COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
Approved Spring 2018

Table of Contents

The College of Education (CED) Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy describes guiding principles for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The CED RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

This policy is informed by the mission and vision of CSULB and the College of Education and other guiding principles that are discussed below.

1.1. Mission and Vision

<u>CSULB</u>

Vision: California State University Long Beach envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.

Mission: California State University Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service for the people of California and the world.

<u>College of Education</u>

Vision: Equity & Excellence in Education

Mission: The College of Education at CSULB is a learning and teaching community that prepares professional educators and practitioners who promote equity and excellence in diverse urban settings through effective pedagogy, evidence-based practices, collaboration, leadership, innovation, scholarship, and advocacy.

1.2 CED Guiding Principles for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

Faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service are essential to accomplishing the mission and vision of both the university and college. Faculty members are expected to provide high quality instruction. Faculty members are also expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement of scholarship and/or pedagogy within the discipline. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing service contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. Faculty members should engage in teaching, RSCA, and service activities that are guided by the vision and mission of the college and university.

The CED values faculty who link their teaching, RSCA and service. These linkages lead to complex and dynamic interrelationships between these three areas.

Successful faculty will distribute their workload across these three areas. In the narrative, the candidate should clearly identify their specific contributions in each of the three areas of review and discuss any overlap between accomplishments in each of these areas.

For example, program assessment can be considered part of instruction or service, depending on how the candidate presents the information. Workload for administrative duties not covered by assigned time may be recorded under service.

1.2.1 Decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet must still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet CED and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.

1.2.2 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the college, university, in the community, and in the profession. All candidates will be evaluated in each of the three areas as having 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, or 3) not met expectations.

1.2.3 This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college needs; and university mission.

2.0 RTP AREAS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

In this policy, the CED defines the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the college, university, in the community, and in the profession.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Faculty are encouraged to engage continually in self-reflection on their effectiveness based on their own self-assessment and on students' responses to instruction. In the narrative, the faculty member should share how the practice of self-reflection contributes to enhanced teaching effectiveness. Materials that should be submitted to reflect the quality of instruction include, but are not limited to, syllabi, student learning outcomes (SLOs), sample assessments, and a rationale for text selection.

Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and department advising, student learning and engagement activities, and administrative assignments (e.g., program coordinator, area coordinator, assessment coordinator).

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy
Effective teaching requires that faculty members adopt an instructional philosophy that fits their discipline and the needs of their students. The faculty member's narrative should clearly articulate his/her instructional philosophy and how that philosophy is translated into effective, high-quality teaching. They should reflect on their teaching practices as noted above and assess their impact on student learning.

2.1.2 Effective Teaching and Addressing Student Learning Outcomes
Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials should clearly convey to students expected learning outcomes and goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. The narrative should discuss how the candidate's expectations as an instructor are communicated, the candidate's assessment methods, and evidence of student learning

Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty members, and should be addressed in their narrative. Effective teaching requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments.

For example, professional development activities include, but are not limited to, attending workshops/conferences, working with a faculty coach/mentor, participating in professional development events, and reading about new and effective teaching practices. It is expected that the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher will develop over time through self-reflection, self-assessment, and professional development.

Teaching methods should be consistent with course curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences. Instructors in the CED are expected to differentiate instruction to accommodate the diverse students in their classes.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction
University RTP policy states, "…student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction." However, utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student responses to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Additional sources of information about student responses to instruction are especially important for candidates to provide in cases in which student evaluations provide limited or mixed evidence of a positive student response to instruction. Additional forms of evaluation may include other documented, systematic informal assessments of student responses to instruction (e.g., mid-semester student evaluations), peer observations, or program exit survey data. Information on the validity and rigor of these other evaluation methods may be included in the supplemental materials.

When instructors present critical analyses of their teaching accomplishments in their narrative, they should discuss the student ratings, including an examination of the mean and median as they compare to Department and CED means and medians, the range of scores, the percentage of students who rate the standard evaluation elements as "agree" or "strongly agree," and trends over time. They should reflect on, including but not limited to, the impact on student evaluations of the nature of the course and content, pedagogy, rigor, class size, and undergraduate vs. graduate level courses and any specific, deliberate actions they have taken or plan to take to address student concerns.

