

RETENTION TENURE AND PROMOTION DOCUMENT DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

I. Introduction

The Department of Geological Sciences gives its highest priority to quality instruction at all levels in the study of the earth system. The Department seeks to prepare undergraduate and graduate students for careers in teaching, industry or government, or further studies at the graduate level. In the rapidly changing and technologically oriented earth sciences disciplines, students must have a strong geological background. As such, students require an instructional program that explores the fundamental geologic processes, cultivates skills in observation and integrative three-dimensional thinking, provides laboratory and field experience, and stimulates interest in the many subdisciplines of the geological sciences.

The Department believes that scholarly activity of faculty is an essential part of the educational program. All graduate students in the Department must be involved in research projects supervised by faculty in order to complete a thesis. Additionally, involvement in research supervised by faculty is an important part of the training of many of the undergraduates. Furthermore, the expertise in current geological sciences acquired by active participation in research is important for effective teaching, especially at the graduate and advanced undergraduate level.

The Department of Geological Sciences establishes the following criteria and procedures to be used for retention, granting of tenure and promotion of its faculty. These are presented for the guidance of the Faculty Candidate, the Department Chair, and the Department RTP Committee. Should any part of this document be in conflict with documents and/or policies of higher administrative bodies, or the Collective Bargaining Agreement, then the parts in conflict are null and void, and those of higher administrative bodies or the Collective Bargaining Agreement will prevail.

II. Responsibilities and Procedures

A. The Department Chair

The Department Chair shall be responsible for informing new faculty members of the standards of performance expected by the Department and of the procedures to be followed in evaluating performance. The Department Chair will distribute copies of the Department, the College and the University RTP policies to new faculty at the time of hiring. At least once a year the Department Chair shall meet with each probationary faculty member and those faculty being considered for promotion for a discussion on performance. The Department Chair shall follow the general guidelines in the University and College documents governing retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

B. The Department RTP Committee

The Department of Geological Sciences RTP Committee will follow the general guidelines in the University document "Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion." The specific procedures that will be used by the Department RTP Committee in following these guidelines are outlined below.

The Department of Geological Sciences RTP Committee shall not exist as a standing committee. Instead, RTP committees shall be formed as needed. The Committee shall consist of all faculty who are eligible as specified by the College RTP Document and are willing to serve, but the minimum number of faculty on the Department RTP Committee will be three. The Department urges that the Department Chair offer herself/himself for election, and that the Department elect the Chair to the Department RTP Committee according to the regulations of the College RTP Document. Once elected, the Department Chair cannot write a separate evaluation for any candidate being considered for RTP action during that academic year. RTP committee members shall be elected by secret ballot by all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The departmental election shall be held as early as is feasible during the Fall semester each year. If an elected member resigns or otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which he/she was elected, and if the resignation reduces the number of Committee members below the required three, then the Department will elect a replacement to serve the rest of the unexpired term.

The Department of Geological Sciences urges that meetings of the Department RTP Committee shall be open for attendance and discussion by all tenured, tenure-track, and emeritus faculty in the Department of Geological Sciences, except when the members of the Department RTP Committee elect by simple majority vote to go into executive session. The purpose of open meetings is to allow all eligible parties to evaluate the fairness of the proceedings and to observe the means by which the final RTP decision was determined. While all attendees can express their opinions, all attendees must restrict their comments to items appearing in the candidate's file. The Department Committee, and particularly the chair of the committee, must balance open discussion with the very important responsibility of the Committee to arrive at a decision in a timely manner. Persons attending meetings who are not members of the Department Committee shall not participate in writing the final evaluation of the candidate, nor should a member who opts to write a minority opinion participate in the writing of the majority opinion. Thus the following protocol is suggested for Department RTP Committee meetings. An outline form of the candidate's accomplishments in each of the three evaluation categories should be presented to all who are present at Committee meetings. If a committee member responsible for compiling a portion of the candidate's accomplishments fails to do so within the time frame suggested by the Committee Chair, then the Chair should assign that member's tasks to another member of the committee without prejudice. The Committee shall then arrive at a decision regarding the candidate based on discussion of the accomplishments. After voting on the RTP action regarding the individual candidate, the prevailing majority shall then write its recommendation according to the format mandated by the "green sheets". If there is a minority of the committee who elects to do so, he/she/they may write a minority opinion after the vote has been completed. In the interests of openness, complete drafts of both minority and majority opinions shall be available for reading and factual reconciliation by eligible participants at least five working days before the deadline for forwarding the RTP file to the next higher level in the review process. All members of the Department who attend RTP meetings shall sign a form (Appendix 1) agreeing to treat all matters dealt with in these meetings as confidential. If the candidate wishes to allow free and open discussion of his or her case, he or she must sign a waiver form (Appendix 2) granting full

