President’s Report

• Discussed the amendment by the CSU Chancellor's office to “education policy item 3 regarding units required to graduation.” Read an email summary: “We added title 5 changes that limit bachelor's degrees to 120/180, the only exceptions are architecture and landscape architecture. By fall 2013, all programs requiring 181-192 units must be reduced to 180. By fall 2014, all programs above 193 units must be reduced to 180 units. By January 2014, programs that have not been reduced to 180 may request the chancellor exception to the 180-unit limit or the chancellor may reduce upper-division GE, major or campus specific requirements, in order to achieve the 180 units. The adjusted total unit requirements will be effective fall of 2014 and will appear in 2014-15 campus catalog.”
• Explained that these changes will be effective Fall 2014 and will appear in the 2014-15 catalog.
• Detailed that there will be two options for programs over 180 units: first, an exception to the policy; second, request for changes in requirements that reduce the program to 180-units or lower requirement or ask for exception in other areas that may or may not include upper-division GE.
• Stated that the success of Proposition 30 in the November election would help student success at Cal Poly.

Provost’s Report

• Provided an overview of reorganization of Academic Affairs in order to provide better service to the campus, faculty, staff, and students in a number of areas.
• Discussed creation a vice provost position to bring graduate, international, and extended education under a single office.
• Discussed internal search for director of graduate education.
• Introduced two new deans: Christine Theodoropoulos (CAED) and Doug Epperson (CLA).

Introduction to Teacher-Scholar Model and the Link to RPT

• Academic Senate Chair: (Rein) Provided brief history of the concept of teacher-scholar and the RPT process at Cal Poly. One key part of the focus group report of 2009 was based on something called the “COACHE Survey” where younger faculty members were asked questions about how they fit in campus, do they perceive any barriers to advancement, what goes well and what does not go well in their careers. Cal Poly found, among other things, that tenure standards, in the mind of the junior faculty members, were not as clear as they should be. The RPT focus group went on to say that what we ought to do is move towards a Teacher-Scholar model. In a resolution in 2009, the Academic Senate endorsed some portions of the focus group report and there are other resolutions which endorsed other parts. The resolution stated, “That we are as a senate, examining what the definition
of the teacher-scholar model is.” Finally, the Academic Senate asked deans and departments or colleges to incorporate the teacher-scholar model into RPT criteria.

Teacher-Scholar and the Link to Flexibility and Advancement

- President Armstrong: Emphasized that there are many forms of scholarship that are valued at Cal Poly. Discussed the importance of recognizing the value of applied research and creative activities. Explained the willingness of stakeholders to invest in faculty and staff.

