CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
POLICY EFFECTIVE *FALL 2015*

CSULB is a teaching-intensive, research-driven university that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global perspectives. The College of Liberal Arts Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the criteria by which the work of probationary and tenured faculty shall be evaluated within this context. The college expects all probationary and tenured faculty to demonstrate a sustained, high-quality record in: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and (3) service contributions.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.1.1 The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the college.

1.1.2 All departments in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) are required to have an RTP Policy. Department RTP standards shall not be lower than college-level standards. Departments may adopt the college policy as their own. In all cases, basic principles of shared governance must be followed in the creation, adoption, and emendation of such policies.

1.1.3 Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and department policies.

1.1.4 The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed work for specified periods of review.

1.1.5 Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As such, all statements made by candidates and all materials put forth for consideration in RTP matters must abide by the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this basic principle. Such issues shall be referred to Academic Affairs.

1.1.6 Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner organized according to the policy requirements and instructions.

1.1.7 Candidates' narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as

47   detailed on the Professional Data Sheet.
48
49   **1.1.8** The CLA RTP policy requires mentoring of candidates and candidates'
50   participation in the mentoring process. While mentoring provides ongoing
51   evaluative feedback for candidates, the RTP process constitutes the formal
52   mechanism for evaluation of probationary and tenured faculty.
53
54   **1.1.9** Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on
55   criteria and procedures delineated in university, college, or department RTP
56   policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on unprofessional sources such
57   as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., Facebook,
58   RateMyProfessors.com, Pick-a-Professor.com), petitions and anonymous letters.
59
60   **1.1.10** As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other
61   materials obtained during open period are to be considered as part of the
62   evaluation of a candidate.
63
64   **1.1.11** Concision and accuracy guide the RTP process at all levels. The CLA RTP
65   Policy requires a streamlined approach to candidates' files. Forms shall be fillable
66   to ensure compliance with word limits.
67
68   **1.1.12** Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more
69   areas of evaluation. Multi-faceted activities may be broken into components and
70   discussed where appropriate. Components discussed or listed under one area of
71   evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.
72
73   **1.2 File Requirements**
74
75   **1.2.1** All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:
76   a. Professional Data Sheet labeled according to university requirements
77   and with the following CLA specifications:
78   1. Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:
79   a. By semester, list formal academic advising
80   activities and associated duties.
81   b. By semester, list activities for which units are
82   assigned (e.g., assigned time or other), such as
83   involvement in student mentoring, supervision of
84   student research, projects, and/or fieldwork.
85   c. By semester, include other instructional activities
86   outside of the classroom. Such activities include,
87   but are not limited to: (1) supervision of student
88   independent research projects; (2) supervision of
89   student research assistants; (3) chairing or serving
90   on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees;
91   and (4) supervision of student teachers.
92   2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA):

1. For all RSCA that does not appear under Works in Progress, candidate must:
   a. Label according to CLA definitions for publication status and peer-review.
   b. Place all previously-claimed work under the double line.
   c. List RSCA-related external grants;
   d. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication listed with the following:
      i. Description of publication venue (e.g., journal, media, or volume) vis-à-vis the discipline and/or subfield;
      ii. Rationale for publication venue choice;
      iii. Explanation of candidate's contribution to co- and multi-authored RSCA.
3. Service activities, including dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.

b. Narrative addressing the three areas of evaluation (instruction and instructionally-related activities; RSCA; and service). This three-part narrative shall be submitted via the Candidate Statement Form*, which allows up to 3,000 words.

c. Workload Assignment Form.*

d. Academic Advisor Report† (as appropriate).

e. All peer-reviewed publications for the period of review, including (for each):
   1. Proof of peer-review for peer-reviewed publications;
   2. Proof of publication status for all in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.

f. Student course evaluation summaries for each course taught for which formal student course evaluations were required during the period of review.

g. For each course taught during the period of review:
   1. One (1) representative syllabus;
   2. One (1) sample learning assessment tool;
   3. One (1) sample of representative course materials not to exceed four (4) pages.

h. All prior RTP reviews, periodic evaluations, and evidence of mentoring (i.e., mini-review evaluations or other) over the full review period, including the candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any. For promotion to rank of Professor, evaluations for promotion to associate shall be included.

i. Index of all materials prepared by the candidate except the index of open period materials, which shall be prepared by department RTP

---

* Denotes official form available from the College of Liberal Arts.
† Academic Advisor form available from the College of Liberal Arts and only required of faculty who receive unit compensation for advising activities.