2.1.4 Instructionally Related Activities
Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Examples of such activities are faculty-led study abroad classes, internships, clinical practice, and service learning. Note that these examples are mentioned to illustrate activities that are valued, not to articulate a requirement. The most highly valued instruction and instructionally related activities are those that fulfill the college vision and mission.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement and pedagogy of the discipline. Academic disciplines in the college vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA.

Engagement in RSCA is understood to be a cumulative process that spans an

entire career as faculty members develop their scholarly agendas. It is therefore expected that scholarly activities and publications will become increasingly substantive along a developmental continuum as careers progress. It is also expected that candidates will engage in a variety of different types of scholarly activities. Faculty of all ranks are expected to publish peer-reviewed journal articles and other scholarly products that contribute to the knowledge base in their field to meet college expectations for RSCA. Additionally, faculty must demonstrate that they continue to be engaged in a variety of scholarly activities throughout their careers.

The CED highly values engagement in research that leads to peer-reviewed publications that support the CED vision and mission. In addition, we value a record of scholarly activities that is varied and includes multiple types of scholarly and creative activities. This includes RSCA that, for example, reflects a traditional research paradigm, grant development, and professional conference presentations as well as emerging research paradigms.

The quality of the RSCA product and the venue in which it appears, or is presented, is an important part of the review; thus, candidates should be discerning when considering outlets for dissemination.

The following list provides examples of Highly Valued and Valued contributions. Candidates should be careful to make a clear and compelling case for how their work meets the expectations for Highly Valued or Valued contributions. During each review period (i.e., reappointment, tenure and promotion), the candidate is expected to have a record of "Highly Valued" and "Valued" products.

Highly Valued Scholarly Products:
- o Peer-reviewed journal articles (Single-authored and co-authored publications are highly valued. Candidates at all levels are expected to have single-authored or lead-authored journal articles in their mix of RSCA products.)
- o Book editor of peer-reviewed book
- o Editor of peer-reviewed journal
- o External grants funded
- o Peer-reviewed authored and/or co-authored books
- o Peer-reviewed book chapters
- o Peer-reviewed conference proceedings and papers
- o Keynote presentations at professional organizations

Valued:
- o Book series editor
- o Book chapters (non-peer reviewed)
- o Book reviews

- Peer-reviewed conference presentations
- Conference presentation proposal reviewer
- Fellowships awarded
- Grant administration
- Grant writing and/or participation
- Invited conference presentations
- Invited papers and articles
- Internal grants funded
- Journal reviewer
- Technical reports

The faculty member's narrative should describe their scholarly agenda, the nature of their scholarly work, and its impact on the field. The narrative should discuss both the quantity and quality of the candidate's accomplishments. It should discuss how the candidate's accomplishments demonstrate intellectual and professional growth over time, and how their scholarly and creative achievements have been disseminated to appropriate audiences, including professional, practitioner, and public audiences. The narrative should describe the scope of the RSCA audience (international, national, state, or local) and relative contribution of the candidate (primary contributor vs. participant) for co-authored work.

In the narrative, RSCA should be shown to:
   (a) contribute to the missions of the department, college, and university;
   (b) be relevant to the candidate's assignment including teaching; administration (if applicable), research, college to community and/or global linkages, etc.;
   (c) demonstrate continuous intellectual engagement and original contributions to the field over time;
   (d) represent significance and impact to the field of study. The candidate should illustrate significance and impact of their RSCA. The quantity of RSCA products, alone, is not sufficient for a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion. The candidate should demonstrate the quality of their RSCA through indicators such as whether the outlet is affiliated with a professional organization, readership, journal acceptance rate, practical impact, impact factor, circulation, number of citations, etc. The inclusion of any particular indicator is not required.
   (e) accurately reflect the contributions of others to their work (in the case of co-authored products)
   (f) contribute to the advancement of scholarship and/or pedagogy within the discipline.

For candidates who author external RSCA grants (funded or unfunded) and choose to highlight them in the narrative, the file must include: 1) summary or description of the project; 2) length of grant period; 3) granting agency; 4) amount of award; and, 5) brief description of candidates' role in authorship and implementation.

Candidates may include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA for the period

of review. Alternately, if they deem it beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates decide to withhold these materials, such items must be listed under Works in Progress on the Professional Data Sheet (PDS) and in discussion in the narrative. RSCA products submitted for the period of review for tenure and promotion to associate professor cannot also be used in subsequent review periods.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the quality of their RSCA achievements, how their RSCA contributes to the advancement of scholarship and/or pedagogy within discipline, how their RSCA reflects intellectual and professional growth over time, and how their scholarly activities and publications have developed over time. The candidate should also articulate future RSCA goals and activities and how their ongoing record aligns with the CED mission.

