

1 **COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS**
2 **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH**
3 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY (RTP)**

4
5 02/23/10 – approved by vote of the faculty of the
6 College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
7

8 The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the College of Natural
9 Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) establishes college-wide standards of excellence
10 and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty within the
11 college for sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 of the university RTP policy (PS 09-10), but
12 readers should still consult the university policy for these sections.¹
13

14 **1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**
15 **(RTP)**
16

17 CNSM faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the
18 impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and
19 instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);
20 and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.
21 All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three
22 areas.
23

24 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three
25 areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate
26 demonstrating a sustained record of quality performance over the period of review and
27 evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making productive
28 contributions in all three areas of evaluation. Reappointment decisions are based on
29 evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing a record of evidence
30 that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.
31

32 **2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**
33

34 Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of
35 excellence in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly,
36 and creative activities; and 3) professional service and engagement at the university, in
37 the community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for
38 reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP
39 policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards.
40 Candidates for RTP recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in
41 each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific
42 standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent and competent in each area of

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

43 evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. A candidate will not receive a
44 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet
45 requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or
46 promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area
47 of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly
48 and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to
49 full professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the
50 areas of evaluation.

51

52 **2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

53 Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers and provide evidence of this
54 effectiveness in their files. Instruction and instructionally related activities include
55 teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom (classroom,
56 laboratory, and field). Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to,
57 curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student
58 research and fieldwork, and related activities involving student learning and student
59 engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to,
60 student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

61

62 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

63 Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject
64 matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty
65 members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and on ways
66 to assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning, which may lead to
67 adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-
68 classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent
69 with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate individual student learning
70 styles.

71

72 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and method

73 The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses
74 taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty in the discipline. Course materials and
75 teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be
76 of value in facilitating learning. Materials submitted by a candidate in her/his file should
77 include at least course syllabi and assessment materials. Teaching materials, such as
78 samples of student work with instructor feedback, should also be submitted when
79 available. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the learning goals
80 and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline. At a
81 minimum, each course taught by the candidate should prepare the students for later
82 courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite. Course policies and grading
83 practices should be clearly conveyed to students, and the results of grading practices
84 should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same or comparable
85 courses taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty. The most recent syllabus from
86 each course taught during the evaluation period must be included.

87

88 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher

89 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing
90 her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches
91 used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should
92 be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the
93 candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward
94 a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time
95 should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant
96 materials. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy,
97 classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the
98 Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or
99 conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that
100 contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

101

102 2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes

103 Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices
104 and course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and
105 goals. Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with
106 course goals.

107

108 2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction

109 In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and
110 university RTP policies, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student
111 response to instruction. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all
112 courses evaluated during the period under review. Note that evaluations for
113 independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department
114 seminar/colloquium courses should not be included in the candidate's file. Student
115 course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.
116 Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing
117 student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item
118 on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does
119 not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

120

121 Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means
122 and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and
123 material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical
124 ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the
125 instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to
126 student needs.

127

128 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

129 Assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be based on peer evaluation of appropriate
130 materials in the candidate's RTP file, peer observation of teaching, and on student
131 course evaluation forms for all courses evaluated since the last promotion or since
132 appointment. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be based on the quality
133 of teaching performance over time across all of the courses assigned to the candidate.

- 134
135 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to
136 suggestions for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations),
137 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of
138 circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4)
139 any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the
140 candidate's teaching effectiveness.
141
- 142 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly
143 rigor of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses
144 taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty.
145
- 146 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness,
147 including a critical analysis of all student input. This analysis must assess the
148 significance of the candidate's student course evaluation data.
149
- 150 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and
151 content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating
152 the learning process.
153
- 154 2.2.5. As part of the review process, a minimum of four class visits shall be made by
155 at least two members of the department RTP committee. These class visits must be
156 conducted during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is
157 not teaching at CSULB that semester; in this case, the visitations from the prior year
158 shall be used). The candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur
159 during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to
160 the start of classroom visits, but otherwise visits will be unannounced. The candidate
161 may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the RTP committee when tests or other
162 activities are scheduled to permit the committee to choose most appropriate days for
163 visits. The committee members' evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should
164 address such factors as instructional clarity, communication with the students, student
165 engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery
166 of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and
167 electronic media or demonstrations. Written reports based on class visits must be
168 placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to the candidate. The signed reports
169 must include times and dates of the visits.
170
- 171 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the
172 candidate in supervisory courses.
173
- 174 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned
175 time for this activity, he/she should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this
176 effort and should address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in
177 meeting student needs.

