

California State University, Long Beach

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY

Contents

	Page
1.0 General Principles.....	3
2.0 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Progression.....	3
3.0 Candidate’s Presentation of the RTP File.....	5
3.1 General Principles.....	5
3.2 The Primary File.....	7
3.3 The Supplementary Documentation File.....	7
3.4 Narrative Essay.....	8
4.0 Responsibilities and Procedures.....	15
4.1 General Responsibilities.....	15
4.2 Responsibilities of the Dean	15
4.3 Responsibilities of the Department Chair.....	17
4.4 Responsibilities of the Review Committees.....	17
4.5 Responsibilities of Candidates.....	19
4.6 Procedures.....	20
5.0 Reviewers’ Guidelines for Evaluation.....	22
6.0 Adoption, Amendments, Grievances.....	24
Related Documents.....	27
I. CED RTP Organizational Guide.....	28
II. Performance Review Information (PRI).....	29
III. CED Professional Data Sheet	30
IV. Mission Statement of the College of Education	31

1.0 General Principles

- 1.1 The College of Education subscribes to the principles embodied in the University Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion. [University Policy Statement 96-12]
- 1.2 This document outlines the guidelines for evaluation to be applied in assessing performance in Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service contributions consistent with University criteria [CSULB.III.A]. The document sets forth broad and inclusive, though not exhaustive, indicators by which a candidate's performance in the three review categories may be evaluated at each level of the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process.
- 1.3 An important goal of the RTP process is to provide formative feedback to candidates about their professional activities and accomplishments, together with recommendations for ongoing professional development.
- 1.4 The College of Education is committed to fostering a climate of collegiality for the professional development of its members. The retention, tenure, and promotion process is intended to promote faculty professional development in accordance with the missions of the departments, College, and University, and the professional interests and goals of individual faculty members.
- 1.5 Responsibility for initiating new faculty into the RTP process lies with the Dean of the College and the Department chairs. This responsibility includes introducing the RTP documents and explaining the process to job candidates during the site visit.
- 1.6 In this document, the following references direct the reader to the applicable sections of related documents:

CBA: Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Board of Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association, Unit 3, Faculty (formerly known as the Memorandum of Understanding – MOU)

CSULB: California State University, Long Beach Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (96-12)

2.0 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Progression

- 2.1 The office of the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel coordinates University RTP policy, establishes and distributes the calendar for the University RTP cycle, provides RTP process workshops for committee members and candidates, and maintains the schedule of eligibility for RTP review.
- 2.2 Probationary faculty are subject to “Mini” Periodic Evaluation in the first year of employment and all subsequent years when there is no scheduled RTP action. The retention, tenure, and promotion calendar is accelerated for faculty who bring prior credit with them as terms of their initial employment.

The Dean establishes the internal College and Department calendar for the “Mini” Periodic Evaluation, per the schedule arranged by the Office for Academic Personnel.

- 2.3 Retention: Retention is awarded to probationary faculty upon a successful full RTP review. Successful candidates for retention shall show evidence of a strong commitment to teaching and instructionally related activities and to a program of scholarly and creative activities. Consideration shall be given to the limited opportunities new appointees have for service contributions during their first years. [CSULB.IV.A]
- 2.4 Tenure: Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty who have met the Department and College expectations in the review categories of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service contributions. 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. [CSULB.IV.B]
- 2.5 Promotion: Expectations for successful performance in each of the three categories of evaluation are heightened, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, for promotion from assistant to associate professor and/or granting of tenure, and for promotion from associate to full professor, respectively. Performance should be consistent with the missions of the Department, College, and University.
- 2.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks:
- (i) Assistant Professor: The appointee ordinarily shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization. The appointee shall also show potential for effective Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service contributions. [CSULB.IV.D]
 - (ii) Associate Professor: In addition to having the qualifications of an Assistant Professor, the candidate shall have had successful experience in Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service contributions. [CSULB.IV.E]
 - (iii) 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, a record of sustained Scholarly and Creative Activities reflecting intellectual and professional growth, and evidence of effective leadership in Service contributions. [CSULB.IV.F]
- 2.7 Joint Appointments: All information in this document applies to faculty appointed jointly to two or more departments. However, it is particularly important for the involved departments to maintain a clear set of requirements for tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. All RTP committee members must be fully informed of these requirements as they relate to individual candidates. These requirements must be agreed upon through a process of consultation and collaboration with the departments and the candidate, with the approval of the dean(s) of the affected college(s). [CSULB.IV.G] (See also CSULB Joint Appointment Policy Statement PS 94-11)