Teacher-Scholar and the Need for RPT Revisions

- Provost Enz Finken: Provided overview of the variety of RPT processes at Cal Poly and explained the need for departments to examine their RPT policies. This involves considering RPT processes across departments and colleges. Other topics that are important in the context of this examination include interdisciplinary activity, awareness of internationalization, and mentoring of new faculty members.
- President Armstrong: Noted the variety of RPT processes across different universities and the need for external validation in teaching and research. Foregrounded the centrality of Learn By Doing in the Teacher-Scholar Model.
- Rein: Explained that the intention of the purpose of the Academic Senate retreat is to reflect on questions related to the RPT process in order to provide departments and colleges about how the process of revising policies could proceed.
- Giberti: Clarified that the resolution on the Teacher-Scholar model was about departments being affirmative about the model; the other was about being affirmative about different types of scholarship. The two are related to each other.
- Provost Enz Finken: Noted that that distinction is important. Disciplines and departments need to be able to recognize the variety of options that faculty have before them in terms of fulfilling the requirements of scholarship teaching and learning. For example, some departments have clear criteria for evaluation with respect to say basic research but they do not for applied research. Traditionally, they might have valued basic research more or did not think about the applied part. Another area that is important, and every department deals with this, is new technology and how digital publication may be evaluated in the RPT process.
- Derelian – Raised the issue of how levels of performance can be distinguished by PRC committees.
- Rein – Observed that clarity in the RPT is necessary for those in different academic areas to tell if someone is doing a good or excellent job.
- Colvin – Raised the issue of workload for faculty for revising RPT process.
- Provost Enz Finken – Explained that the request for revision came from the faculty. Provost’s office is asking that departments look at policies, think about what is there, and decide if changes are necessary.
- President Armstrong – Noted the importance of flexibility in the process that will allow for improvement.
- Colvin – Observed that these issues come from the top down.
• President Armstrong – Explained that it was a bit of both.
• Provost Enz Finken – Explained that the Provost asked the Senate should examine the basic rules that everyone on this campus should follow as they engage the RPT process. The Provost is keenly aware of the issue of time. How do people find time to do this? It is very important and the deans and Provost to to have more conversations in helping faculty find ways to find time in your departments that make sense. How do you buy time for your faculty, how do you get release time, how do you create opportunities to support faculty, etc.? Cal Poly should not be entering a new era assuming that everybody, every year is going to do 36 WTUs and there is no flexibility.
• Laver – Noted that the idea of the practicality of having college develop a platform on which departments can base their own documents on that happened in CLA about three years ago. The dean asked the chairs to get together over the summer and discuss the common thread values in our diverse document at the moment, stitched them into a college document, and then had departments go thorough and proceed from there. It is important to leave the individual department room to interpret the Teacher-Scholar model. It worked really well.
• Enz Finken – Of all the six colleges, CLA had the highest levels of documentations and cleanest RPT files. Maybe that is the reason. It was a very effective process.
• Laver – Explained that it did not waste the departments’ time.
• Rein – Stated that the purpose of the retreat is to discuss exactly what CLA was doing a couple years ago. Anytime you make a change in the documents that govern how you are to be, you ought to be self-reflective and needs to be revisited because what was defined as ideal 10 years ago does not mean that would be ideal for the university today and needs to be revisited from time to time. The Senate has taken the opportunity to charge departments and colleges to do that.
• Epperson – Noted (in response to Colvin) that individual departments are not required to conduct the examination. The Senate request was that the Provost charge at a discipline level. Colleges are free to play the role.
• Scaramozzino – Explained that the Library is so small that its PRCs are composed of reviewers from other departments. Raised question if any discussion about a similar process across the campus had been proposed.
• Enz Finken – Answered that someone did raise that issue at the Deans’ retreat, but did not know what the answer is about whether the campus want to mandate that.
• Scaramozzino – Noted that external review circumvents internal politics.
• Bailey – Observed that in the College of Science and Math, there are not department documents, but rather college documents. The criteria need to be looked at and updated, but whatever is done, they need to offer guidance and not necessarily specificity. If colleges and departments are too prescriptive, that will hamper people in doing what they might want to do. Clear guidance is needed, something that people can see that there is some level of expectation, but then faculty each have to come up with a professional plan. That professional plan they take the guidance from the document and that becomes their personalized set of criteria approved by the college. Two things needed to make it work within any colleges is: (1) to be effective mentors of those faculty members so they get a decent professional plan that is going to get them tenure, promotion, whatever, and (2) to be honest and talented evaluators of those faculty members. The criteria cannot be too specific. Guidance, good mentoring, and evaluation and a professional plan that is approved and mentored by faculty.
COMPLETE RESPONSES BY TABLE

Table 1
**Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty**

Considering the variety in the nature of scholarship within any given department and across departments in a college, how should professional development expectations be communicated to candidates in department and college RPT guidelines in a way that allows for flexibility in scholarship?

- Confusion between the terms “scholarship” and “professional development.” Some see such as narrow subset of professional development, but the slippage between the terms creates confusion in standards. Is reading 2 articles professional development? Yes. But is it scholarship? No.
- Also, does professional development/scholarship make us better teachers? Not necessarily. But, we are not saying research must have direct correlation to teaching, but some faculty hear the “connection to teaching” as meaning that it must have a very direct correlation. Doris gave example from her dept. of very non-teaching related scholarship, but is valuable and relevant.
- Way question is phrased demonstrates lack of institutional clarity between professional development and scholarship.
- This assumption—that they are linked—historically was accurate, less so now.
- Resolution does not address that professional development is purely about scholarship. We are not suggesting that resolution should address professional development.
- University has not engaged in what it means to be a scholar. Being good teacher does not mean you are a scholar of teaching.
- Should we accept a more entrepreneurial activity as scholarship? Boyer would say no, but that is outdated.
- How do we communicate (answering the question): Don’t let faculty get too far afield without bringing them back to expectations. Doris gave example of peer mentoring of a tenure-track faculty member with research proposal as part of professional development plan.
- Have a credible, guided prof. dev. plan, though we prefer different terminology (see above): possibly “development plan.”
- Are there adequately formal mechanisms for guidance for junior faculty, so that they understand the “limits” of flexibility and don’t get “off track”?
- We agree with the Provost that there is reticence to provide true, honest feedback.
- Using the Psychology example to allow for a flexible approach allowing individual variation.
- If we had common understanding of what it means to be a “scholar,” wouldn’t need a laundry list that we see in the samples provided. Assessment is part of scholarship. Reaching a wider audience, sharing, is part of it, too. Adds to your discipline is another required component. Faculty have joined “the academy,” with the responsibilities inherent in that. Being a university professor intrinsically means a responsibility of scholarship.
- Historically, low expectations of scholarship at Cal Poly, esp. in later years near retirement. Expectations must be doable; we must figure into the equation a realistic timeframe. Write into expectations the flexibility of buyouts.

**Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback**
For each the PRC, Chair and Dean, what is the responsibility to provide feedback to candidates during non-action years and what is the nature of the feedback which should be provided?

- Lead into this from previous observation: examine ways in off years ways to get scholarship done.
- Need guidance from chair and dean as to tactics, and need for systemic strategies of ways to achieve adequate scholarship.
- “Nature” of feedback: should be honest. Would some anonymity be desirable?
- Need to help candidate interpret feedback, and use it to create improvements.
- Need for continuous improvement feedback loop, and nurturing of success, to achieve that improvement.
- Shouldn’t wait until Year 4 for problems to begin to emerge.
- Difference between summative and formative feedback.
- Problem: ignorance on some departments’ part as to where to send faculty for improvement. CTL is there for teaching improvement, but where to go for scholarship improvement? CTL has also done grant writing workshops. They seem willing to do more.
- We could learn more from other institutions and systems how they have undergone this transition to more scholarship.
- Feelings of stress from going to semesters: belief that faculty will teach more, which is in tension with increased scholarship. Need to manage those concerns.
- We return to our idea that, even before these two questions, appropriate definitions need to be established.

What do you want the Provost, Deans and Departments to keep in mind about these issues when considering revision of RPT to incorporate the Teacher-Scholar Model?

- Final question seems to lack sufficient focus on faculty, seems top-down.
- Needs to be iterative process; start with good structure, but can revise.
- Resource support is needed. Recognition of where we are now relative to where we were a few years ago; we would expect these individuals to continue to develop the process of the RPT model to reflect future change.
- College’s strategic plans and RPT documents should be in sync, should also be true at university level.
- Institutional reputation relies on activities, output, accomplishments of our faculty. Ex: grant is easier to get if your institution is recognized. Our self-interest is served by enhancement of reputation. This should be stated out loud, to help others understand the larger vision that we are all part of.

Table 2

Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty

Considering the wide variety of disciplines at Cal Poly, how should uniformity in professional development guidelines across departments be clearly communicated to candidates in the department and college RPT guidelines?

- Some basic statement of minimal expectations should be made: externally validated activity outside the classroom.
- “Or equivalent” clauses that articulate specific expectations but also flexibility.
- Peer mentoring so new people understand what’s expected of them.
- Multiple models of performance if necessary; Boyer’s models mandate more than one model of performance.
Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback
For each the PRC, Chair and Dean, what is the responsibility to provide feedback to candidates during non-action years and what is the nature of the feedback which should be provided?

- Professional development plan means that there should be no surprises if the candidate and supervisor have agreed on the plan and progress is being tracked during off years.
- Department heads should resolve disagreements among senior faculty about candidates.
- The PRC, chair, and dean need to stay involved every year during the probationary period.
- The 109 form speaks in general terms speaks in general terms about performance, candidates need to be told in writing and in person if they're not meeting expectations.

What do you want the Provost, Deans and Departments to keep in mind about these issues when considering revision of RPT to incorporate the Teacher-Scholar Model?

- The need to set realistic expectations given the resource situation. The importance of the student and student learning in Cal Poly’s Teacher-Scholar Model.

Table 3
Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty
How can RPT guidelines be written to make professional development expectations clear to both candidates and to those at the college and provost level?