136   committee chair or designee.
137
138   **1.2.2** With the exception of optional written student evaluations as per 2.1.7.3,
139   materials in excess of the above requirements will be returned to the candidate.
140
141 ## 2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION
142 The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The College
143 of Liberal Arts requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines
144 for each area of evaluation below.
145
146 ## 2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities
147 Effective instruction and instructionally-related activities within the College of Liberal Arts
148 encompass a wide range of tasks and responsibilities. This section specifies criteria for the
149 evaluation of a faculty member's instruction and instructionally-related activities. Further, this
150 section delineates the type and amount of documentation regarding a candidate's instructional
151 effectiveness.
152
153   **2.1.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities File**
154   Candidates **must** submit:
155   a.   Narrative written on the fillable form.
156   b.   Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal
157   student course evaluations were required during the period of review.
158   c.   For each course taught during the period of review:
159   1.   One (1) representative course syllabus.
160   2.   One (1) sample of an appropriate assessment of student learning
161   outcomes.
162   3.   One (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to
163   exceed four (4) pages.
164   d.   Academic Advisor Report, if applicable.
165
166   **2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice**
167   The candidate's narrative of instructional philosophy and practice provides the context
168   necessary for understanding and interpreting the candidate's instructional goals,
169   materials, and accomplishments.
170
171   This narrative, as further evidenced by submitted materials, shall address the following:

172   a.   The over-arching goals of the candidate's instructional practices.

173   b.   Relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to instruction.

174   c.   Teaching methodologies and their links to student assessment and learning
175   outcomes.

176   d.   Student course evaluations relative to level.

177   e.   Grade distributions relative to level.

178   f.   Reflection on course evolution in response to feedback, professional

179   development activities, and/or experimentation with instructional
180   methodologies or assessments.

181 Furthermore, the narrative shall address the following *as appropriate*:

182   g. Student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms,
183   relative to level.

184   h. Grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

185 **2.1.3 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Materials**
186 For each course taught during the period under review candidates will include only: (a)
187 one (1) representative syllabus; (b) one (1) assessment tool for student learning; and (c)
188 one (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages.
189
190   **2.1.3.1 Syllabi**
191   A representative syllabus for each course instructed during the period of review
192   must be submitted. For courses taught more than once in the period of review
193   (e.g., GEOG444), only one (1) representative syllabus shall be submitted.
194   Candidates may include an additional syllabus for no more than two (2) selected
195   courses to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation. Evaluation will
196   consider syllabi content relative to course level and catalog description. Syllabi
197   must reflect currency in the discipline and be consistent with current Academic
198   Senate syllabus policies.
199
200   **2.1.3.2 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**
201   For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one
202   assessment tool of student learning (e.g., comprehensive final assignment, exam,
203   lab, paper assignment, or project assignment). Evaluation will consider
204   appropriateness relative to course content, student learning goals and objectives,
205   course level, and number of enrolled students.
206
207   **2.1.3.3 Instructional Materials**
208   For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one
209   (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages.
210   Instructional materials include, but are not limited to, class handouts, lecture
211   notes, web page printouts, and PowerPoint slides. Media containing instructional
212   materials (e.g., CDs and DVDs) can be discussed in the narrative but may not be
213   submitted.
214
215 **2.1.4 Peer Observation of Instruction**
216   As part of the department RTP evaluation, the department committee may choose
217   to perform a classroom observation or a candidate may choose to request such an
218   observation. If performed, the evaluation must adhere to the CBA and comply
219   with a consistent departmental rubric or procedure, including compliance with the
220   requirement that notice be given at least five (5) days before a classroom visit.
221   The subsequent evaluation may be incorporated into the department RTP
222   evaluation and/or submitted as a separate document during the open period.
223

2.1.5 Grade Distributions

Differentiation among levels of student learning is an important responsibility of any teacher. Grade distributions provide a measure of grade leniency and severity. Further, they provide a useful measure for contextualizing assessment of student learning and student course evaluations. As grades in a class necessarily differ from one group of students to another, evaluation will consider the overall trend in grade distributions.

2.1.6 Academic Advisor Report

Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal student academic advising shall report on their activities per a consistent procedure approved by the Dean or designee. For RTP purposes, the report serves to document instructionally-related activities for which assigned time is granted.