2.8 Early Tenure or Early Promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. [CSULB.IV.C]

- (i) Early Tenure. To receive a favorable recommendation for early tenure, a candidate must achieve a record of accomplishment at a “superior” level in all three categories of review at an early point in time. The quality and duration of the candidate’s record must be sufficient to provide confidence that the pattern of achievement shall continue. [CSULB.IV.C.1]
- (ii) Early Promotion. To receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion, a candidate must achieve a record of accomplishment at a “superior” level in all three categories of review at an early point in time. The quality and duration of the candidate’s record must be sufficient to provide confidence that the pattern of achievement shall continue. [CSULB.IV.C.2]

3.0 Candidate’s Presentation of the RTP File

3.1 General Principles

- 3.1.1 The candidate’s RTP File consists of two separate parts: the Primary File and the Supplementary Documentation File(s). Information and materials in each file should be appropriately dated and be consistent across files. The Primary File becomes part of the faculty member’s permanent Personnel File, which is kept in the Office of the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel. The Supplementary Documentation File(s) is returned to the candidate following the review process. [CBA 15.8 and 15.9] For guidance in developing their RTP files, candidates should refer to both the CED RTP Organizational Guide and sample file(s) made available by the Dean’s Office.
- 3.1.2 The RTP file shall include work accomplished during the period under review. The “period under review” shall be considered to be:
 - Retention candidates:
Review period represents the probationary period (including years of prior service credit, if applicable) with emphasis on work accomplished since the last RTP action.
 - Tenure candidates:
Review period represents the entire probationary period (including years of prior service credit, if applicable).
 - Promotion candidates:
Review period represents the time since the last promotion OR since appointment at the current rank. Although continuing academic merit of earlier activities may be noted, and may in fact be necessary to demonstrate continuity of professional development, accomplishments credited to a prior promotion action may not be credited again.

Work accomplished in earlier review periods may be referred to in the Narrative Essay and the Professional Data Sheet; however, supportive documentation of work completed prior to the review period shall not be placed in the Supplementary Documentation File(s).

- 3.1.3 Faculty accomplishments are reviewed in three categories: (1) Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities; (2) Scholarly and Creative Activities; and (3) Service.

It is the candidate's responsibility to place her/his work in the appropriate category for evaluation. Work may be cross-referenced in more than one category, but different aspects of the work should be emphasized in the appropriate category. For example, such activities as development of new programs in the College, cooperative interdepartmental efforts, partnership arrangements with school districts and/or community or business agencies, and service to appropriate student groups may be placed under Instructional and Instructionally Related Activities or under Service contributions; however, scholarship generated from such activities should be placed under Scholarly and Creative Activities.

- 3.1.4 Faculty members have different strengths and interests that may change over the span of a career. Accordingly, successful candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion will not necessarily have similar achievements. Candidates shall emphasize their achievements in different areas depending upon their professional interests, as related to the goals and missions of the Department, College, and University.
- 3.1.5 Faculty may have job assignments that regularly or temporarily carry non-classroom, instructionally related responsibilities. It is the candidate's responsibility to fully describe a
- 3.1.6 non-classroom workload assignment and indicate how the work is consistent with the missions of the Department, College, and University, as well as with the candidate's professional development goals. Candidates who hold non-classroom, instructionally related responsibilities shall not be penalized for carrying a reduced teaching assignment.
- 3.1.7 "Essential" and/or "enhancing" elements of a candidate's performance depend on context, circumstances, and individual candidates. Candidates shall identify their "essential" and "enhancing" accomplishments in each of the three review categories, consistent with the missions of the Department, College, and the University.

"Essential" elements represent the record of accomplishment consistent with the candidate's job description and assigned responsibilities during the period under review.

"Enhancing" elements are aspects of a candidate's record of accomplishment that go beyond expected performance in terms of quantity and quality.

Although candidates are expected to account for the complete spectrum of their professional activities within the review period, the documentation of their accomplishments should represent a selected portfolio; that is, candidates are encouraged to highlight "best examples" of performance in any of the three review categories.

3.2 The Primary File

3.2.1 Organization and Contents: The Primary File shall be submitted in the form of a loose-leaf notebook with its title and the candidate's name, department name, and type of review (retention, tenure, or promotion) prominently identified on the front and spine of the notebook. Labeled dividers should separate each of the sections listed below. The candidate shall be responsible for material and/or information in sections i-vi. Sections vii-xi shall be completed during the review process.

