

45
46 Candidates are encouraged to take these minimal department standards into account
47 when constructing their RTP files and writing their narratives.
48

49 **2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

50 The Department of RGRL has identified high-quality RSCA as the foundation of our
51 collective professional profile as engaged teachers and scholars. The department values
52 RSCA related to all of the areas of expertise of faculty members, including pedagogy.
53

54 **2.2.1 Requirements:** In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the
55 CLA RTP Policy, the department has the following minimal requirements for
56 candidates in the RTP process:
57

- 58 a. Reappointment: Candidates for reappointment must demonstrate an ongoing
59 effort to build a scholarly portfolio. By the time candidates turn in their files for
60 reappointment, they are expected to have at least one substantive, original
61 article accepted by a peer-reviewed venue (e.g., journal or other) and to have
62 another article under consideration. Candidates whose RSCA falls outside these
63 parameters for reappointment need to make the case that their records meet the
64 requirements for quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy.
65 Other supporting professional activities might include activities such as book
66 reviews, peer-reviewed conference presentations, and external research grant
67 proposals, but these activities should not be prioritized over the goal of
68 publication.
69

70 To meet these requirements, recent PhDs in their first three (3) years of
71 appointment are strongly encouraged to use their dissertations as the basis for
72 at least two (2) publications during the initial appointment period and to
73 present papers at conferences. Candidates who are more advanced in their
74 careers during the reappointment period are encouraged to continue to further
75 develop their RSCA programs.
76

- 77 b. Tenure and/or promotion: Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate
78 Professor shall demonstrate an increasingly strong record of publications.
79 The department values sustained quality over quantity. A record of multiple
80 publications that are not original or that do not advance disciplinary knowledge
81 in a meaningful way is unlikely to receive a positive recommendation for tenure
82 and/or promotion. Publications (or their RSCA equivalent) may be published, in
83 press, forthcoming, or accepted as per the definitions and allowances provided
84 in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.1).
85

86 In recognition of the diversity of possible RSCA records a candidate may
87 develop, the department has articulated various scenarios (see below). These
88 scenarios represent the department's expectations for a positive
89 recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. All scenarios involve peer-
90 reviewed publication in a variety of venues (e.g., different journals).
91 Candidates whose RSCA records fall outside these scenarios for tenure and/or
92 promotion need to make the case that their records meet the requirements for

93 quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy.
 94

95 To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, candidates
 96 must demonstrate:

- 97 1. Ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book
 98 reviews and/or non peer-reviewed articles; peer-reviewed
 99 conference presentations; and/or non peer-reviewed lectures or
 100 presentations).
- 101 2. A record of peer-reviewed RSCA aligned with one of the following
 102 scenarios. In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate
 103 quality and impact of RSCA.
 - 104 a. Three (3) high-quality, original, substantive peer-reviewed
 105 articles in different high-quality, prestigious venues.
 106 Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary
 107 knowledge in a meaningful way. In this scenario, the
 108 candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review
 109 process, the prestige of the venues (e.g., based on acceptance
 110 rates, rankings, or other similar data), and originality of RSCA
 111 to make the case for quality over quantity.
 - 112 b. Four (4) substantive, original article-length, peer-reviewed
 113 publications in different venues. In this scenario, the prestige
 114 of publication venues, acceptance rates, and rigor of review
 115 process are less important.
 - 116 c. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.
 - 117 d. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored
 118 monograph in which the candidate played a significant,
 119 demonstrable role in the authorship. In such cases, the
 120 candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published, in
 121 press, forthcoming, or accepted peer-reviewed, substantive,
 122 original articles in different venues. Textbooks related to the
 123 candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's
 124 contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can
 125 be shown to advance scholarship in the discipline.
 - 126 e. Externally-funded, competitive extramural grants or
 127 fellowships that support the candidate's research agenda may
 128 also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA
 129 requirements. In such cases, the candidate must have a
 130 minimum of two (2) published, in press, forthcoming, or
 131 accepted substantive, original articles and must make the case
 132 that the externally-funded grant should be considered the
 133 equivalent of a peer-reviewed publication in terms of the
 134 weight it should be given in the RSCA evaluation.
- 135
- 136 c. Promotion to Professor: Candidates for promotion to Professor must
 137 demonstrate evidence of sustained and consistent RSCA that has resulted
 138 in publications in high-quality, peer-reviewed venues for the review
 139 period (i.e., since the last personnel action). The following two

- 140 requirements must be met for candidates to receive a positive
 141 recommendation for promotion to Professor:
 142 1. Candidates must demonstrate ongoing engagement in the
 143 profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-
 144 reviewed articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations;
 145 and/or non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations).
 146 2. Candidates must have four (4) substantive, original article-length,
 147 peer-reviewed publications or their equivalent to be eligible for
 148 promotion to Professor. These publications need to appear in a
 149 variety of venues. They may be published, in press, forthcoming,
 150 or accepted as per the definitions and allowances provided in the
 151 CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.1).
 152

153 Since the department values quality over quantity, multiple publications that are
 154 not original or that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way
 155 are unlikely to receive a positive recommendation for promotion.
 156

157 The following examples represent some of the other possible **scenarios** that
 158 merit a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor. As with tenure
 159 and/or promotion to Associate, all of these scenarios require that the candidate
 160 provide evidence of ongoing engagement in the profession as per the above
 161 requirements (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed
 162 articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and non peer-reviewed
 163 lectures or presentations). In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate
 164 quality and impact of RSCA.
 165

- 166 1. Three (3) high-quality, original, substantive peer-reviewed
 167 articles in different high-quality, prestigious publication venues.
 168 Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary
 169 knowledge in a meaningful way. In this scenario, the candidate
 170 must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the
 171 prestige of the venues, and originality of RSCA to make the case
 172 for quality over quantity.
 173 2. Externally-funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships
 174 that support the candidate's research agenda may also be
 175 considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements. In such
 176 cases, the candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published,
 177 in press, forthcoming, or accepted peer-reviewed, substantive,
 178 original articles and must make the case that the externally-
 179 funded grant should be considered the equivalent of a peer-
 180 reviewed publication in terms of the weight it should be given in
 181 the RSCA evaluation.
 182 3. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.
 183 4. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored
 184 monograph in which the candidate played a significant,
 185 demonstrable role in the authorship. Textbooks related to the
 186 candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's

187 contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can be
 188 shown to advance scholarship in the discipline. As with all RSCA,
 189 the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate quality and impact
 190 on the field.

