CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE, GERMAN, RUSSIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS, POLICY EFFECTIVE FALL 2021

The Department of RGRLL houses language and literature programs that are aligned with the Modern Language Association's best practices guidelines, which recommend that programs educate students to have "deep translingual and transcultural competence."[1] As such, the department expects all probationary and tenured faculty to engage in high quality teaching, research, and service that supports its programs, goals, and related professional associations.

The department has adopted the College RTP Policy. In addition, our policy includes what is specified below. Candidates and evaluators therefore should follow the department policy within the context of the College RTP policy and the University RTP policy.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

All guiding principles are the same with the following exception:

1.2 File requirements

The candidate's narrative (maximum of 3,000 words) normally shall be distributed evenly across the three areas of evaluation. Candidates are encouraged to distribute their narrative accordingly to ensure sufficient discussion of all areas of evaluation.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

The following categories of evaluation are required by the University and College RTP policies.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

The Department of RGRLL prides itself on teaching excellence, which is required for the success of our programs. The department therefore expects that all faculty will be effective, engaged teachers who are able to teach across the curriculum as per program and student needs.

In addition to requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy, the department complies with the University TRP Policy with regard to the following requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

a. Reappointment: Only candidates who demonstrate an effective performance in teaching and clear potential for improvement shall be recommended for reappointment.

[1] Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World," *Profession* (2007): 1-11.

b. Tenure and/or promotion: Only candidates who demonstrate sustained and high-quality teaching in the overall record shall be recommended for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.
c. Promotion to Rank of Professor: Only candidates who demonstrate excellent, highly effective teaching shall be recommended for promotion to Professor.

Candidates are encouraged to take these minimal department standards into account when constructing their RTP files and writing their narratives.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The Department of RGRLL has identified high-quality RSCA as the foundation of our collective professional profile as engaged teachers and active scholars. The department values RSCA related to all of the areas of expertise of faculty members, including pedagogy, translation, and relevant fields of scholarly and creative endeavor.

The following two examples articulate paradigmatic considerations regarding journal articles/collaborative research and publications in languages other than English for candidates at all levels of review.

Journal articles

Candidates should provide evidence of the selectivity of journals (e.g. acceptance and/or rejection rates; journal impact factor when available). This goes for both online and print journals.

In most sub-disciplines of literary studies, single-authored works are the norm, and co-authoring implies substantial contributions from all authors. In some experimental subfields, co-authorship is more common, and contributions may be more unequal. Faculty are expected to have co-authorship relations appropriate to their sub-discipline, which in most cases means that some single-authored work is expected as evidence of an independent research program. However, exceptions may be made for highly successful collaborations, provided that the candidate documents substantial personal contributions. In the case of co- or multiple authorship (or editorship, for example of a special issue or volume of essays), the candidate should provide a clear description of the distribution of work by different authors and evidence such as memoranda, emails, working drafts with sufficient detail and accuracy to allow evaluators to gauge individual input, and / or public disclosure statements identifying individual contributions submitted to the journal in question. Candidates shall indicate at what stage in their career collaborations were formed. Research partnerships formed later than graduate school better demonstrate engagement with the scholarly community than, e.g., ongoing collaboration with former advisors, though the quality and distribution of the work remains a central consideration.

Foreign language publications

As a department that teaches several world languages, we value publications in candidates' languages of expertise as well as in English. In the case of foreign language publications, candidates should indicate whether they authored in a foreign language or

had an English-language article or chapter translated. Candidates should expect to provide the same information about all foreign language publications that they provide for publications in English, and shall arrange to have translations done of any significant correspondence (acceptance letters, descriptions of editorial policy provided by editors, reader reports, etc.).

2.2.1 Requirements: In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy, the department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

a. Reappointment: Candidates for reappointment must demonstrate an ongoing effort to build a scholarly portfolio. By the time candidates turn in their files for reappointment, they are expected to have at least one high-quality, original, substantive, peer-reviewed, article-length essay or book chapter—published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress) —in a prestigious venue; and to have another article under consideration. Translation of a creative or scholarly monograph also meets the criterion of one article accepted and a second article under consideration. Translation of a creative or scholarly monograph plus a substantive preface and/or translator's note in addition to the translation may count as the equivalent of two, substantive, original articles, and thus would exceed expectations for reappointment. Candidates whose RSCA falls outside these parameters for reappointment need to make the case that their records meet the requirements for quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy.

Other supporting professional activities or enhancing categories of assessment might include activities such as book reviews, peer-reviewed conference presentations, and external research grant proposals, but these activities should not be prioritized over the goal of publication and do not receive the same weight.

To meet these requirements, recent PhDs in their first three (3) years of appointment are strongly encouraged to use their dissertations as the basis for at least two (2) publications during the initial appointment period and to present papers at conferences.

b. Tenure and/or promotion: Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate an increasingly strong record of publications. The department values sustained quality over quantity. A record of multiple publications that are not original or that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way is unlikely to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. Publications (or their RSCA equivalent) may be published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress) as per the definitions and allowances provided in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.1).