- 178
179 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities
180 The college recognizes that there is a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and
181 complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. The list
182 below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the
183 possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category.
184
- 185 2.2.8.1. Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching;
186
 - 187 2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;
188
 - 189 2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis
190 research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation
191 of such research;
192
 - 193 2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional
194 laboratories;
195
 - 196 2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the
197 candidate's assigned workload, and mentoring of students;
198
 - 199 2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;
200
 - 201 2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and
202 computer-based materials;
203
 - 204 2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for
205 Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of
206 improving instruction; and
207
 - 208 2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other
209 forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of
210 novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.
211
- 212 2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:
213
- 214 2.2.9.1. Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;
215
 - 216 2.2.9.2. Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the
217 same course unless the course has significantly changed over time);
218
 - 219 2.2.9.3. Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and
220 homework sets; and,
221
 - 222 2.2.9.4. If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to
223 students (e.g. a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).

224
225 2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.
226
227 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline
228 Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the
229 discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most
230 directly achieved through maintaining an active program of research or scholarly
231 activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific conferences and reading of
232 appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.
233

234 **2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

235 236 2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA 237

238 College faculty must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that
239 demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty
240 members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute
241 to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are
242 disseminated to appropriate audiences. Candidates should refer to their respective
243 department policies for definitions and criteria for evaluation of RSCA. Department
244 standards may be higher than college-level standards. Candidates for tenure must
245 develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed
246 publications in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator. The
247 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the
248 candidate's scholarly activity and this narrative must identify the candidate's
249 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. A candidate's
250 research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the
251 faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged and departments must
252 define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement. The
253 department RTP policy shall provide specific additional departmental requirements in
254 research and shall list discipline-specific criteria used in evaluating RSCA. Candidates
255 for promotion to full professor must have a record of RSCA activity after their promotion
256 to associate professor that results in peer-reviewed RSCA products.
257

258 2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA 259

260 2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA
261 element to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The
262 candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The
263 evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific
264 RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The candidate's
265 documentation and the review of it will focus on continuing professional development,
266 and this theme should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative.
267 The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to evaluators in understanding
268 the candidate's intellectual and professional achievements in this category, the nature of
269 student involvement in the candidate's RSCA (if applicable), and how the candidate

270 places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the department,
271 college, and university RTP policies.

272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280

281 2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The
282 documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP
283 review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the
284 supplementary documentation binder.

285
286
287
288

289 2.3.2.4. External evaluations of the candidate's contributions to the discipline will

290 be considered, consistent with the provisions of the current CBA and university policy.
291
292 2.3.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to RSCA
293 Candidates are expected to be involved in multiple RSCA related activities beyond the
294 peer review publication expectations defined by the departments for tenure and
295 promotion. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor
296 exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by RTP evaluators in this
297 category. Peer-reviewed RSCA products are given greater weight than non peer-
298 reviewed products.

299
300
301

302 2.3.3.1. Publication of additional peer-reviewed paper(s) in established journals in
303 the area of expertise;

304

305 2.3.3.2. Publication of a peer-reviewed book or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book;

306

307 2.3.3.3. Successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship
308 of publications and presentations with students as evidenced by student
309 presentations at scientific meetings;

310

311 2.3.3.4. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings and conferences;

312

313 2.3.3.5. Awards of peer-reviewed applications for external funding;

314

315 2.3.3.6. Applications for external funds to support ongoing RSCA;

316

317 2.3.3.7. Citations of the candidate's work in other authors' peer-reviewed works
318 or in books;

319

- 315 2.3.3.8. Applied research or professional activity to address problems of
316 importance to the disciplines and society;
317
- 318 2.3.3.9. Awards of internal grants;
319
- 320 2.3.3.10. Editorial/reviewer assignments with recognized professional publications
321 or review panels for research grants calling for professional expertise;
322
- 323 2.3.3.11. Textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses
324 beyond the candidate's own personal teaching; or
325
- 326 2.3.3.12. Patents that resulted from the candidate's research or professional
327 activity.
328