access to the candidate's RTP file by all eligible faculty members of the Department. In order to take effect, the waiver form must be received by the Chair of the RTP Committee no later than the end of the open period for that candidate. If the candidate chooses to keep his or her file confidential to the members of the Department RTP Committee and other eligible administrators, this action will in no way influence the Department RTP Committee's evaluation of the candidate. If the Department Chair chooses to write a separate evaluation of candidates, she/he must inform the Department RTP Committee in writing prior to the election of the Department RTP Committee and may not attend meetings of the Department RTP Committee. The faculty member elected to serve on the College RTP Committee may not attend meetings of the Department RTP Committee.

In certain circumstances the Department RTP Committee may deem it appropriate to hold a closed, executive session. In the event of such a session, records of the proceedings will be kept in written form, and made available to the candidate and other members of the faculty eligible to review them, as described in the paragraph above.

The Department RTP Committee will have a meeting with the candidate to discuss the Committee's written evaluation of the candidate (and minority report(s), if applicable) at least five working days before the evaluation must be turned in to the Dean's office. This meeting is intended to give the candidate constructive advice. If the candidate declines the opportunity for such a meeting, then the Department RTP Committee shall forward the file to the next level of review according to College and University deadlines.

Each year during the semester that a candidate is being reviewed for a retention, tenure, and/or promotion decision the Department RTP Committee will send each member to at least two classroom visits, each visit of at least forty-five minutes duration, for the purpose of peer teaching evaluation. Written comments from each of the RTP Committee members will be placed in the candidate's file. These evaluations must be addressed substantively in the committee's final report. The Department RTP Committee shall also solicit written comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service performance from the university community, such as faculty colleagues not serving on the RTP Committee and current and former students. Solicitation of comments shall be done as early as is feasible during the Fall semester each year. Solicitation shall be done in a manner such that all interested individuals have a reasonable opportunity for input. All comments must be signed and dated. Any such comments received will also be placed in the candidate's file and a copy forwarded to the candidate.

If the Department Chair elects to write a separate opinion, the Chair will have access to all written comments about classroom visitations by Department RTP Committee members entered into the candidate's file, even if these comments are entered after the end of the open period.

The candidate shall have an opportunity to respond to all materials placed in his or her file. If the candidate wishes to respond, he or she should do so promptly.

The Department RTP Committee may request additional information, such as external reviews, to assist in its evaluation as specified in the University document "Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion".

III. Criteria and Evaluation

A. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities.

1. Evaluation: The assessment of teaching effectiveness will be based on peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching during his or her career, with particular emphasis on teaching during the current review period. This will include an assessment of scores on student evaluations, written reports of observations of the candidate's teaching during the review period by members of the RTP Committee, evaluation of the course materials submitted by the candidate, evaluation of the narrative provided by the candidate, written comments submitted by faculty, and written comments submitted by students and alumni. The Committee will solicit written comments from students and faculty in the Department, and from alumni of the Department.
2. Essential Criteria: For promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, teaching must be satisfactory and must demonstrate a potential for excellence. For promotion to Professor, most areas of teaching and related activities must be excellent. Teaching as the principal instructor for lecture or laboratory classes will be the most important activity considered in assessment of teaching. Supervision of laboratory sections of courses taught by others, mentoring CSULB students in research activities, and, when it is part of the candidate's workload, advising will also be evaluated.
 - (a) Pedagogical Approach and Method: The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same courses or comparable courses taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty. Each course should prepare the students for more advanced courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite, and build on previous courses in the Department. The material presented should be appropriately chosen and up-to-date. Course materials should be appropriately chosen, clear, and of value in facilitating learning. Course policies and grading practices should comply with those of the University and College, and must be clearly conveyed to students in a timely fashion. The results of grading practices should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same or comparable courses.
 - (b) Student Response to Instruction: Student ratings of instruction, as well as other student and alumni input to the RTP Committee, should reflect a favorable perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to student needs. The RTP Committee will conduct a complete critical analysis of all available numerical data from student evaluation sheets. This critical analysis will include a

comparison of the candidate's scores with those for the same or comparable courses. Any written comments will also be analyzed critically by the RTP Committee.

(c) Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher: The candidate must show evidence of thoughtful, deliberate effort to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change must be presented in a narrative, as described in the University Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, and the College Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review.