- Sort achievements into tiers (3) established by the University
- Separate activity and achievement.
- Define each activity/achievement by significance of each discipline an impact on personal development and teaching.

Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback
For each the PRC, Chair and Dean, what is the responsibility to provide feedback to candidates during non-action years and what is the nature of the feedback which should be provided?

- Once tiers defined—departmental guidelines establish how many.
- Establishment of achievement's impact on teaching and learning.

Table 4
Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty
Considering the variety in the nature of scholarship within any given department and across departments college, how should professional development expectations be communicated to candidates in department and college RPT guidelines in a way that allows for flexibility in scholarship?

- College creates angst in emphasis on several elements that don't pertain to all departments. By way of comparison, the departmental guidelines are more likely to be clearer. Department document does specify that research in teaching and scholarship are valid and appropriate.
- Another college mandates two quality peer-reviewed journal articles. Teaching must exceed departmental standards. There is no confusion. There is also built-in flexibility.
- We must use whatever tools are necessary to insure that the research is rigorous.
- External validation can be a tool to insure rigor and quality.
- Providing mentors, exemplars, and models of materials are useful communication of expectations.
• Communication of deficiencies in the appropriateness of research should be communicated by year three.

Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback
For each the PRC, Chair, College Committee and Dean, what is the responsibility to provide feedback in the evaluation process during the Promotion/Tenure process and what is the nature of the feedback which should be provided?

• Peer review committees must review current criteria to insure that the advice that the candidate receives is accurately linked to the current RPT document.
• Professional Development plans should be referenced, and when necessary adjusted, during each review cycle.
• Operational definitions of the contribution of research and its quality should be available to peer review committees.
• It is difficult to author a letter with appropriate descriptive language. A ‘rubric’ for PRC could be helpful to provide more accurate descriptors of progress.

Table 5
Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty
Considering the wide variety of disciplines at Cal Poly, how should uniformity in professional development guidelines across departments be clearly communicated to candidates in the department and college RPT guidelines?

• Flexibility in percentage of attention to each of three areas. Play to strengths, but have to do a good job in each. Fully engaged in the mission of the University.
• Those primarily focused on outside projects and research. Are they carrying load of teacher-scholar model if not very engaged in undergrad classes? Is this simply a workload issue? Professional development plans should account for this.
• Sharing professional development plans across departments. Is that helpful? Should that be threatening?
• Degree of flexibility versus defined standards.
• Decisions about roles of R1-type researcher responsibilities, etc., should benefit the entire unit.
• Issue of interpretation of standards/guidelines. Importance of individual elements on a list. But can't remove issue of individual judgment about value/quality of contributions.
• Should college specify minimum numbers of things like publications at college or dept. level. Strive for standards and criteria without numbers in each area.
• How to measure variance in teaching or service.

Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback
For each the PRC, Chair, College Committee and Dean, what is the responsibility to provide feedback to those later in the evaluation process during the Promotion/Tenure process and what is the nature of the feedback which should be provided?

• No system works without feedback; more frequent and immediate the better without overwhelming.
• Problems with college process should not affect an individual faculty member negatively. Feedback from Provost to College about problems with process needs to happen early.
• PRC and chair give annual feedback, but communicator is the chair.
• Mentorship perhaps should be more formalized; could be problems in terms of workload on existing faculty, etc. Are informal systems actualized? Dept. chair/head should establish norm that new faculty should seek out feedback and assistance.
College Committee – If role is to ensure equal rigor within departments, then Dean needs to advise a department that there is a problem without it affecting an individual faculty member if they got inappropriate feedback earlier in review cycle from PRC and department head.

Table 6
Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty
How can RPT guidelines be written to make professional development expectations clear to both candidates and to those at the college and provost level?
- List of all acceptable creative activities and how they can be validated/ documented. IE-Consulting, Publications.
- Each candidate writes a Professional Plan that can be approved by the department committee, department chair, and dean who will also give feedback and guidance to the candidate.

Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback
For each the PRC, Chair, College Committee and Dean, what is the responsibility to provide feedback to those later in the evaluation process during the Promotion/Tenure process and what is the nature of the feedback which should be provided?
- Each party involved will provide honest guidance and feedback for candidate
- Feedback on two levels: Look at the case and their plan to move forward (Teaching, professional development, service)
- Candidate must look at case and prove that they have plans for continuous growth and improvement at the next step
- Feedback back down- from the dean and faculty committee to the department level on things they can improve upon in the process

Table 7
Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty
Considering the variety in the nature of scholarship within any given department and across departments college, how should professional development expectations be communicated to candidates in department and college RPT guidelines in a way that allows for flexibility in scholarship?
- Regular scholarly journal articles are important- some of the more traditional activities.
- Looking into professional and industry workshops that can be conducted.
- Conduct fee back workshops for continuing education within the industry- i.e. involving students in workshops with industry partners.
- Extension website where faculty members can post project results, data, etc. to share with industry members.
- Receiving industry feedback for all of the workshops, etc., that we host; we either propose topics or they bring them to us.
- Expectations might include examples of scholarship varying from department to department; defined by each department; concrete examples with room to grow with number of outlets for productivity.
- The expectations would be finely defined.
- Reviews from off-campus sales, professional reviews, quantifiable things.
- Interdisciplinary: on the list of examples, define which of them could be defined as interdisciplinary.
• We need to set a definition to interdisciplinary so that we understand what falls under this category.
• Proposal system: "If I achieve XYZ in the next 5 years, I will be practicing research, teaching, service etc." and then it would go to the higher level for the evaluation; essentially a professional development plan.
• This would allow everyone to define scholarship for themselves; managed at the department head and dean level.
• The proposal could come through the RPT process as an evaluative tool- maybe at the halfway mark, you can use this as a tool to define your process and can be evaluated based on how far you have gotten through the plan.
• Toolbox of ideas; list of specific program proposals- particularly fields that apply to industry but would not apply well to others such as writing or art; providing some guidance.
• Question proposed: If one works very hard for many years but does not have success, is that a failure and is it bad?
• Important to remember that certain disciplines could work tirelessly without success, while others can produce a product but not to the quality that is laid out.
• List of examples of what can be defined as scholarship within each of the departments more specifically.
• General criteria for what qualifies as scholarship to accompany list examples.
• Professional development plan as part of your RPT file.

**Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback**

In what ways, if any, should the nature of feedback provided by evaluators differ between action years (Promotion and Tenure decision) and non-action years?

• It is important to have the people working alongside the faculty member providing support and feedback.
• Scholarship is not just work, it is successful work.
• Value that something is contributing to something relates to impact that it can have on someone.
• Generalized criteria for what describes scholarship- setting the limitations and definition creates flexibility and clarity- does it have to be peer reviewed, etc.
• Examples should be coupled with a description for where and how they fit within the things that are defined in the criteria so that they can compare where their thing fits into the more general criteria all in one place.
• One of the criteria would have to cover the idea that it contributes to the greater pool of knowledge and then its left to the evaluator.
• Those who are being evaluated would not want a surprise and so constructive comments along the way.
• Evaluators need to be very critical especially in the first years
• Group that provides feedback should be as honest and consistent as possible
• In the non-action years, members of the PRC who are close enough to your discipline to understand the work should be a part of a discussion to make sure progress is made; simply for the sake of being constructive; less formal.
• Formality versus informality (provide more mentorship); non-action years are constructive while the action years are more judgment based.
• In the first three years, evaluator’s feedback must be constructive, critical and detailed

What do you want the Provost, Deans and Departments to keep in mind about these issues when considering revision of RPT to incorporate the Teacher-Scholar Model?
It is important to be mindful of the increase in workload for PRC committees and potential impact on the scholarship of committee members.

The most important thing we should be doing is not to raise, lower, or change the bar but define it and make it more clear.

Table 8

Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty

Considering the wide variety of disciplines at Cal Poly, how should uniformity in professional development guidelines across departments be clearly communicated to candidates in the department and college RPT guidelines?

- Professional development plan is roadmap; approved at all levels, it is the more effective means of (not a contract, though). It also serves as a communication between levels of review. If they don't need to fix that disagreement, not the faculty member's fault!
- Clarify your passions in your plan—not everyone is the team’s quarterback.
- Programs should develop lists to find common practices or values. Share best practices to inform a college document.
- Avoid metrics that are too much bean-counting.
- We want to promote an academic lifestyle, not burnout.
- Good documents at all levels
- Trust. Peers will not write negatives if they will be cherry-picked and used against the faculty member. trust is the number one impediment to an honest peer review.
- Uniform policy: with trust of department-level review, higher levels of review could be referees of the process and not simply “the bad guy.”
- Professional Development Plan should have uniform format, but each individual faculty member’s role defined within program – look at program's overall goals in teaching, prof. dev., and service.
- Can’t evaluate faculty equally – look at WTU breakdown.
- Tenure process is to encourage behavior that continues after tenure...don’t burn them out! Uniformly apply this philosophy!

Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback

In what ways, if any, should the nature of feedback provided by evaluators differ between action years (Promotion and Tenure decision) and non-action years?

- Faculty need to hear not simply praise or criticism, but whether they are “on track” in relation to their prof. dev. plans, the dept.’s and/or the college’s docs.
- Grading?
- Chair should evaluate faculty member’s unique role in department. Okay professional development, but good teaching and great service? Great.
- Chair needs to remind dean and/or college committee of values in individual department’s RPT document.
- Department RPT document must accompany WPAF throughout review levels.
- Chair should strive to provide an explanation of differing views should they exist among faculty in multiple PRC letters.
- The most important thing for faculty is uniform feedback from all levels of review. No mixed signals. And agreement must be sought, otherwise Provost’s review will be assumed to be most important. That circumvents shared governance (not the provost’s fault – it’s a system tendency that we have to watch out for)
When the provost/dean disagrees with the review of a faculty member, that faculty member needs to understand that this is a disagreement with the department, not the faculty member. Don’t let the faculty member be a pawn in the process.

What do you want the Provost, Deans and Departments to keep in mind about these issues when considering revision of RPT to incorporate the Teacher-Scholar Model?

- When the provost/dean disagrees with the review of a faculty member, that faculty member needs to understand that this is a disagreement with the department, not the faculty member. Don’t let the faculty member be a pawn in the process.
- Chair needs to remind dean and/or college committee of values in individual department’s RPT document.
- We want to promote an academic lifestyle, not burnout.
- Avoidance of a moving “expectations target” (i.e., clarity in and linkage of the candidate’s plan with the dept. and/or college documents) and trust in the process is key to assuaging candidate angst and promoting trust and buy-in to the process.
- Keep Expectations in line with teaching load (our number one product).

Table 9
Activity A - Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure, exploring the roles of flexibility, uniformity and certainty

How can RPT guidelines be written to make professional development expectations clear to both candidates and to those at the college and provost level?

- Expert Witness-External Validation?
- Amount of time on external activities
- Service—what is the role? What is the expectation?
- Scholarship: four types in Boyer book. What is the balance between those areas? Options? Level-- the department or at the individual level?
- Humboldt Statea—you need adequacy at all four levels.
- CSM: Approach is to have an individualized plan for RTP
- Use plan as a contract
- CLA: professional plan for RTP. Does not have a formal approval plan at the college level. CLA sets out expectation.
- Scholarship: peer-reviewed articles
- Mentoring from someone
- Dean: actual conversation, meeting
- Department
- Colleagues
- CAFES: discrepancy between department expectations
- Subjective/quality/point system
- Allows for changes over time
- Not certainty for RTP expectations or expectations change over time
- Leadership changes lead to uncertainty for RTP process
- External reviewer, either by college or by department
- Tier into strategic plan for university
- University guidelines/department level guidelines
- External reviewers from outside Cal Poly (from other universities)
- Examples of RTP expectations (not a comprehensive list)
• Present at conferences—what was your contribution to the presentation or poster presentation
• Publish a peer reviewed article in a journal
• Consulting: Letter of support from employer

Activity B – Discussing the Roles of Evaluators and the nature of evaluation and feedback
In what ways, if any, should the nature of feedback provided by evaluators differ between action years (Promotion and Tenure decision) and non-action years?
  • Clear language and what does it mean
  • Clearly allowed to hire when someone retires or is not selected for tenure
  • Factors influencing the RTP process outside of the process
  • Clear expectations on where the person can go.
  • Write clear direction for the Dean.
  • Advice or feedback for achieving the goal
  • Years of feedback-write to the committee
  • Years of advice-write to the candidate

What do you want the Provost, Deans and Departments to keep in mind about these issues when considering revision of RPT to incorporate the Teacher-Scholar Model?
  • University clearly giving expectations of what the university-wide guidelines will be for RTP