- (i) RTP Candidate Status Sheet (as distributed by the Office for Academic Personnel)
- (ii) Completed Performance Review Information (PRI) sheet
- (iii) Table of Contents
- (iv) CED Professional Data Sheet. Entries within categories should be dated and listed in reverse chronological order. Use double lines to separate accomplishments during the current review period from accomplishments completed during previous review periods.
- (v) Narrative Essay. A description of the candidate's performance in each of the three evaluation categories during the period under review. See Section 3.4, Narrative Essay.
- (vi) Previous CSULB recommendation and evaluation documents for retention, tenure, or promotion.
- (vii) Open File. A file in which letters, statements, and/or documents in reference to the candidate may be submitted for inclusion in the Primary File. Anonymously written items will not be included. [CBA. 15.8 and 15.12]
- (viii) Recommendation by the Department Chair, if provided
- (ix) Completed Department RTP Evaluation and Recommendation Form
- (x) College of Education RTP Evaluation and Recommendation
- (xi) Dean's Evaluation and Recommendation

3.3 The Supplementary Documentation File

3.3.1 The Supplementary Documentation File(s) shall contain evidence supporting the Narrative Essay's description of the candidate's performance and accomplishments in the three review categories for the period under review.

3.3.2 Organization and Contents: The Supplementary Documentation File(s) shall be submitted in the form of up to three loose-leaf notebooks of one to two inches each (one each for Instruction, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service). The title and candidate's name and department name should be prominently identified on the front and spine of each notebook. Use of organizational aides (such as tabs, labels, dividers, and color coding) is strongly recommended.

- 3.3.3 Materials should be arranged and cross-referenced, as appropriate, so as to be easily referenced when reading the Narrative Essay.
- 3.3.4 A candidate's name and contributions, which appear on submitted documents, should be highlighted for easy identification.
- 3.3.5 Although performance from previous review periods may be discussed in the Narrative Essay, materials included in the Supplementary Documentation File(s) shall only reflect performance during the period under review.
- 3.3.6 A "Miscellaneous" or "Supplemental" section may be included to cover activities that are appropriate for review but not easily categorized into the standard three review categories.

3.4 The Narrative Essay

- 3.4.1 In order to present their achievements in a coherent and professional context, candidates are required to place a Narrative Essay in the Primary File describing their work in each of the three evaluation categories for the period under review. The Narrative Essay is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the candidate's professional goals and values as they relate to: (a) the discipline; (b) the missions of the Department, College, and University; and (c) the context of their job description and responsibilities. References in the Narrative Essay to supporting materials must be clearly identified and linked for easy reference to the supporting materials in the Supplementary Documentation File(s).
- 3.4.2 The Essay shall include: (a) a job description and current responsibilities; (b) area(s) of special competence or expertise; (c) summary of accomplishments prior to the review period; (d) discussion of responses to recommendations from past reviews, if any; (e) description of significant accomplishments during the review period in the three review categories of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service; (f) an indication of direction(s) and goals for the future.

The recommended length of the Narrative Essay is 10-20 pages, double-spaced, with 12 point font.

- 3.4.3 **Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities:** Candidates shall discuss both their instruction (classroom teaching and/or field supervision) and their instructionally related activities, such as academic advising, curriculum and program development, thesis supervision, program coordination, and related activities directly involving students. Administrative assignments should be discussed in this latter area (instructionally related activities).

3.4.3.1 Instruction

Classroom teaching shall be described and documented along three dimensions: (1) Pedagogical Approach and Methods, (2) Student Response to Instruction, and (3) Ongoing Professional Development. Performance in each of the three dimensions shall be described in the Narrative Essay and substantiated by the inclusion of appropriately selected materials in the Supplementary Documentation File. [CSULB.III.A.1a]

Pedagogical Approach and Methods

- (i) Classroom teaching may be articulated in the Narrative Essay by discussing the following:
- Reasons for choices of learning goals, instructional methods, and selection of materials;
 - Syllabi, including assignments, course readings, handouts, use of technology, examinations, etc.;
 - Assessment practices; and
 - Ways in which a course has evolved with repeated teaching, if appropriate.

Candidates are encouraged to indicate how they have developed innovative approaches to teaching and assessment or exemplary ways of fostering student learning, such as involvement in community service learning and/or arranging for study/teaching-abroad and international exchange experiences. Candidates should provide selected documentation of such instructional efforts.