In recognition of the diversity of possible RSCA records a candidate may develop, the department has articulated various scenarios (see below). These scenarios represent the department's expectations for a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. All scenarios involve peer-reviewed publication in a variety of venues (e.g., different

journals). Candidates whose RSCA records fall outside these scenarios for tenure and/or promotion need to make the case that their records meet the requirements for quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy. To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, candidates must demonstrate substantial activity in the following primary categories of assessment; that is to say, candidates must meet one scenario from 1a through 1e as well as criterion no. 2:

1. A record of peer-reviewed RSCA aligned with one of the following scenarios. In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate quality and impact of RSCA. Candidates whose research is conducted together with others and whose research outcomes are therefore co- or multi-authored shall offer a detailed description of their role in the collaborative work, (e.g., conceptualization, writing, and data analysis) in co- and multi-authored RSCA. The magnitude of the candidate's contribution is weighed, rather than the mere order of authorship.

a. Three (3) high-quality, original, substantive, peer-reviewed articles or book chapters—published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress) —in different prestigious venues. Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way, including literary and cultural studies, translation, and/or pedagogy. In this scenario, the candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the prestige of the venues (e.g., based on acceptance rates, rankings, or other similar data), and originality of RSCA to make the case for quality over quantity.

b. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.

c. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored monograph in which the candidate played a significant, demonstrable role in the authorship. In such cases, the candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted peer-reviewed, substantive (thus not in progress), original articles in different venues. Textbooks related to the candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can be shown to advance scholarship or integrate scholarship into innovative pedagogical practice in the discipline.

d. Publication of an academic translation closely related to the candidate's area of expertise. Translations that feature a translator's substantive introduction, annotations or editorial work on the original text performed by the translator prior to translation can be considered the equivalent of two, peer-reviewed articles.

e. Externally-funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships that support the candidate's research agenda may also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements. In such cases, the candidate must have a minimum of <u>two</u> (2) original, substantive, peer-reviewed, article-length essays or book chapters—published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress)—in different prestigious venues; <u>and</u> must make the case that the externally-funded grant should be

considered the equivalent of a peer-reviewed publication in terms of the weight it should be given in the RSCA evaluation.

2. Ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and/or qualifying non peer-reviewed/invited lectures or presentations).

c. Promotion to Professor: Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate evidence of sustained and consistent RSCA that has resulted in publications in high-quality, peer-reviewed venues for the review period. Candidates for promotion to full professor should have made additional substantial contributions that have had a significant impact in the field beyond the contribution that earned tenure.

The following two requirements must be met for candidates to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor:
1. Candidates must have three (3) substantive, original article-length, peer-reviewed publications or their equivalent to be eligible for promotion to Professor. These publications need to appear in a variety of prestigious venues. They may be published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted as per the definitions and allowances provided in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.1).

Since the department values quality over quantity, multiple publications that are not original or that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way are unlikely to receive a positive recommendation for promotion. The following examples represent some of the other possible **scenarios** that merit a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor, that is to say, candidates must meet one scenario from 1 a through d as well as criterion no. 2. In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate quality and impact of RSCA.

a. Three (3) high-quality, original, substantive peer-reviewed articles in different high-quality, prestigious publication venues. Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way. In this scenario, the candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the prestige of the venues, and originality of RSCA to make the case for quality over quantity.

b. Externally-funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships that support the candidate's research agenda may also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements. In such cases, the candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted peer-reviewed, substantive, original articles and must make the case that the externally-funded grant should be considered the equivalent of a peer-reviewed publication in terms of the weight it should be given in the RSCA evaluation.

c. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.

d. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored monograph in which the candidate played a significant, demonstrable role in the authorship. Textbooks related to the candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can be shown to advance scholarship in the discipline. As with all RSCA, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate quality and impact on the field.

2. Candidates must demonstrate ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non-peer-reviewed articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and/or non-peer-reviewed lectures or presentations).

2.2.2 Departmental Definitions

All definitions stated in the CLA RTP Policy apply. For the purposes of the Department RTP Policy, the following additional definitions apply:

a. 'Substantive' is defined as an article-length publication. Such publications often range from 7,000-10,000 words. Regardless of length, candidates need to articulate impact and substance of RSCA in the narrative. Review or state-of-the-field articles meeting these criteria are considered substantive.
b. 'Original' is defined as RSCA that makes an argument that is not reiterative of other research published by the candidate or other scholars.
c. Peer-reviewed conferences are those for which abstracts are reviewed by a selection committee.
d. Non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations usually are those given by invitation, but also might include a lecture given in a colleague's class or lecture series.
e. A funded external grant refers to a funded external grant proposal, not to an application for such a grant.
f. Pedagogical contributions are defined as textbooks, peer-reviewed e-books and published materials that advance teaching and learning in the area of expertise and/or explore how people teach and learn in the discipline.
g. Translations submitted for consideration in the tenure and promotion process must be contextualized and documented by the candidate: whether the translation was conducted upon invitation (due to disciplinary expertise), by submitting a proposal to a publishing house, etc.