191 **2.2.2 Departmental Definitions**

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

- 194 a. 'Substantive' is defined as an article-length publication. Such publications
 195 often range from fifteen (15) to twenty-five (25) manuscript pages.
 196 Regardless of length, candidates need to articulate impact and substance
 197 of RSCA in the narrative. Review or state-of-the-field articles meeting
 198 these criteria are considered substantive.
- 199 b. 'Original' is defined as RSCA that makes an argument that is not
 200 reiterative of other research published by the candidate or other
 201 scholars.
- 202 c. Peer-reviewed conferences are those for which abstracts are reviewed
 203 by a selection committee.
- 204 d. Non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations usually are those given by
 205 invitation, but also might include a lecture given in a colleague's class or
 206 lecture series.
- 207 e. A funded external grant refers to a funded external grant proposal, not to
 208 an application for such a grant.
 209
 210

211 **2.3 Service**

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

215 **2.3.1 Service requirements and opportunities**

216 In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy (2.3), the
 217 department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP
 218 process:
 219
 220

221 **2.3.1.a Baseline service requirements**

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

231 **2.3.1.b Department service opportunities**

232

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

242 **2.3.1.c College service opportunities**

243 College service opportunities include, but are not limited to, the following
 244 committees and councils: Faculty Council, Grade Appeals, EPCC, RTP, Budget,
 245 and ad-hoc committees.

246 **2.3.1.d University service opportunities**

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

251 **2.3.2 Service expectations by rank**

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

257 **2.3.2.a Reappointment:** Faculty in their first three years of appointment are
 258 expected to perform service above the baseline requirement in the department.
 259 Such service can include, but is not limited to serving on department committees
 260 or performing other service as per 2.3.1.b above.

261 **2.3.2.b Tenure and/or promotion:** Candidates coming up for tenure and/or
 262 promotion are expected to have diversified and increased their service profiles
 263 during the probationary period. In addition to active participation in department
 264 service opportunities delineated in 2.3.1.b above, candidates for tenure and/or
 265 promotion also are expected to perform service at the college or university level
 266 as per the CLA RTP Policy (2.3.2.1).

267 **2.3.2.c Promotion to rank of Professor:** Successful candidates shall have, as per
 268 the CLA and University RTP Policies, a significant, substantive record of
 269 service at department, college, and university levels; a record of leadership
 270 at the university; and a record of service in the community and/or the
 271 profession. The only additional requirement in the Department of RGRLL is
 272 that candidates also must have a sustained, ongoing record of meeting the
 273 baseline service requirements to the department as per 2.3.1.a above.

274
275
276
277
278
279
280

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

281
282
283
284 **3.4 Department RTP Committee**
285 Procedures for elections of the Department RTP Committee are outlined in the CLA RTP
286 Policy. As per the CLA RTP Policy (3.4.2), at least three (3) members of the department
287 RTP committee or sub-committee must evaluate each candidate.

3.5 Mentoring

288
289 Both the University and College RTP Policies emphasize the importance of mentoring
290 for the RTP process.

3.5.1 Designation of a mentor

291
292
293 In the Department of RGRLL, newly hired untenured faculty shall work with the
294 department chair to identify whether the chair or a mutually-agreed upon
295 mentor shall act in this capacity.

3.5.2 Communication and structure

296
297
298 Mentors and mentees shall have ongoing communication about progress toward
299 success in the RTP process.

3.5.3 Tenured faculty and mentoring

300
301
302 All faculty are encouraged to seek input from a broad range of knowledgeable
303 colleagues throughout their careers. Tenured faculty members are encouraged
304 but not required to participate in the mentoring process. If tenured faculty
305 members elect to participate in the mentoring process, they shall work with the
306 department chair to identify their mentoring needs and to identify a mutually-
307 agreed upon mentor.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

308
309
310 The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review
311 requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

312
313
314 The University and College RTP Policies delineate the criteria for appointment and promotion.
315 Candidates are encouraged to read both policies for these important criteria.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

316
317
318 The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the University
319 RTP Policy. In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee
320 shall prepare the index of open period materials.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

321
322
323 The University and CLA policies delineate the additional processes applicable to RTP.

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

324
325
326 Changes to any RTP policy at CSULB may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA CBA. In
327 general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

328

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

332
333 The tenured and probationary faculty of the department, voting by secret ballot, may amend
334 the policy and evaluation criteria section of this policy.

335
336 Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

337
338 (1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty-five percent (25%) of the tenured
339 and probationary faculty to the chair of the department.

340
341 (2) By a motion made by the Advisory Council to the tenured and tenure-track faculty in
342 the department.

343
344 Amendments shall be discussed in a faculty meeting before a vote is taken. Once a vote by
345 secret ballot has been taken on the proposed amendments to the policy and the amendments
346 are recommended by a majority of those who cast a vote, then the revised document shall be
347 sent to Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost for final approval. Amendments shall become
348 effective in the academic year after the amendments are approved.

349
350 Approved: _____

Effective: Fall 2010