(d) Ongoing Professional Development in the Discipline: The candidate must have kept abreast of developments in the discipline, by activities such as those described in the University Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, and the College Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review. Relevant activities must be described in a narrative and documented when possible.

3. Enhancing Criteria: Enhancing criteria include development of new curricula, development of innovative course materials or teaching approaches, publications or presentations at professional meetings regarding such innovations, publication of a textbook, conducting assessment of one's instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction, mentoring research of students from high schools, other colleges, or universities, support of student organizations, recruitment and retention activities, or other activities which lead to an enhancement of teaching effectiveness.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities (SCA)

Given the Department's mission, the faculty are expected to conduct scholarly research on an ongoing basis, and all candidates for tenure or promotion are required to have a record of publication which provides evidence of 1) the quality of their scholarly activity, and 2) a sustained research program. The Department RTP Committee will evaluate both the quantity and quality of the completed contributions submitted, as well as the extent of the candidate's contribution in the case of multi-authored products.

The Department asserts that the scientific peers at CSULB most qualified to evaluate the merits of research by the candidate are other faculty within the Department of Geological Sciences. Thus the greatest weight in evaluating the candidate should be given to the recommendation by the Department RTP Committee. Nevertheless the Department recognizes that there is significant variation in research culture among the scientific subdisciplines within geological sciences, and the evaluation of individuals for retention, tenure, and promotion must be both thorough and flexible.

1. Evaluation: Evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative work will be based on an examination of copies of all published papers and abstracts published or submitted during the period of evaluation, as well as copies of all grant proposals and reviewer's comments of unsuccessful proposals submitted during the period of evaluation if included in the file by the

candidate; a narrative submitted by the candidate describing the overall goals and progress of the scholarly research, the nature of student involvement, and the candidate's professional development; and on written comments submitted by faculty. The narrative must identify the specific extent of the candidate's participation in any jointly authored activities and the proportion of work performed during the review period. Evaluations of the candidate's scholarly activities may be solicited by the candidate from scientists outside the University, and by the Department RTP Committee, and external evaluations are strongly urged if there are no faculty in the department qualified to evaluate the work in a knowledgeable fashion. If the candidate or the Committee chooses an external review, the external reviewers must be chosen in accordance with University policy described in the University document "Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion", but a minimum of three external reviews should be acquired to give a fair and thorough evaluation. In such cases the Department Committee shall as early as possible contact the external reviewers and send them all materials provided by the candidate to facilitate their review of the candidate's scholarly and creative activities. The Department Committee is allowed to contact the reviewers only for the purpose of expediting the return of reviews, but may not offer any judgments to the potential external reviewers as to the merits of the candidate's record.

In evaluating the candidate's record, the Department Committee will refer to the ranking list of possible scholarly and creative activities in section III-B-4 below (hereafter referred to as the "ranking list"). This list is intended to give the candidate an idea of the relative value of different types of contributions, but is not complete or comprehensive. Contributions not appearing on the list must still be considered and will be given an explicit relative ranking by the Department Committee in its final evaluation of the candidate. Completed contributions will be valued most highly by the Department Committee (e.g., published papers, manuscripts unconditionally accepted by the editor of a journal, for publication, grant moneys awarded, etc.). When ambiguity exists, the candidate must provide evidence that the contribution is completed. The ranking list provides guidelines to the candidate concerning minimum requirements for the action sought, but the Candidate's record must provide the Department RTP Committee with evidence that the research is likely to continue.

2. Tenure and Associate Professor: The Department specifically requires that for a candidate to be considered eligible for promotion to associate professor, the candidate must present evidence of continuing scholarship according to the essential criteria stated below. Also listed below are enhancing criteria for the category of SCA.

Essential Criteria: There must be clear evidence of ongoing research, conducted to a substantial degree at CSULB, in which the candidate has a major responsibility. Evidence for this research is completed contributions, including at least one from 4-a-1 or 4-a-2 as well as other evidence from the rest of the ranking list (or like contributions). The candidate must have made efforts to obtain funding to support instructionally related research and involve students in the ongoing research.

Enhancing Criteria: These include additional contributions from the ranking list, mentoring a masters student to successful graduation, supervision of students in research projects, etc.

3. Professor: To be considered for promotion from associate professor to professor, the candidate must present evidence of continuing scholarship according to the essential criteria stated below. Also listed below are enhancing criteria for the category of SCA.