2.1.7 Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations complement the information obtained in the criteria stated above.

2.1.7.1. Evaluation Relative to Context

Committees, chairs, and the dean shall evaluate student response to instruction relative to context, including:

a. Class characteristics
   1. Course level
   2. Number of enrolled students
   3. Whether this was a new course preparation
b. Candidate's teaching assignment
   1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of evaluation
   2. Total number of different course preparations
c. Candidate's experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness
d. Trends over time

2.1.7.2 Course Evaluation Summaries

Course evaluation summaries that are consistent with department and college means provide one measure of effective instruction. Course evaluation summaries must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations are required during the period of review.

2.1.7.3 Written Remarks on Student Course Evaluations

The inclusion of written remarks from student course evaluations is optional. Candidates may include written remarks for a course if such remarks help clarify or explain an ambiguity on the course evaluation summaries. In such cases, all original student evaluations for the selected course, including those evaluations without student comments, must be included.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The College of Liberal Arts requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) of all faculty members. CLA recognizes the diversity of fields represented within the college. Traditional scholarship and emerging scholarly fields, such as the scholarship of engagement and multi-media RSCA, fall under this rubric. This section outlines the criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

2.2.1 RSCA File

2.2.1.1 Required Materials

Candidate's files **must** include:

a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.
b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative activities <u>for the review period only</u>. RSCA claimed in prior actions cannot be included. Published peer-reviewed research includes, but is not limited to: books, articles, films, and other media. Such materials shall be placed in the binder or, in the case of books and other materials that do not fit in the binder, shall be submitted with the file. <u>Furthermore, candidates have the option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per the following guidelines:</u>
   1. Candidates <u>may</u> 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 <u>must</u> be listed under Works in Progress on the PDS.
   2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only include publications and all in press, forthcoming, or accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a prior successful action.
c. For candidates who author externally-funded RSCA grants and choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, file must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2) length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award; (5) brief description of candidate's role in authorship and implementation.
d. Proof of publication status as per policy (below) for all in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.
e. Proof of peer review as per 2.2.3.

2.2.1.2 Optional Materials

The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews) is optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as negative for any candidate.

316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361

2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials
Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g., works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures). Listing such items on the PDS is sufficient.

2.2.2 RSCA Narrative
The RSCA narrative for the period of review must address:
   a. Focus and sustained nature of the candidate's research, scholarly, and creative activities.
   b. Significance and impact of the candidate's RSCA.
   c. Candidate's role in authorship for co- and multi-authored RSCA.
   d. Significance and impact of non peer-reviewed RSCA included in the candidate's RTP file.

2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition
In the College of Liberal Arts, peer review is the primary requirement for the majority of a candidate's research, scholarly, and creative activities.

2.2.3.1 Definition
Peer review is typically defined as a process by which qualified experts in the discipline impartially evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities. For the purposes of this policy, the term peer review encompasses the terms 'juried' and 'refereed,' which may be used for all RSCA impartially evaluated by qualified experts in specific disciplines.

Peer review may also be defined as:
   a. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the publishing venues of non-academic sectors.
   b. The process of evaluation of extramural RSCA grant proposals by granting agencies or organizations.
   c. A process leading to performances or exhibits.

2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement
For each RSCA item on the Professional Data Sheet, candidates are required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using consistent labels of "Peer Reviewed," "Refereed," or "Juried" as appropriate to the field.

2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status
RSCA not yet in print or otherwise in the public domain must be labeled on the Professional Data Sheet according to the following definitions of publication status:
   a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable. Both refer to an accepted work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-

362   publication state.
363   b.   <u>Accepted</u> refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has
364   agreed to publish without major changes.
365   c.   <u>Conditionally accepted</u> refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed
366   and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity,
367   indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be
368   published.
369   d.   <u>Revise and resubmit</u> refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and
370   has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating
371   that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.
372   e.   <u>Submitted</u> means only that work has been submitted for consideration.
373   f.   <u>Under contract with complete manuscript draft</u> refers to RSCA for
374   which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.
375   g.   <u>Under contract without complete manuscript draft</u> refers to RSCA for
376   which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.
377
378 **2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status**
379 For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file,
380 candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the
381 publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation
382 (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.
383
384 **2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**
385
386   **2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**
387   Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such
388   proof must be provided in English.
389
390   Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:
391   a.   A printout of the venue's editorial policy.
392   b.   Copies of reader reports.
393   c.   Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.
394
395   **2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns**
396   Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.
397
398   Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest;
399   monetary payment to secure publication; and duplicate publication:
400
401   a.   <u>Conflicts of interest</u>: Conflicts of interest include, but are not
402   limited to serving contemporaneously on the editorial, advisory, or
403   executive board of the press or journal with which one has
404   published.
405   b.   <u>Monetary contributions</u>: Publications in venues to which an author
406   is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure
407   publication (e.g., for-profit presses and vanity presses) shall be

