

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)
PS 96-12**

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the mission, vision, and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members (including coaches, librarians, and Counseling and Psychological Services faculty) eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.¹ The university RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.

24
25

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1.1 University Mission and Vision

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, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

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

1.2.1 A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's articulated mission and vision. CSULB faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.

1.2.2 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 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 department, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.

1.2.3 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of

¹Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). However, this document should not be considered as a substitute for those parts of the Agreement that affect RTP matters.

44 review in: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; 3)
45 service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the
46 profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three
47 areas.

48
49 **1.2.4** This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or
50 adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based
51 upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college
52 needs; and university mission.

53 54 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

55
56 Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the
57 standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and
58 promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the
59 university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty
60 accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally-
61 related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the
62 community, and in the profession.

63 64 **2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities**

65 Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers.
66 Instruction and instructionally-related activities include teaching and fostering
67 learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally-related
68 activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and
69 departmental advising, supervision of student research and fieldwork, direction of
70 student performances and exhibitions, and related activities involving student
71 learning and student engagement. Additional instructional activities may include,
72 but are not limited to, student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project
73 supervision.

74 75 **2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

76 Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching
77 practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful,
78 deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result
79 in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty
80 members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in
81 professional development activities associated with classroom and non-
82 classroom assignments. Teaching methods should be consistent with
83 course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

84 85 **2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes**

86 Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of
87 student learning. Instructional practices and course materials should
88 clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals.
89 Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.

90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response 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.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Departments and colleges shall develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA. The University RTP policy provides a guiding framework for this charge.

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, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies.

Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments includes, but is not limited to, publications of merit reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, fellowships, grants, contracts, scholarship of engagement, and artistic exhibits and performances. These achievements must be reviewed by professional peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences.

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.

Departments and colleges shall develop their own standards and criteria for the evaluation of quality service. These standards and criteria shall be based in a comparative evaluation of responsibility and commitment across service obligations at the department, college, and university levels. Departments and colleges shall then make clear to the candidate what types of service are appropriate to faculty rank and experience. Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles in faculty governance

136 activities and committees; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to
137 university, college, or department policies and procedures; ongoing advising of
138 student groups; service or leadership activities for professional organizations or
139 boards; conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local
140 government, and community organizations.

141
142 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

143
144 Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department,² RTP
145 committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost,
146 and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP
147 process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate
148 policy on external evaluations.

149
150 The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic
151 administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate
152 during the open period.

153
154 Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to
155 materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP
156 candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP
157 committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as
158 an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external
159 reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

160
161 **3.1 Candidate**

162 A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from
163 the department chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and
164 how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates have the primary
165 responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their
166 accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required
167 information and supporting materials. Candidate should clearly reference and
168 explain all supporting materials.

169
170 The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and
171 accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the
172 quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1)
173 instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the
174 university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required
175 supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student
176 evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall
177 provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period,
178 including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

² Throughout this document, the designation 'department' applies also to 'program' or an equivalent unit in a non-instructional area whose employees are considered to be faculty under the provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement. Thus, unit heads and directors are the equivalent of department chairs.

179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The department shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards shall not be lower than college-level standards.

The department RTP policy is 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. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenured and probationary faculty.

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 the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.

The tenured and probationary faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement 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.

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

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 chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, 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

225 rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute
226 a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department
227 chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level
228 of review.

229
230 **3.5 College RTP Policy**

231 The college RTP policy shall specify in writing the standards to be applied in
232 evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with university
233 and college missions. The college RTP policy shall ensure consistency of
234 standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the
235 standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the college.

236
237 College RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and
238 probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the
239 Provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and
240 probationary faculty of the college.

241
242 **3.6 College RTP Committee**

243 The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as
244 well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and
245 recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in
246 accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university
247 RTP policies. The college RTP committee shall ensure that fair and consistent
248 evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the
249 standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP
250 committee shall take into serious account the department's specific standards for
251 evaluating the candidate.

252
253 The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation
254 to the college dean.

255
256 **3.7 Dean of the College**

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

264
265 The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior
266 evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the Provost based
267 upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

268
269 **3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs**

270 The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the

271 annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and
272 deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs,
273 deans, and members of college and department RTP committees.

274
275 The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and
276 make a final recommendation.

277
278 **3.9 President**

279 The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with
280 respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate
281 this authority to the Provost.

282
283 **4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

284
285 All tenured and probationary faculty undergo performance review and evaluation.³
286 Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the
287 candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the
288 candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every
289 five (5) years.

290
291 The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of assistant
292 professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of
293 appointment and service credit.

294
295 **4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment**

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

300
301 In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a
302 reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or
303 three years.

304
305 **4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion**

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

311
312 A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and
313 promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed
314 under Section 5.5.

³ Evaluation of lecturers is not covered in this policy; see the Academic Personnel website and the Policy on Range Elevation for Lecturers.

315
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

4.3 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 5.5.

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.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL 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.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he/she is making significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

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 is expected to show progress in his or her program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

5.2 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 meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

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. 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 his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

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 successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her 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. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and 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 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.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and 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 inspire 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.

407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452

5.5.2 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 department and college policies.

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.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

6.1 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

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

6.3 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.

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

6.5 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.

453
454 **6.6** The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the
455 department RTP committee, reviews the candidate's materials and may provide
456 an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of
457 review by the deadline.

458
459 **6.7** The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides
460 an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of
461 review by the deadline.

462
463 **6.8** The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent
464 written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.

465
466 **6.9** The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent
467 written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the
468 authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment,
469 tenure, and promotion.

470
471 The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision
472 regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

473 474 **7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

475
476 **7.1** Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without
477 prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also
478 applies to candidates for early tenure.

479
480 **7.2** If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation
481 documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at
482 which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials
483 shall be provided in a timely manner.

484
485 **7.3** At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the
486 recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the
487 recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review
488 level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing
489 no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A
490 copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP
491 package and also be sent to any previous review levels.

492
493 **7.4** The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external
494 evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

495 496 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

497
498 Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA

499 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Additionally, campus administrators may make
500 certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus
501 needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

502

503 The tenured and probationary faculty of CSULB, voting by secret ballot (with pro and
504 con arguments attached), may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this
505 document.

506

507 Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

508

509 (1) A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and tenure-
510 track faculty to the chair of the Academic Senate.

511

512 (2) By action of the Academic Senate.

513

514 Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the
515 faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be
516 distributed by the chair of the Academic Senate to the faculty at least five (5)
517 instructional days before the public hearing.

518

519 Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a
520 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret
521 ballot conducted by the Academic Senate within twenty (20) instructional days of the
522 public hearing and they have the concurrence of the University President.

523

524

525 Effective: Fall 2009