Essential Criteria: There must be clear evidence of ongoing research, conducted to a substantial degree at CSULB, in which the candidate has a major responsibility, since the last promotion. There must be multiple contributions from level 4a, from level 4b, and ordinarily from all three levels of the ranking list. The candidate must have involved students in the ongoing research, and must have supervised at least one masters student to successful graduation. If the candidate has not supervised a Master's student to graduation, then the narrative must identify the specific extent of the candidate's participation in mentoring graduate students to completion of their degrees.

Enhancing Criteria: These include additional contributions from the ranking list, an extraordinary level of supervision of students in research projects, and/or exceptionally numerous contributions from one or more levels of the ranking list or like contributions.

4. Ranking list: The following list is intended to provide guidance to the candidate so that he/she may understand the Department's expectations of what is considered evidence of scholarly and creative activity and the relative weight given to different types of contributions. In using this ranking list, the Department Committee will realize that the list is neither complete nor comprehensive. Contributions not appearing on the list must still be considered and will be given an explicit relative ranking by the Department Committee in its final evaluation of the candidate. Completed contributions will be valued most highly by the Department Committee.

a. Offers Strongest Evidence of SCA:

1. First authorship (or co-authorship where the candidate can clearly demonstrate that his or her contribution to completion of the research was primary) of research papers published in peer-reviewed media with special recognition given to student coauthorship or participation in research program. Due consideration should be given to variations among fields of research in how authorship of papers is considered.
2. First authorship (or co-authorship where the candidate can clearly demonstrate that his or her contribution to completion of the book was substantial) of a book using expertise of the candidate in the earth sciences.

3. Principal investigator or co-investigator on funded external research -related grant or contract. The candidate must be the substantive contributor to both the writing of the grant or contract application and the subsequent performance of the grant or contract.

b. Offers Evidence of SCA:

1. Co-investigator on funded external research grant or contract. The candidate must be a substantive contributor to both the writing of the grant or contract application and the subsequent performance.
2. Published data reports in peer-reviewed journals.
3. Principal investigator on funded grants from CSULB (SCA, etc.).
4. Reports to government agencies or private industry.
5. First author or co-author (substantive contribution) of research papers presented at national or international meetings or congresses, with special recognition given to: 1) invited contributions; 2) student co-authorship or participation in research program; or 3) presentation of the paper by the candidate at the conference.
6. Principal investigator or co-investigator on unfunded grant or contract proposal with substantial evidence from external reviews of high quality of proposal.
7. Co-author (substantive contribution) of research papers published in peer-reviewed journals, with special recognition given to student coauthorship or participation in research program.

c. Offers Partial Evidence of SCA:

1. First author or co-author (substantive contribution) of research papers presented at regional meetings or congresses. Special recognition is given to invited contributions or contributions co-authored by students.
2. Convenor or chair of sessions conducted at regional meetings or congresses.
3. Invited talks and presentations at other universities, industry colloquia, government laboratories, and government agencies
4. Presenter of workshops or training sessions sponsored by professional societies
5. Leader or co-leader of sponsored field trips
6. Funds raised by informal means to support research.
7. Non-peer-reviewed research publications

C. Professional Service

Service to the local, national, and international community can provide examples for the classroom and experiences that broaden and deepen scholarly and creative activities. Community service promotes the goals of the university by extending learning into the community. Service to professional and academic organizations provides opportunities to share ideas, to communicate and express scholarly and creative activities, and to learn and develop teaching skills, materials, and methods. Shared

governance is an important aspect of maintaining an open environment in the academy, encouraging the pursuit of truth and knowledge. Shared governance depends on active faculty involvement in university service.

1. Essential Criteria. All faculty must participate actively in the processes of faculty governance, and in the activities of professional organizations.
2. Enhancing Criteria. Faculty may enhance their service achievements with active involvement on committees at all levels of the University and University system. The level of involvement of that service is the primary consideration. Authorship of documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the University, college, or department missions or procedures may comprise a service contribution. Sponsoring student groups and participating in educational equity programs are also service contributions.

In addition to campus governance activities, faculty members may participate in community service to professional organizations and in professionally-related activities at local, state, national, and/or international levels through such discipline-oriented activities as committees, workshops, speeches, media interviews, serving as convenor or chair of sessions conducted at regional meetings or congresses, reviewer of proposals and manuscripts for publication, or by serving as an editor of books or special editions of peer-reviewed journals. Service to the community may also include consultantships to schools, local governments, industry, and community service organizations. Service contributions based on consultantcies, whether paid or unpaid, shall be evaluated on the basis of the contributions to the mission of the University and particularly to the Department of Geological Sciences. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the mission of the University.