408   considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection
409   process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to
410   offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for
411   publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images).

412   c.   Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in
413   their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same
414   article published in different venues or in different languages.
415   Reprints must be labeled as such.
416

2.3 Service

417
418 High-quality, sustained service contributions to the University as well as to the profession
419 and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts.
420 Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty member.
421

422 In keeping with the self-governance tenets that inform our campus, service contributions
423 must be performed at the department, college, and/or university levels. This section
424 delineates service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.
425

2.3.1 Service File

426
427 Candidates **must** submit:
428   a.   Narrative written on the fillable form. The narrative shall address
429   significance and impact of service identified on the PDS.
430   b.   Professional Data Sheet. As per university guidelines, the PDS must
431   address dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and
432   responsibilities.
433

2.3.2 Service Expectations

434
435 All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of
436 faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues.
437

438 At all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be
439 weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates
440 serve.
441

442 Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to: faculty
443 governance activities and committees; program development; sponsorship of
444 student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and projects;
445 authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or
446 department policies and procedures; mentoring of students; service or leadership
447 activities for university committees, professional organizations or boards;
448 conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local
449 government, and community organizations.
450

2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank

451

a. <u>Probationary faculty members in the first three years</u> of appointment typically are expected to focus service activities at the department level.

b. <u>For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor,</u> probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-quality service contributions to their department, and to either the college or the university.

c. <u>For promotion to the rank of Professor,</u> successful candidates are expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) a record of leadership at the University; and (3) a record of service in the community and/or the profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g., committee chair) and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g., active participation in accreditation or policy-writing processes).

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service activities relative to department, college, and university RTP policies as well as the CBA.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process, and emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.

3.1 Candidate

Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.

3.1.1 It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Academic Affairs.

3.1.2 It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required material is included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.

3.1.3 As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of material after the date of file completion must have the approval of the college RTP committee, which is the peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.

3.2 Joint Appointments

The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the

498   formation of an evaluation committee. This committee shall consist of members selected
499   from among the peer review committees of the departments within which the candidate
500   holds a joint appointment. For more details on joint appointments, see the university
501   policy.
502
503   **3.3 Department RTP Policy**
504   The University RTP Policy dictates that all departments shall have RTP policies. The
505   document also delineates ratification procedures and review requirements. All department
506   policies must then be ratified by the Faculty Council in a majority vote and must be
507   approved by the dean and the Provost.
508
509   In the College of Liberal Arts, departments may adopt the college policy as their own.
510   Department policies shall be subject to review as needed. If changes are made to those
511   policies, they must then be ratified and approved as outlined above.
512
513   **3.4 Department RTP Committee**
514   The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities for department RTP
515   committees and stipulates that no one individual may participate in the evaluation of any
516   single candidate in more than one level of review.
517
518   **3.4.1** In the College of Liberal Arts, departments must elect no fewer than three
519   (3) tenured, full-time faculty members to department RTP committees. As per the
520   CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may
521   serve on RTP committees if elected by majority vote and approved by the
522   President, yet no RTP committee may comprise solely faculty participating in the
523   FERP. All elections must be done by secret ballot.
524
525   **3.4.2** Department constitutions or RTP policies may stipulate that larger
526   committees or separate committees may be elected for different actions (i.e.,
527   reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Professor). In all cases, at least three (3)
528   members of the department RTP committee must evaluate each candidate.
529
530   **3.4.3** As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a
531   higher rank than the candidate.
532
533   **3.4.4** Department RTP committees are encouraged to provide concise evaluative
534   commentary of candidates' files.
535
536   **3.4.5** As per the academic honesty clause of the College RTP policy,
537   misrepresentations, if detected, must be noted in the evaluation.
538
539   **3.5 Mentoring**
540   The College of Liberal Arts recognizes the importance of mentoring in the success of
541   RTP candidates and requires candidates to participate in ongoing mentoring activities,
542   which aim to help candidates maintain a clear trajectory of their professional
543   accomplishments and goals. The University RTP Policy identifies the department chair as

