

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
POLICY EFFECTIVE FALL 2010**

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):

- 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
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

224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269

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.

270 **2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

271 The College of Liberal Arts requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)
272 of all faculty members. CLA recognizes the diversity of fields represented within the
273 college. Traditional scholarship and emerging scholarly fields, such as the scholarship of
274 engagement and multi-media RSCA, fall under this rubric. This section outlines the
275 criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities
276 regarding RTP files and materials.
277

278 **2.2.1 RSCA File**

279 **2.2.1.1 Required Materials**

280 Candidate's files **must** include:

- 281 a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.
- 282 b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative
283 activities for the review period only. RSCA claimed in prior
284 actions cannot be included. Published peer-reviewed research
285 includes, but is not limited to: books, articles, films, and other
286 media. Such materials shall be placed in the binder or, in the case
287 of books and other materials that do not fit in the binder, shall be
288 submitted with the file. Furthermore, candidates have the option to
289 include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per the
290 following guidelines:
- 291 1. Candidates may include accepted, in press, or forthcoming
292 RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it
293 beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such
294 materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates
295 decide to withhold these materials, such items must be
296 listed under Works in Progress on the PDS.
 - 297 2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only
298 include publications and all in press, forthcoming, or
299 accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a
300 prior successful action.
- 301 c. For candidates who author externally-funded RSCA grants and
302 choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, file
303 must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2)
304 length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award;
305 (5) brief description of candidate's role in authorship and
306 implementation.
- 307 d. Proof of publication status as per policy (below) for all in press,
308 forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.
- 309 e. Proof of peer review as per 2.2.3.

310

311 **2.2.1.2 Optional Materials**

312 The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews) is
313 optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as
314 negative for any candidate.
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
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. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has
- 364 agreed to publish without major changes.
- 365 c. Conditionally accepted 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. Revise and resubmit 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. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.
- 373 f. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for
- 374 which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.
- 375 g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for
- 376 which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.
- 377

2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status

378 For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file,

379 candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the

380 publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation

381 (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.

382

383

2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest

2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process

384 Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such

385 proof must be provided in English.

386

387 Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:

- 388
- 389
- 390
- 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

2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns

395 Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.

396

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. Conflicts of interest: 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. Monetary contributions: 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

417 **2.3 Service**

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

426 **2.3.1 Service File**

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

434 **2.3.2 Service Expectations**

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

451 **2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank**

- 452 a. Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment
453 typically are expected to focus service activities at the department
454 level.
455 b. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor,
456 probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-
457 quality service contributions to their department, and to either the
458 college or the university.
459 c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates are
460 expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (1)
461 service at department, college, and university levels; (2) a record of
462 leadership at the University; and (3) a record of service in the
463 community and/or the profession. University leadership may be
464 demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g., committee
465 chair) and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g.,
466 active participation in accreditation or policy-writing processes).
467

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

468 RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service
469 activities relative to department, college, and university RTP policies as well as
470 the CBA.
471

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

472
473 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process, and
474 emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.
475

3.1 Candidate

476
477 Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that
478 complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking
479 guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and
480 procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.
481

482
483 **3.1.1** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually
484 accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Academic Affairs.
485

486 **3.1.2** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required material is
487 included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.
488

489 **3.1.3** As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become
490 accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of material after the date of file
491 completion must have the approval of the college RTP committee, which is the
492 peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.
493

3.2 Joint Appointments

494 The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with
495 a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates
496 that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the
497

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
- 579 a. The committee must have seven (7) tenured, full-time faculty members
580 at the rank of Professor and three (3) additional members at the rank of
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. There shall be no more than one faculty member from any one
593 academic area.
594 g. Committee members may not serve on any other standing or ad hoc
595 RTP committee at the university.
596

597 **3.8.2 Structure and Duties of the College RTP Committee**

598

599 **3.8.2.1** The RTP committee shall consist of two standing sub-committees:

- 600 a. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee shall consider all
601 cases of tenure and promotion. A minimum of five (5) committee
602 members at the rank of Professor must serve on this committee.
603 b. The Reappointment Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of
604 reappointment. A minimum of three (3) committee members at the
605 rank of Associate Professor or Professor must serve on this
606 committee.
607

608 **3.8.2.2** At the first meeting of the CLA RTP Committee:

- 609 a. The committee shall elect a chair who holds the rank of
610 Professor. This chair also shall serve as chair of the Tenure and
611 Promotion Sub-Committee.
612 b. Once elected, the CLA RTP Committee chair, in consultation
613 with the members of the committee, shall determine the size and
614 membership of the two sub-committees based on the relative
615 number of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion actions to be
616 considered.
617 c. The entire CLA RTP Committee then shall elect a chair of the
618 Reappointment Sub-Committee. The sub-committee chair shall
619 report to the CLA RTP Committee chair.
620

621 **3.8.3 The sub-committees are bound to the following rules:**

- 622 a. As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must
623 have a higher rank than the candidate.
624 b. No RTP sub-committee may be comprised solely of faculty
625 participating in the FERP.
626 c. For each action, a majority recommendation must be made by the
627 members of the sub-committee. A minority report may be submitted.
628

629 **3.8.4 Evaluation and Recommendations**

- 630 a. The college RTP committee must make its own independent evaluation
631 of each candidate.
632 b. The college RTP recommendation usually shall not exceed 750 words.
633

634 **3.9 Dean of the College**

635 The Dean is charged with mentoring department chairs regarding their role in the RTP

636 process. The dean also communicates standards and expectations and ensures the
637 integrity of the RTP process across the college. The Dean writes an independent
638 evaluation and recommendation for each candidate and forwards that evaluation to the
639 Provost.

640
641 **3.10 University-Level Review**

642 The Provost reviews the candidate's file and all prior evaluations and makes a final
643 recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions
644 for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President
645 may delegate this authority to the Provost.

646
647 **4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

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

650
651 **5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

652 Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1)
653 instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall
654 demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any
655 action.

656
657 **5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

658 The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must
659 demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the
660 college and the candidate's department, a candidate for reappointment must show
661 evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

662
663 At minimum, this evidence must include demonstration of: (1) effective teaching; (2)
664 research, scholarship, and/or creative activities that include initial publications or similar
665 evidence of RSCA appropriate to rank, experience, and discipline; and (3) engagement in
666 service at the department level.

667
668 The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any
669 area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).

670
671 **5.2 Awarding of Tenure**

672 The University RTP Policy delineates the meaning of tenure and the criteria for the
673 awarding of tenure.

674
675 **5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor** The University RTP Policy states
676 the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor, including the
677 expectation that a candidate shall have a record of high-quality peer-reviewed work that
678 has contributed to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or
679 interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition to the minimum standard stated in that
680 policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the candidate to make high-quality service
681 contributions to the department and to either the college or the university.

682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

The University RTP Policy states that standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor.

In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include 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 a substantial record of peer-reviewed work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities. The candidate also is expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership at the University; and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

As outlined by the University RTP Policy, early tenure and/or early promotion are awarded in rare circumstances in which a candidate demonstrates a superior record of accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation. That policy states that candidates for early tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the university policy on external evaluation.

5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts

In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a potential candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources and mentors, including the department chair, dean, and, if possible, department RTP committee members.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the University RTP Policy.

In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall prepare the index of open period materials.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 The University RTP Policy specifies that, prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

7.2 The University RTP Policy and the CBA specify that if, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been

727 provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner. In the College of Liberal
728 Arts, a timely manner is defined as no more than five business days.

729
730 **7.3** In the College of Liberal Arts, committees, chairs, and deans cannot request
731 additional material that is not specified by the college or department RTP policies unless
732 such material is required to verify otherwise unsupported claims made in the file.

733
734 **7.4** The University RTP Policy specifies that, at each level of review, the candidate shall
735 be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the
736 recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The
737 candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten
738 (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the
739 candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any
740 previous review levels.

741
742 **7.5** External evaluations of candidates are governed by the university policy on external
743 evaluation and the CBA.

744 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

745 Changes to the College of Liberal Arts RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the
746 CSU-CFA CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to
747 accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures
748 do not require a vote by the faculty.

749
750 The tenured and probationary faculty of the CLA, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy
751 and evaluation criteria section of this document.

752
753 Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

754
755 (1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty percent (20%) of the tenured and
756 probationary faculty to the chair of the Faculty Council.

757
758 (2) By a two-thirds vote of the full membership of the Faculty Council.

759
760 Proposed amendments shall be submitted to the dean for discussion at a public hearing for the
761 faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be
762 distributed by the chair of the Faculty Council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days
763 before the public hearing. The dean or designee shall conduct the hearing.

764
765 Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote
766 of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the
767 Faculty Council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the
768 concurrence of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Provost.

769
770 Approved: _____

771 Effective: Fall 2010
772