date

COMMENTS OF PERSON BEING EVALUATED:

NOTE: The college dean or division head's evaluation statement will subsequently be attached to this form. If the person being evaluated is eligible for consideration for retention, tenure or promotion, the entire packet will be forwarded to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or President. The complete evaluation statement and attachments will be filed in the individual's Personnel Action File in the college/division office following action on the recommendations.

(Person Being Evaluated)

On the basis of the foregoing evaluation and the additional comments below, I recommend:

Tenure

Nontenure

Promotion

Nonpromotion

Retention to a _____
probationary year

Nonretention

COMMENTS OF DEAN:

Dean's Signature

Date

Appendix D

Appendix D: Evaluation Criteria for Teaching, Professional Development, and Service

Excellence in teaching is the primary criterion by which faculty are evaluated. The other major evaluation criteria are professional development and service.

The purpose of professional development is two-fold. First, it is considered necessary for sustaining teaching excellence in the rapidly growing discipline of Computer Science. Second, professional development, particularly in the areas of research and publication, is considered an integral part of scholarship at the university level. Such scholarship enhances the reputation and visibility of the department, and should therefore be pursued by all faculty.

The evaluation criteria presented here apply to tenured and tenure-track faculty. At each formal review, the evaluatee should prepare documentation that addresses how the criteria have been met in the evaluatee's teaching and professional development activities. Normally, the criteria will be applied to work performed within the five years preceding the time of evaluation.

Each of the three areas of evaluation comprises a number of categories, listed below. Some categories appear in two or more areas. The evaluatee may designate to which area his or her accomplishments in such categories apply, but a given accomplishment may only be applied to one area.

D.1. Excellence in Teaching

Teaching evaluations are based on information gathered from student evaluations, classroom visitations, course materials, and other relevant sources. Evaluatees are encouraged to provide a written statement describing their instructional goals, methods, and accomplishments.

In reviewing the gathered and supplied information, excellence will be based on the following specific criteria:

1. Numeric scores and written comments from student evaluations.
2. The observed quality of classroom presentation and interaction.
3. The use of innovative techniques in course materials.
4. The development of new courses or substantially new course content.
5. The breadth of courses taught and the number of new preparations taught.
6. Instructional goals, methods, and techniques that show a clear commitment to excellence and innovation in teaching; specific factors that evidence innovation include the following:
 - a. The use of state-of-the art tools and techniques for classroom and/or laboratory instruction.
 - b. The adaptation of recent research results to the classroom.
 - c. The frequent revision of course materials to incorporate the latest

developments in the field.

7. Student mentoring and advising in independent academic study or research.

These seven criteria will be used by the evaluatee's peer review committee to determine an evaluation rating of excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. In all cases, the rating determination will be made on an individual basis. In order to provide prospective evaluatees with specific guidance, the following paragraph describes general guidelines that a committee may use in the evaluation of teaching. These guidelines are advisory only and will never be applied in a formulaic manner to any evaluatee. Evaluatees should therefore not consider these guidelines as a guarantee of a particular evaluation rating.

Achieving excellence in a majority of the seven categories listed above will generally be considered grounds for a teaching evaluation of good or better. Achieving excellence in less than a majority of these areas will generally be considered grounds for a good or satisfactory teaching evaluation. Satisfactory performance in all areas will generally be considered grounds for a satisfactory evaluation.. Unsatisfactory performance in a majority of the areas will generally considered grounds for an unsatisfactory teaching evaluation, as well as an unsatisfactory evaluation overall.

D.2. Excellence in Professional Development

Evaluation criteria for professional development are comprised of the following categories and subcategories::

1. Scholarly publication
 - a. Refereed journals and conferences
 - b. Text books and published software
 - c. Technical reports
 - d. Locally published material, such as course notes
 - e. Informally published material, including on the WWW
2. Funded contracts and grants
 - a. Research
 - b. Development
 - c. Instructional support, including equipment
3. Industrial or academic consultation
 - a. Research, or significant development.
 - b. Non-research
4. Continuing education
 - a. Conference attendance
 - b. Completing relevant courses
 - c. Design and instruction of new or substantially new courses
 - d. Instruction of courses with material that requires substantially new preparation.
5. Activity as an officer or other significant contributor in a professional society.

These five criteria will be used by the evaluatee's peer review committee to determine an evaluation rating of excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. In all cases, the rating determination will be made on an individual basis. In order to provide prospective evaluatees with specific guidance, the following two paragraphs describe general guidelines that a committee may use in the evaluation of professional development. These guidelines are advisory only and will never be applied in a formulaic manner to any evaluatee. Evaluatees should therefore not consider these guidelines as a guarantee of a particular evaluation rating.

Work in any of the following categories will generally be considered grounds for a professional development evaluation of good or better: 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a. Work in any of the other categories will generally be considered grounds for a satisfactory professional development evaluation. Work in no area of professional development will generally be considered grounds for an unsatisfactory professional development evaluation, as well as an unsatisfactory evaluation overall.

As noted above, the quantity and quality of work in professional development will be evaluated on an individual basis to determine the precise professional development rating. As a general rule, faculty should strive to achieve at least one of the following each year:

- a. refereed or edited scholarly publication (category 1a or 1b);
- b. funded or ongoing research contract or grant (category 2); or
- c. funded position of industrial or academic research consultation (category 3a).

D.3. Excellence in Service

Evaluation criteria for service are comprised of the following categories and subcategories:

1. Participation in administrative duties, such as:
 - a. Significant departmental duties, such as chairmanship, scheduler, or CSL Director.
 - b. Chairmanship of a departmental, school or university committee.
 - c. Membership and regular participation on a departmental committee.
 - d. Membership and regular participation on a college committee.
 - e. Membership and regular participation on a university or academic senate committee, or academic senate..
 - f. Responsibility for organizing a significant departmental activity such as new student day, the industrial advisory counsel meeting, etc.
 - g. Special projects of notable service to the department or university.
2. Involvement in student activities, such as:
 - a. Advising a student club.
 - b. Directing a significant student activity such as Open House events.
3. Community service, such as:
 - a. Assisting nonprofit organizations in computer-related areas.
 - b. Service in support of the activities of computing-related professional societies.
4. Fund raising activities for the department, college, or university.

These four criteria will be used by the evaluatee's peer review committee to determine an evaluation

rating of excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. In all cases, the rating determination will be made on an individual basis. In order to provide prospective evaluatees with specific guidance, the following two paragraphs describe general guidelines that a committee may use in the evaluation of service. These guidelines are advisory only and will never be applied in a formulaic manner to any evaluatee. Evaluatees should therefore not consider these guidelines as a guarantee of a particular evaluation rating.

Three or more activities per year from the categories listed above will generally be considered grounds for a service evaluation of good or better. Especially demanding activities such as 1a or 1b may be given extra weight, generally permitting a service evaluation of good or better even in the absence of other service. A chairmanship (1a) and one other activity from the list above will also generally be considered grounds for a service evaluation of good or better. Two activities per year from the list above will generally be considered grounds for a satisfactory service evaluation. Fewer than two activities per year from the list, or only one activity that is not in the "especially demanding" category, will be generally be considered grounds for an unsatisfactory service evaluation and an unsatisfactory evaluation overall.

Faculty in their first or second year of employment at Cal Poly will generally be held to a lighter standard in the evaluation of service, since establishment of service activities takes some time and experience.