544	having the responsibility for communicating the department, college, and university
545	policies to candidates and for providing mentoring to candidates. In the College of
546	Liberal Arts, mentoring can be performed by the chair or a mutually agreed-upon
547	tenured, full-time faculty designee. Candidates are charged with seeking guidance from
548	the department chair or designated mentor. Evidence of mentoring shall be included in
549	the candidate's file and can include, but is not limited to, feedback provided on mini-
550	review evaluations.
551	
552	**3.6 Department Chair Evaluations**
553	The University RTP Policy stipulates that a department chair may write independent
554	evaluations of RTP candidates. In the College of Liberal Arts, the absence of such a letter
555	shall not be construed as a negative judgment on the candidate. If the chair elects to write
556	a separate evaluation, that document usually will not exceed 500 words.
557	
558	**3.7 College RTP Policy**
559	The University RTP Policy specifies that the college RTP policy must be ratified by a
560	majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members and approved by the dean
561	and the Provost.
562	
563	The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy shall be subject to review as needed. The Faculty
564	Council shall be charged with facilitating those reviews. Any substantive change in the
565	policy requires ratification as per the procedures outlined in this policy.
566	
567	**3.8 College RTP Committee**
568	The college RTP committee reviews materials submitted by candidates, departmental
569	committees, and department chairs. Evaluation by the college committee must take into
570	account the RTP policy of the candidate's department as well as the university and
571	college RTP policies. The committee renders its own evaluation, which it forwards to the
572	dean.
573	
574	**3.8.1 Election of the Committee**
575	The college RTP committee shall have ten (10) full-time, tenured faculty
576	members. The committee shall be constituted in the following way:
577	
578	a. The committee must have seven (7) tenured, full-time faculty members
579	at the rank of Professor and three (3) additional members at the rank of
580	Associate Professor or Professor.
581	b. Additionally, one (1) alternate at the rank of Professor shall be elected
582	for one year. If the alternate does not serve on the committee, this
583	individual is eligible for election to the committee when the term ends.
584	c. Members shall be elected by secret ballot as per the election
585	procedures delineated in the CLA Constitution.
586	d. As per the CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement
587	Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if elected by majority
588	vote and approved by the President, yet no RTP committee may be
589	comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

590   e.   Members shall serve staggered two-year terms and shall not be re-
591   elected for more than two (2) consecutive terms.
592   f.   In the event that the committee cannot be populated with members
593   who are all from different academic areas, up to two faculty members
594   may be elected from the same academic area, provided they are at
595   different ranks.
596   g.   Committee members may not serve on any other standing or ad hoc
597   RTP committee at the university.

3.8.2 Structure and Duties of the College RTP Committee

3.8.2.1 The RTP committee shall consist of two standing sub-committees:
a. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of tenure and promotion. A minimum of five (5) committee members at the rank of Professor must serve on this committee.
b. The Reappointment Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of reappointment. A minimum of three (3) committee members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must serve on this committee.

3.8.2.2 At the first meeting of the CLA RTP Committee:
a. The committee shall elect a chair who holds the rank of Professor. This chair also shall serve as chair of the Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee.
b. Once elected, the CLA RTP Committee chair, in consultation with the members of the committee, shall determine the size and membership of the two sub-committees based on the relative number of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion actions to be considered.
c. The entire CLA RTP Committee then shall elect a chair of the Reappointment Sub-Committee. The sub-committee chair shall report to the CLA RTP Committee chair.