2.3 Service

The programs in the Department of RGRLL require ongoing service activities for their success at the university. As such, the department has high service expectations for its faculty.

2.3.1 Service requirements and opportunities.

In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy (2.3), the department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

2.3.1a Baseline service requirements

In addition to the CLA RTP Policy requirement that faculty participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues, the Department of RGRLL has defined the baseline service requirements of all faculty: active participation in faculty meetings, section meetings, LOTE interviews, and assessment. Evaluators in the RTP process shall evaluate baseline service requirements and shall state when such service requirements have not been met. Service at the baseline level is necessary but not sufficient for meeting the minimum expectation for department service.

2.3.1b Department service opportunities

For RTP purposes, there are many ways to give service to the department. These include, but are not limited to: service on department standing and ad-hoc committees (e.g., Curriculum, Personnel, LOTE Advisory, Scholarship, Grade Appeals Committees, Advisory Council, Personnel/RTP Committees, Textbook Selection Committees); curriculum development; professional development workshops for graduate and undergraduate students; acting as official advisor to student organizations and clubs; and organizing cultural events. As per the CLA RTP Policy, all activities for which assigned time is given must be listed under Instruction and Instructional Activities and not under Service.

2.3.1d University service opportunities

University service opportunities include, but are not limited to: serving on Academic Senate or its numerous councils and committees; volunteering to serve on WASC or other university-level councils and taskforces; participation on University by the Sea and other similar initiatives.

2.3.2 Service expectations by rank

For all ranks, candidates for RTP actions are expected to be engaged in ongoing, substantive service that demonstrates an active engagement with the processes of faculty governance. As with the college policy (2.3.2), at all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be weighed more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates serve.

2.3.2a Reappointment: Faculty in their first three years of appointment are expected to perform service above the baseline requirement in the department. Such service can include, but is not limited to serving on department committees or performing other service as per 2.3.1b above.

2.3.2b Tenure and/or promotion: Candidates coming up for tenure and/or promotion are expected to have diversified and increased their service profiles during the probationary period. In addition to active participation in department services activities

delineated in 2.3.1b above, candidates for tenure and/or promotion also are expected to perform service at the college or university level as per the CLA RTP Policy (2.3.2.1).

2.3.2.c Promotion to rank of Professor: Successful candidates shall have, as per the CLA and University RTP Policies, a significant, substantive record of service at department, college, and university levels; a record of leadership at the university; and a record of service in the community and/or the profession. The only additional requirement in the Department of RGRLL is that candidates also must have a sustained, ongoing record of meeting the baseline service requirements to the department as per 2.3.1a above.

3 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PROCESS

3.4 Department RTP Committee

Procedures for elections of the Department RTP Committee are outlined in the CLA RTP Policy. As per the CLA RTP Policy (3.4.2), at least three (3) members of the department RTP committee or sub-committee must evaluate each candidate.

3.5 Mentoring

Both the University and the College RTP Policies emphasize the importance of mentoring for the RTP process.

3.5.1 Designation of a mentor

In the Department of RGRLL, newly hired untenured faculty shall work with the department chair to identify whether the chair or a mutually-agreed upon mentor shall act in this capacity.

3.5.2 Communication and structure

Mentors and mentees shall have ongoing communication about progress toward success in the RTP process.

3.5.3 Tenured faculty and mentoring

All faculty are encouraged to seek input from a broad range of knowledgeable colleagues throughout their careers. Tenured faculty members are encouraged but not required to participate in the mentoring process. If tenured faculty members elect to participate in the mentoring process, they shall work with the department chair to identify their mentoring needs and to identify a mutually-agreed upon mentor.

4 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.

5 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

The University and College RTP Policies delineate the criteria for appointment and promotion. Candidates are encouraged to read both policies for these important criteria.

6 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the University RTP Policy. In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall prepare the index of open period materials.

7 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The University and CLA policies delineate the additional processes applicable to RTP.

8 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

Changes to any RTP policy at CSULB may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA CBA. In general, changes to procedure do not require a vote by the faculty.

The University RTP Policy stipulates (3.2) that all department RTP policies are subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the Provost.

The tenured and probationary faculty of the department, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this policy.

Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

(1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty-five percent (25%) of the tenured and probationary faculty to the chair of the department.

(2) By a motion made by the Advisory Council to the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department.

Amendments shall be discussed in a faculty meeting before a vote is taken. Once a vote by secret ballot has been taken on the proposed amendments to the policy and the amendments are recommended by a majority of those who cast a vote, then the revised document shall be sent to Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost for final approval. Amendments shall become effective in the academic year after the amendments are approved.

Approved: _____

Effective: Fall 2021