2.3 Service

High-quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of faculty governance and to maintain active engagement within the university, community, and profession through high quality service contributions and activities throughout their career. Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member. At all levels, the quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which the candidate serves.

For example, service contributions at each rank can include, but are not limited to, participation and/or leadership in governance activities, committees, and sub-committees (elected, ad hoc, appointed); authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, CED, or department policies and procedures; ongoing advising of student groups; service or leadership activities in professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community organizations.

The narrative should include a description of the nature of the service at all levels, its significance, and how it fulfills the college vision and mission. The faculty member should also describe the extent and duration of activities, positions held, and how the service activities are related to the candidate's professional field or bring recognition to the university.

For example, membership on committees or subcommittees (e.g. conducting curriculum revision, strategic planning, university task force) or serving in an elected or non-elected leadership role should be sufficiently explained within the narrative. Ways to demonstrate service include: letters from the committee chair; agendas with your name on the agenda as a speaker; minutes that reflect where the candidate made a substantive contribution, e.g., a product/policy created by the committee to which they contributed.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the provost, and the president. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the president to provide information concerning the candidate during the Open Period. Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the provost, associate vice president for academic personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the president (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair and other RTP advisory resources such as those provided by the university, department RTP workshops, and department colleagues, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied.

The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments.

Please see section 4.0 for a full explanation of required documentation.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

CED departments shall follow the CED RTP Policy. Department standards shall not be lower than college-level standards.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for analyzing critically and describing the candidate's performance by applying the CED RTP policy to the department review process. The committee members will then evaluate the performance as having 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, or 3) not met expectations in each area.

The tenured and probationary faculty of a department shall elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The CBA restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP. RTP committee members must have a higher rank than those candidates under review.

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any candidate in more than one level of review.

Candidates must minimally meet expectations in all three areas of review (instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service) in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and /or promotion.

3.4 Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

The department chair (and/or dean) shall meet with the department RTP committee members prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the college and university processes and procedures.

Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates, unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The CED RTP policy specifies the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with university and college missions. The CED RTP policy ensures consistency of standards across the college. The CED RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost. The College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The CED RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations, if any. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the college and university RTP policies. The CED RTP committee shall ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the college RTP documents. The committee members will evaluate the performance as having 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, or 3) not met expectations. The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean. A candidate must minimally meet expectations in each area of review in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and /or promotion.

3.7 Dean of the College

The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with college and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees.

The provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9 President

The president has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The president may delegate this authority to the provost.

4.0   Required Documentation

Materials should be organized according to the appropriate review categories. Candidates should be judicious in their selection of evidence and choose the best evidence and representative examples to make their case. Supplemental files for each review category should be no larger than 200 pages per review category.

4.1 The Primary File

4.1.1   RTP Status Sheet (provided by the college)

4.1.2   Professional Data Sheet (PDS)
The PDS serves as the curriculum vitae for RTP purposes in the CED; it should be a complete listing of accomplishments or should incorporate bullets or charts. Entries in the PDS should be dated and listed in reverse chronological or chronological order consistently throughout the documents. So that the candidate's recent record may be reviewed in the context of his/her full career, all achievements should be listed, with a double bar separating work to be evaluated under the current period of review from earlier (previously reviewed) work.

The University requires that each category A-E as listed below begin on a separate page and be presented chronologically or in reverse chronology. Be consistent in the ordering throughout the document. Current requirements are listed below; please check the Faculty Affairs web site for the most current information.

A. Academic Preparation and Honors
    1. Degree, institution, year, major, other education
    2. List academic awards and honors

B. Teaching Activities
    1. Current teaching and/or administrative assignment.
    2. Field of special competence (include areas of special content or pedagogical knowledge bearing on teaching effectiveness)
    3. Teaching assignment (include list of all courses taught by semester)
    4. Participation in student activities (list activities such as advisement, sponsorship, etc. other than routine advisement during office hours or registration periods)

       [Please note: The University requires that evidence of student learning outcomes be addressed in the PDS. For the CED, this information must be addressed in the

narrative and therefore does not have to be included in the PDS.]

C. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (List all relevant accomplishments and indicate which are highly valued and valued as outlined in the CED RTP policy.)

D. University and Community Service Activities (list all relevant accomplishments and provide dates and degree of participation or responsibility such as reports authored, programs or policies implemented, and offices held).

    1) Service to University, College and Department
    2) Service to the Community
    3) Service to the Profession
    4) Other

E. Other contributions that reflect credit in terms of your professional standing and recognition which have a bearing upon your University teaching, research, scholarly, and creative activities, or university or community service.

4.1.3 The Narrative
The narrative should describe the candidate's priorities and areas of professional emphasis, including their scholarly agenda. Other elements of the narrative have been described throughout this policy. The narrative shall include a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instructional and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the University, community, and profession as well as the linkages between these areas as was discussed earlier. The candidate should clearly reference and explain materials presented in supplemental files that support elements of the narrative. Candidates should explain how they have addressed areas of improvement (if any) from prior reviews. A recommended length for the narrative is 10-20 double spaced pages, 12-point font with 1-inch margins.

4.1.4 Index of Supplemental Material

4.1.5 Summary sheets from Student Evaluations for all courses during time of review.

4.1.6 Prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations.

4.1.7 Open Material Index and Materials

4.1.8 All reviews: department committee, college committee, dean, and provost (if applicable)

4.1.9 Candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any, and adjusted recommendations

4.2 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

4.2.1 A representative sample of syllabi from all courses taught during the review period.

4.2.2 If the candidate chooses, raw student course evaluations for a given course in a semester may be included. In such cases, all raw evaluations for that particular course section must be included.

4.2.3 Examples of student assessments, and other evidence to support the narrative.

4.3 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

4.3.1 Full manuscripts to all published articles should be included in the file. For books, the entire manuscript is not required, but evidence of publication should be provided, which may include a publisher's announcement, galley proof, or other accessible information in electronic form including an e-book or link to the work.

4.3.2 Full manuscripts of submitted works with documentation from editor, publishers, or professional association, etc. (whichever applies).

4.3.3 Letters from co-authors regarding workload distribution in co-authored works are optional.

4.4 Service

Documentation of service can take multiple forms, as suggested in the service area (2.3) of this policy

5.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary faculty undergo performance review and evaluation. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five years.

The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of assistant professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.

5.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

In the first and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the college dean.

In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.

5.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion.

A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 6.5.

5.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 6.5.2.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in a separate Academic Senate policy document.

6.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION LEVEL CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities, 2) RSCA, and 3) service.

6.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria outlined by

the college in this document, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality and meeting expectations in all three areas of evaluation.

Reappointment is critical as it indicates the potential long-term commitment to the candidate by the university and the college. The CED requires that probationary faculty must show the reasonable likelihood that they will be able to meet the requirements for tenure. Candidates should note that reappointment does not guarantee a favorable recommendation for tenure. In all cases where the recommendations have been unanimously positive, the dean has the authority to grant reappointment for one, two, or three-year periods, or to recommend not granting reappointment, with the final decision made by the provost.

The minimum expectation for reappointment in CED in the area of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities:

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission.

The candidate should demonstrate effective teaching by multiple methods including pedagogical approaches described in the narrative, course materials, and Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) evaluations.

The minimum expectation for reappointment in CED in the area of RSCA:

The candidate is expected to show progress in his or her program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements.

The minimum expectation for reappointment in CED in the area of Service:

The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental or program level.

The candidate is expected to focus service activities at the program and department level.

6.2 Awarding of Tenure

The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly

output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.

The candidate must present evidence of valued contributions in all areas and potential for ongoing professional growth that reflects the college vision and mission. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

6.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

Minimum expectation for promotion to associate professor in CED in the area of Instruction and Instructionally-related activities:

An associate professor is expected to be an excellent teacher who is highly effective in the classroom, fosters quality learning experiences, and is responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission.

The candidate should demonstrate excellent and highly effective teaching via multiple methods, including pedagogical approaches described in the narrative, course materials, and SPOT evaluations.

Minimum expectation for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor in CED in the area of RSCA:

At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA. The candidate is expected to have produced high quality peer-reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study.

Minimum expectation for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor in CED in the area of Service:

The candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the department and college or the expanded community. The service activities should reflect active participation, ongoing contributions, and initiative.

