

Department of Physics and Astronomy Policy on Retention, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review

I. Preamble

A. Mission Statement: The faculty, staff, and administration of the Department are dedicated to a mission whose major components are:

- * to provide high quality instruction by faculty for whom excellent teaching is a high priority, and who produce ideas and innovations which continually improve teaching and learning;
- * to conduct original research that leads to new knowledge, and to publish and present scholarly and creative works that advance the field of physics and physics education;
- * to provide opportunities for students to participate in research projects with faculty who consider continuing scholarly activity a responsibility both to their students and to their discipline;
- * to seek external funding from public and private sources in support of our mission, providing supplements to State of California financial support;
- * to provide students and faculty with high quality learning and teaching environments, and to foster an atmosphere that encourages and supports collegial interaction, personal growth, and intellectual achievement;
- * to encourage flexibility in faculty assignments, because the Department's goals are most fully realized when each faculty member maximizes his or her contribution, though those contributions may differ in area and emphasis.

B. The Department establishes the following criteria and procedures to be used as guidelines for decisions concerning retention, tenure, and promotion. Should any part of this document be in conflict with documents and/or policies of higher level bodies, then the parts in conflict are null and void, and those of higher level bodies shall prevail.

II. Responsibilities and Procedures

A. The Department Chair

The Department Chair shall be responsible for informing new faculty members of the criteria and procedures used in evaluating their performance. The Department Chair shall distribute copies of the Department, College, and University RTP policies to new faculty upon their arrival. At least once a year the Department Chair shall meet with each probationary faculty member and each faculty member eligible for promotion to discuss his or her performance.

If the Department Chair elects to write an opinion regarding a faculty member's RTP candidacy, the Chair will have access to all materials in the candidate's RTP file. The candidate shall have the opportunity to include a response in the RTP file.

B. The Department RTP Committee

The RTP Committee of 3 to 5 members shall be elected by the Department. Its election shall begin with the nomination of all eligible faculty members and tabulation of their names on a ballot. If the Department Chair elects to write an independent opinion regarding the candidates being considered, he or she shall remove his or her name from the ballot. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members shall vote to select a maximum of five names on the ballot. Those who receive a majority of ballots cast shall serve on the Committee. If less than 5 faculty members are elected, a second ballot shall be made to include names of eligible faculty members who did not receive a majority vote in the first ballot. The election continues until a total of 5 faculty members are elected or until no more eligible faculty members receive a majority vote. The Committee shall write a report assessing each RTP candidate, and that report (or both a majority and a minority report, if any) shall be added to the candidate's RTP file. All faculty members who attend RTP meetings shall keep materials and discussions confidential.

The candidate shall have one week to respond to the RTP Committee's report(s) and to any other materials placed in his or her RTP file.

III. Criteria and Evaluation

A. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities.

Given the Department mission, the faculty members are expected to provide high quality instruction and produce ideas and innovations which continually improve teaching and learning. The Department RTP committee will evaluate the candidate's contributions in teaching.

1. Evaluation: The assessment of teaching effectiveness will be based on evaluation of the candidate's teaching, with particular emphasis on teaching during the current review period. This evaluation will include the following items.
 - An assessment of scores on student evaluations.
 - Written reports of at least four class visits during the review period by members of the RTP Committee; such reports should deal with the candidate's mastery of the subject matter, the clarity of presentation, sensitivity to student response, and cordiality towards student participation.
 - Evaluation of the course materials and narrative submitted by the candidate.
 - Written comments by students, faculty and alumni if submitted: the Committee will solicit written comments from students and faculty members in the Department, and ^{may} solicit comments from alumni or other knowledgeable parties; each written comment must be signed and dated by its author.
2. Essential Criteria: For promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, teaching effectiveness must show compelling evidence of potential for excellence. For promotion to Professor, most areas of teaching and related activities must be excellent. Teaching lecture or laboratory classes and mentoring students in research and study will be the most important factors in assessing teaching. ^{only}

- (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 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 overall a favorable perception of the instruction's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to the student needs. The RTP Committee will conduct an analysis of all available numerical data from student evaluation sheets. This analysis will include a comparison of the candidate's scores with those for comparable courses. Any written comments will also be analyzed by the RTP Committee. The student evaluation results may be influenced by many factors and should be supplemented by other input.
- (c) Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher: The candidate must write a narrative describing his or her teaching efforts, with appropriate documentation, as required by the University 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:

- (a) development of a new course that is relevant to the curriculum,
- (b) development of innovative course materials or teaching approaches that can be demonstrated to improve the quality of teaching,
- (c) publications or presentations of pedagogical issues at professional meetings,
- (d) organizing or chairing sessions at meetings such as AAPT.
- (e) publication of a textbook.
- (f) conducting assessment of one's instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.
- (g) mentoring research of students from high schools, other colleges, or universities.
- (h) support of student organizations, recruitment and retention activities, or
- (i) other activities which lead to an enhancement of teaching effectiveness.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities

Given the Department's mission, the faculty are expected to conduct scholarly research on an ongoing basis, and each candidate for tenure or promotion is required to have a record of publication which provides evidence of

- 1) the quality of his or her scholarly activity, and
- 2) a sustained research program.