329 The department RTP policy shall list specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental
330 criteria for tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as
331 appropriate, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant
332 contributions to the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies.
333

334 **2.4. Professional Service**

335 Professional service consists of activities other than teaching and RSCA that result from
336 the candidate's academic expertise and contribute to the mission of the university. It
337 includes service to the discipline, the department, the college, the university, and the
338 community. The college recognizes that the departments have different expectations
339 with regard to professional service. However, after reappointment, candidates are
340 expected to expand the scope of participation beyond their department, and candidates
341 for promotion to full professor are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect
342 of professional service.
343

344 The candidate's narrative should address the nature, the outcomes, and the
345 contributions of this service to the missions of the university, the college, or the
346 department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise.
347

348 2.4.1. Criteria for Professional Service

349 Faculty must participate actively in faculty governance through active involvement on
350 committees at the department and college levels to receive a positive recommendation
351 for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Faculty being considered for
352 promotion to full professor must demonstrate significant service at the college,
353 university, or CSU system level. A candidate's service to her/his respective profession
354 will be given consideration. The quality of service is the primary consideration, rather
355 than mere membership on a number of committees.
356

357 2.4.2. Evaluation of Professional Service

358 The emphasis in the evaluation of professional service shall be on: 1) the quality and
359 significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes
360 to the missions of the university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and

361 level of the candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward
362 service. Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based
363 on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence,
364 which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda
365 acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.
366

367 2.4.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Professional Service

368 The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as
369 professional service. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither
370 ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP
371 committee in this category.
372

373 2.4.3.1. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the
374 department, the college, or the university;
375

376 2.4.3.2. Sponsoring student groups;
377

378 2.4.3.3. Actively engaging in institutional educational and research programs;
379

380 2.4.3.4. Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing);
381

382 2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international
383 levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees,
384 workshops, speeches, and media interviews;
385

386 2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments,
387 and community service organizations;
388

389 2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants,
390 fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for
391 general expertise in the discipline.
392

393 **3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

394 Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.
395

396 **3.1.** The CNSM candidate's narrative should also include plans and goals for the
397 coming five years and a discussion of how the candidate has addressed suggestions
398 made during previous reviews.
399

400 **3.2.** Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write evaluations of all RTP
401 candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee.
402 Such chair evaluations must be independent of the department RTP committee's
403 evaluation. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a
404 higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a
405 review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair
406 participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

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

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

Consult the university RTP policy.

5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate 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.

5.1.2. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB’s diverse body of students and to the university’s educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in her/his 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 level consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

5.2. Awarding of Tenure

Tenure represents the university’s long-term commitment to a faculty member and is awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure recommendations are based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate’s overall record of accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the continuation of this record.

5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and professional service. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in sections 2.2.8 of this policy.

5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate’s research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in sections 2.3.3 of this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for

453 tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the departmental standards for
454 assessment of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments. All levels of review will
455 use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.
456

457 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to
458 the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in
459 service are listed in section 2.4.3 of this policy.
460

461 **5.4. Promotion to Professor**

462
463 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than those for
464 tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the
465 departmental RTP policy. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent
466 record of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular
467 development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that
468 includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of
469 her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have
470 disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international
471 level. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership
472 at the university and in the community or the profession.
473

474 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if
475 deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a
476 candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.
477

478 **5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

479 Consult the university RTP policy.
480

481 **6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

482 Consult the university RTP policy.
483

484 **7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

485
486 All information in this policy applies to faculty appointed jointly to two or more
487 departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for
488 tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must
489 be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the
490 departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the
491 dean(s).
492

493 **8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

494
495 **8.1.** Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of
496 changes to the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural
497 changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,
498 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

499
500 **8.2.** The tenured/tenure-track faculty of the college, voting by secret ballot (with pro
501 and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy and
502 evaluation criteria section of this policy.
503
504 **8.3.** Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:
505
506 8.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the
507 tenured/tenure-track faculty or
508
509 8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.
510
511 **8.4.** Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for
512 the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be
513 distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional
514 days before the public hearing.
515
516 **8.5.** Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a
517 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty voting in a secret ballot
518 conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public
519 hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president
520 or designee.
521
522 Effective: Fall 2010