3.8.3 The sub-committees are bound to the following rules:
a. As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a higher rank than the candidate.
b. No RTP sub-committee may be comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
c. If department chairs serve on the CLA RTP Committee, they will be recused from decisions involving any faculty from their department or program.
d. For each action, a majority recommendation must be made by the members of the sub-committee. A minority report may be submitted.
e. No RTP subcommittee may have more than one person from a given academic area. Committee members with joint appointments shall not serve on subcommittees with colleagues from either of their academic

636   areas.
637
638   **3.8.4 Evaluation and Recommendations**
639   a. The college RTP committee must make its own independent evaluation
640   of each candidate.
641   b. The college RTP recommendation usually shall not exceed 750 words.
642
643   **3.9 Dean of the College**
644   The Dean is charged with mentoring department chairs regarding their role in the RTP
645   process. The dean also communicates standards and expectations and ensures the
646   integrity of the RTP process across the college. The Dean writes an independent
647   evaluation and recommendation for each candidate and forwards that evaluation to the
648   Provost.
649
650   **3.10 University-Level Review**
651   The Provost reviews the candidate's file and all prior evaluations and makes a final
652   recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions
653   for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President
654   may delegate this authority to the Provost.
655

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

657   The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review
658   requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.
659

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

661   Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1)
662   instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall
663   demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any
664   action.
665
666   **5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**
667   The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must
668   demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the
669   college and the candidate's department, a candidate for reappointment must show
670   evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.
671
672   At minimum, this evidence must include demonstration of: (1) effective teaching; (2)
673   research, scholarship, and/or creative activities that include initial publications or similar
674   evidence of RSCA appropriate to rank, experience, and discipline; and (3) engagement in
675   service at the department level.
676
677   The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any
678   area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).
679
680   **5.2 Awarding of Tenure**
681   The University RTP Policy delineates the meaning of tenure and the criteria for the

682   awarding of tenure.
683
684   **5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor** The University RTP Policy states
685   the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor, including the
686   expectation that a candidate shall have a record of high-quality peer-reviewed work that
687   has contributed to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or
688   interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition to the minimum standard stated in that
689   policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the candidate to make high-quality service
690   contributions to the department and to either the college or the university.
691
692   **5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor**
693   The University RTP Policy states that standards for promotion to full professor shall be
694   higher than standards for promotion to associate professor.
695
696   In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor
697   must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The
698   successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include high-quality contributions to
699   the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary
700   fields of study. The candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed
701   work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to
702   Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities. The
703   candidate also is expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at
704   department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership at the University;
705   and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.
706
707   **5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion**
708   As outlined by the University RTP Policy, early tenure and/or early promotion are
709   awarded in rare circumstances in which a candidate demonstrates a superior record of
710   accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation. That policy states that candidates for
711   early tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation
712   process according to the university policy on external evaluation.
713
714   **5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts**
715   In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a
716   potential candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources
717   and mentors, including the department chair, dean, and, if possible, department
718   RTP committee members.
719
720   ## 6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS
721   The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the
722   University RTP Policy.
723
724   In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall
725   prepare the index of open period materials.
726
727   ## 7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

728
729   **7.1** The University RTP Policy specifies that, prior to the final decision, candidates for
730   promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review
731   (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.
732
733   **7.2** The University RTP Policy and the CBA specify that if, at any time during the review
734   process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package
735   shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been
736   provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner. In the College of Liberal
737   Arts, a timely manner is defined as no more than five business days.
738
739   **7.3** In the College of Liberal Arts, committees, chairs, and deans cannot request
740   additional material that is not specified by the college or department RTP policies unless
741   such material is required to verify otherwise unsupported claims made in the file.
742
743   **7.4** The University RTP Policy specifies that, at each level of review, the candidate shall
744   be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the
745   recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The
746   candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten
747   (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the
748   candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any
749   previous review levels.
750
751   **7.5** External evaluations of candidates are governed by the university policy on external
752   evaluation and the CBA.
753

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

755 Changes to the College of Liberal Arts RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the
756 CSU-CFA CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to
757 accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures
758 do not require a vote by the faculty.
759
760 The tenured and probationary faculty of the CLA, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy
761 and evaluation criteria section of this document.
762
763   Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:
764
765   (1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty percent (20%) of the tenured and
766   probationary faculty to the chair of the Faculty Council.
767
768   (2) By a two-thirds vote of the full membership of the Faculty Council.
769
770 Proposed amendments shall be submitted to the dean for discussion at a public hearing for the
771 faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be
772 distributed by the chair of the Faculty Council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days
773 before the public hearing. The dean or designee shall conduct the hearing.

774
775   Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote
776   of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the
777   Faculty Council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the
778   concurrence of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Provost.
779
780   Approved:_____ (Dean, CLA) _____(Provost)
781   Effective: Fall 2015