The candidate is required to make high quality service contributions to the department, and to either the college, or the university, and profession or community (as appropriate). Examples of service at this level could include: serving on elected college committees, participating in a university initiative, chairing a committee in a professional association/organization, or organizing/coordinating a university event.

6.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Minimum criteria for promotion to professor in CED in the area of

Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:

Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development.

The candidate should demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching via multiple methods, including pedagogical approaches described in the narrative, pedagogical approaches, course materials, and SPOT evaluations.

Minimum criteria for promotion to professor in CED in the area of RSCA:

The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that demonstrates increased breadth and depth in their discipline and includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international levels.

Minimum criteria for promotion to professor in CED in the area of Service:

In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession. Promotion to full professor requires consistent involvement in leadership and innovation. It also requires a record of service to the department, college, university, and community.

For promotion to the rank of full professor, successful candidates are typically expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) service at the community and/or professional levels; (3) a record of some leadership at either the department, college, university, community and/or professional levels. Additional examples of this level of service could be mentoring faculty (e.g., support for RSCA, peer observations of teaching), serving on a mental health board, serving on an editorial board, consulting a school district, or chairing a search committee.

6.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and the dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate who is an assistant professor and is applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to associate professor. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may

not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

6.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas of review: Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, RSCA, and Service. Candidates for early tenure must demonstrate superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must demonstrate a sustained record that inspires confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

To be recommended for early tenure, the candidate must receive an evaluation of "exceeded expectations" in all areas of review, relative to requirements for tenure on the standard timeline. For assistant professors, the standard timeline for review for tenure is when the candidate has begun the sixth year in the current rank, while for associate professors, the standard timeline is when the candidate has begun the fifth year in the current rank.

In addition, to be recommended for early tenure, candidates must demonstrate "a *sustained* record of high quality over *multiple* years" (University RTP Policy Statement 09-10, Section 5.2, italics added).

6.5.2 Early Promotion

In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the college policies. The candidate must exceed expectations in all areas of review to be granted early promotion.

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work

sufficient for promotion, but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

To be recommended for early promotion, the candidate must receive an evaluation of "exceeded expectations" in all areas of review, relative to requirements for promotion on the standard timeline. For assistant professors, the standard timeline for review for promotion is when the candidate has begun the sixth year in the current rank, while for associate professors, the standard timeline is when the candidate has begun the fifth year in the current rank.

7.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

7.1   The Division of Academic Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including deadlines for the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period, completion of all RTP reviews by all review levels, and final decision notification to the candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be consistent with the requirements of the CSU-CFA CBA.

7.2   The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.

7.3   Departments shall post in the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The department RTP committee chair prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.

7.4   Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the department RTP committee by the deadline.

7.5   The department RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

7.6   The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee, reviews the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

7.7   The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

7.8   The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the provost by the deadline.

7.9   The provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the president. The president has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The president (or provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

8.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

8.1   Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see the CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

8.2   If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.

8.3   At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any previous review levels.

8.4   The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

9.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE CED RTP POLICY

Changes to the CED RTP policy are subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost.

The Faculty Council shall have the power to propose changes to this CED RTP policy by a two-thirds vote of its members. Amendments may also be proposed by a petition of not less than one-third of the voting tenured and probationary college faculty presented to the dean and to the chair of the Faculty Council.

All proposed changes shall be distributed during the academic year to faculty at the College meeting called for discussion of such proposals. Elections regarding

proposed amendments shall be conducted via secret ballot. Ballots shall be distributed to all voting tenured and probationary college faculty at least 10 working days prior to the due date of those ballots. Ballots may be distributed to faculty having active on-campus appointments via their on-campus mailboxes. However, ballots for voting-eligible faculty who do not have such on-campus appointments during the term of the election (such as faculty on sabbatical) must be addressed and distributed according to the contact information on file at the Dean's Office. In order to certify an election regarding a proposed amendment, at least two-thirds of the voting tenured and probationary college faculty must participate in the voting regarding that amendment.

An amendment to this policy shall be adopted and become effective when it has satisfied all of the following conditions: (a) has been voted on by two-thirds of the voting tenured and probationary college faculty in a certified election, (b) has received a simple majority vote of the voting faculty, (c) is approved by the dean, and (d) is approved by the provost.