IV. RETENTION, TENURE, AND LEVELS OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

A. Retention

Retention is awarded to probationary faculty upon the completion of a performance review. The successful candidate will have performed satisfactorily in each area to be evaluated, although consideration will be given to the limited opportunities new appointees have for professional service. Probationary faculty should show evidence of a strong commitment to teaching and instructionally-related activities and to a program of scholarly and creative activities. By the first review for retention, probationary faculty should present evidence that they have begun work towards fulfilling essential criteria in all three areas of evaluations. The subsequent retention decision will be based on evidence presented of steady and sustained progress demonstrated in all three areas: instruction and instructionally related activities, scholarly and creative activities and professional service.

B. Tenure

Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty who have met the essential criteria in instruction and instructionally-related activities, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service. In addition, they shall have demonstrated fulfillment of some of the enhancing criteria, as described in Section III. Tenure represents the University's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual has the potential to continue to make increasingly distinguished contributions to the University and its instructional program, as well as to the academic community. Candidates hired at the ranks of Associate or Full Professor, without tenure, must be evaluated for tenure based in part on their record while at CSULB.

C. Early Tenure and/or Promotion

Early Tenure and/or Promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons.

1. **Early Tenure.** To receive a favorable recommendation for early tenure, a candidate must achieve a record of accomplishment which meets the essential criteria at a superior level in all three areas of review at an early time. In addition, the candidate must present a record of significant enhancing achievements. The length (duration) of the candidate's record must be sufficient to provide confidence that the pattern of achievement will continue.
2. **Early Promotion.** To receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion, a candidate must achieve a record of accomplishment which meets the essential criteria at a superior level in all three areas of review at an early time. In addition, the candidate must present a record of significant enhancing achievements. The length (duration) of the candidate's record must be sufficient to provide confidence that the pattern of achievement will continue.

D. Requirements for Appointment to Rank of Assistant Professor:

The appointee ordinarily shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization. The appointee should also show potential for effective teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service, as defined in section III above and consistent with the mission of the Department, College and University.

E. Requirements for Appointment or Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor:

In addition to having the qualifications of an Assistant Professor, the candidate ordinarily shall have had successful experience in teaching and scholarly/creative activities. Meeting essential criteria is necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. In addition to meeting the essential criteria, there should be evidence of progressive professional development in the areas of instruction and instructionally-related activities, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service, and demonstrated fulfillment of some of the "enhancing criteria" in each of these areas, as defined in Section III above.

F. Requirements for Appointment or Promotion to Rank of Professor:

In addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, there shall be substantiation of continued effectiveness and professional growth in instruction and instructionally-related activities and evidence of relevant and effective professional service. The candidate ordinarily shall have established a record of sustained scholarly or creative activity, reflecting intellectual and professional growth and demonstrating fulfillment of several of the "enhancing criteria", as described in Section III.

V. AMENDMENTS

A. Method of Proposal

Amendments may be proposed by submitting same to the Department with the signatures of any three full-time faculty members of the Department.

B. Notification

Written notification to all full-time faculty members of the Department must be made at least 10 days prior to the submitting of the amendment to the faculty for a vote.

C. Voting

A majority of those voting by secret ballot is required for amending this document.

Appendix 1. Confidentiality Agreement Regarding Department of Geological Sciences RTP Committee Meetings, to be signed by all faculty who are eligible to participate in Department RTP meetings, as defined in the Department RTP document, and who wish to do so.

I, _____, agree to treat all matters discussed in the Department of Geological Sciences RTP Committee meetings for the academic year

_____ as confidential in perpetuity.

(signature)

(date)

Appendix 2. Waiver of Confidentiality for the Purpose of Opening Candidate's File to Review by All Eligible Faculty in the Department of Geological Sciences.

By signing this document I, _____ (print candidate's name) open the file I have submitted for RTP consideration to review by all eligible faculty of the Department of Geological Sciences, as described in the Department of Geological Sciences document on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion. The purpose of this waiver is to allow open discussion of my record within the Department during consideration of my case. I further agree to not revoke this waiver during the current period of consideration of my file for RTP, which is for the academic year _____. I acknowledge my understanding that my decision to open my file to Geological Sciences faculty outside of the Department RTP Committee will not influence the Committee's final decision concerning my case.

(signature of candidate) (date)

received by Chair, Department RTP Committee:

(signature) (date)

Geology RTP document

final copy submitted to Dean, 5/27/98

**Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs
July 1998**

Distribution:

original to Department Secretary, copies to Candidate, Department Chair, Chair of Department RTP
Committee