The Department RTP Committee will evaluate both the quantity and quality of the completed contributions submitted.

1. Evaluation: Evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative work will be based on an examination of copies of all published papers, book chapters, reviews, abstracts, and any other relevant publications published or submitted during the period of evaluation. The candidate, at his or her discretion, may also submit for evaluation copies of all grant proposals and reviewer's comments on proposals submitted during the period of evaluation. The evaluation may also include written and signed comments submitted by faculty members qualified to comment on the work. The candidate will also provide a narrative describing the overall goals and progress of the scholarly research, the nature of student involvement, and the candidate's professional development. The Department RTP Committee or the candidate may request evaluations of the candidate's scholarly activities from scientists outside of the department, and such external evaluations are strongly urged if there are no faculty members in the department qualified to evaluate the work in a knowledgeable and detailed fashion. If it elects to pursue an external review, the external reviewers must be chosen in accordance with the University Policy on External Evaluations.

In evaluating the candidate's record, the Department Committee will refer to the lists of possible scholarly and creative activities in Section 4 below. These lists are intended to give the candidate an idea of the relative value of different types of contributions, but are not intended to be complete or comprehensive. Contributions not appearing on the list must be considered 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.) The lists provide guidelines to the candidate concerning minimum requirements for the action sought.

2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: The Department requires that the candidate present evidence of continuing scholarship in which the candidate has a major responsibility and a record of research papers accepted by peer-reviewed journals. The enhancing criteria are listed in Section 4 below.
3. Promotion to Professor: The candidate should provide clear evidence of ongoing research in which the candidate has a major responsibility and a record of research papers accepted by peer-reviewed journals, since the last promotion. The enhancing criteria are listed in Section 4 below.

4. Enhancing Criteria: There are many ways that faculty may go beyond the essential criteria to enhance their achievement; the following are illustrative, not exhaustive, of the possibilities:
 - 1) Authorship of a book, chapter of a book, or review article relating to the candidate's scientific research.
 - 2) Principal investigator or co-investigator on externally funded research grants or contracts.
 - 3) Authorship of research papers presented at international meetings, national meetings, or regional meetings.
 - 4) Principal investigator or co-investigator on a grant or contract proposal which received favorable external peer reviews.
 - 5) Principal investigator on grants awarded by CSULB.
 - 6) Authorship of reports to government agencies or private industry.
 - 7) Colloquia presented at universities, government laboratories, or commercial laboratories.
 - 8) Publications not related to the candidate's scientific research.

C. Professional Service

Professional service includes service to the discipline, the Department, the College, the University, and the community. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the mission of the university. The emphasis in the evaluation shall be on: (1) the quality and significance of the activity, and (2) the extent and level of involvement.

1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: The candidate is expected to participate actively in Department committees. His or her service contributions listed in Section 3 should be included and will also be evaluated.
2. Promotion to Professor: The candidate is expected to participate actively in Department, College, or University committees. His or her service contributions listed in Section 3 should be included and will also be evaluated.
3. In addition to campus governance activities, the candidate may
 - (a) participate in service to professional organizations,
 - (b) participate in professionally related activities at local, state, national, and/or international level through discipline-oriented activities such as committees, workshops, speeches, or media interviews,
 - (c) serve as chair of sessions conducted at regional meetings or congresses,
 - (d) review proposals and manuscripts for publication,
 - (e) serve as editor of books or special editions of peer-reviewed journals,
 - (f) participate in service to the community by serving as a consultant to schools, local governments, industry, and community service organizations.

IV. Summary

The quality of the candidate's performance is the most important element to consider in the evaluation. Both essential and enhancing criteria are evaluated in the context of the mission of the Department, the College, the University, and of the professional interests of the candidate. The RTP committee is expected to rank each candidate as Excellent, Competent, or Deficient.

V. Post-Tenure Review

1. The Department Chair shall notify each faculty member to be reviewed in writing. He or she may designate the Department RTP Committee to evaluate the candidate. Otherwise, a separate Post-Tenure Review Committee consisting of three members shall be elected to do the evaluation. Eligible faculty members shall not decline nomination or election to the evaluation committee. The Department Chair will also serve as an ex-officio member of the evaluation committee.
2. The Chair of the review committee shall provide the candidate to be reviewed a copy of the review timetable. If the candidate does not turn in a file on time, the committee Chair shall write memoranda to the Dean of the College. The committee shall state to the Dean that the candidate has failed to comply with University policy and the provisions of the Department, and thus no formal Post-Tenure Review process can be implemented.
3. After the review is completed, the Committee shall write a report and forward it to the Dean of the College.

VI. Amendments

Amendments to this document will be considered upon submission to the Department with the signatures of three full-time faculty who are members of the Department. Written notification to all Department members eligible to vote must be provided at least 10 working days prior to the close of balloting. Affirmative votes of at least 60% of the faculty eligible to cast ballots will be required to ratify the amendment.

05/03