(ii) Documentation of Instructional Materials

- For each course taught more than once during the period under review, the following materials should be included in the documentation file from the most recent semester the course was taught: a course syllabus that includes the methods of assessment, the final exam (or substitute comprehensive assignment), and selected additional course materials, at candidate's discretion.
- Candidates shall not provide course materials for two semesters of the same course unless teaching issues have been highlighted as an area of concern in a prior review, or unless there is another significant reason to do so (such as demonstrating how activities, materials, or assessments have evolved).
- The file may include selected materials from web sites that instructors have created for the course, but need not include a printout of the entire web site.

- (iii) Candidates may choose to document their involvement in instructionally-related activities outside the classroom in such areas as field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, support of student organizations, and/or recruitment and retention activities.

Student Response to Instruction

- (i) Candidates shall submit and discuss the Summary Reports from the University Student Evaluation of Instruction forms from two courses per semester taught during the period under review, unless the candidate's job description or workload precludes it. Candidates shall discuss their teaching performance relative to Department and College averages.

For selected course sections, candidates are encouraged to submit and discuss the raw University Student Evaluation of Instruction forms that correspond to the Summary Reports. Raw student evaluations do not have to be submitted for every section, but if they are submitted for a section, the entire set of forms for that section must be included.

- (ii) Candidates shall fill out the “Summary Course Evaluation and GPA Distribution Grid” and place it within this section of the narrative.

SUMMARY COURSE EVALUATION AND GPA DISTRIBUTION GRID

Term	Course No.	No. of Students Enrolled	No. of Students Responding	Cand. Mean	Cand. SD*	Dept. Mean	Dept. SD*	College Mean	College SD*	Class GPA	Dept GPA at Same Level (LD, UD, GR)

- (iii) Candidates should include multiple indicators of their teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to letters from former students, samples of exemplary student work (with student consent), e-mail communications, etc.

Ongoing Professional Development

- (i) Candidates may describe to what extent they have engaged in formal coaching/mentoring arrangements with colleagues, including peer classroom visitations, per the guidelines established by the College (available in the Dean’s office). As the guidelines suggest, any evidence submitted should reflect an ongoing process of constructive critiquing and conferring with colleagues, based on multiple factors, such as classroom visitations, modified instructional materials, instructor-developed evaluation forms/feedback procedures (that supplement University Student Evaluation of Instruction forms), and videotaped class sessions for self-critique or collaborative discussion.
- (ii) Candidates may discuss the various informal ways they have sought to develop professionally as a teacher. For example, they may have engaged in regular collaboration and ongoing interactions with colleagues about pedagogical issues or course development, or they may have sought ways to integrate technology into their instruction.
- (iii) Candidates may wish to explain their involvement with the CSULB Faculty Center for Professional Development (such as participation in its programs or consultation with the professional staff). They may also discuss their involvement in other teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University, CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning, or professional organizations.
- (iv) Candidates may indicate ways in which they have kept abreast of developments in their field through participation in instruction-related sessions at discipline conferences; reading of discipline-appropriate materials such as journals and books; interaction with practitioners in the field; sharing of resources; electronic communications with colleagues; and such activities. Ways of demonstrating currency

in the field include the development of new discipline-related instructional materials, including electronic or multimedia software, new advising or assessment models, etc.

- (v) Candidates may describe activities in which they have demonstrated leadership regarding instructional issues, such as offering teaching colloquia to Department colleagues, pedagogical workshops at discipline meetings, or coaching of colleagues.

3.4.3.2 **Instructionally Related Activities:**

Candidates shall describe non-classroom instructional activities, such as thesis supervision, academic advising, curriculum and program development, program coordination, and related activities directly involving students.

Note: Faculty members with administrative assignments are to describe their assigned responsibilities and accomplishments.

3.4.4 **Scholarly and Creative Activities:**

Candidates shall discuss how their accomplishments demonstrate intellectual and professional growth over time, and how their scholarly and creative achievements have been disseminated to appropriate audiences, including professional, practitioner, and public audiences. Scholarly and creative activities should be shown to: (a) contribute to the missions of the Department, College, and University; (b) be relevant to the candidate's assignment, including teaching, administration, research, college to community linkages, etc.; (c) demonstrate continuous intellectual engagement with the field, and (d) represent significance to the field of endeavor.

Contributions to collaborative, interdisciplinary, community-based, international, and inter-institutional research programs are highly valued, especially in consideration of the challenging processes involved.

3.4.4.1 In describing and documenting their various scholarly and creative achievements, candidates should make the case for and provide multiple indicators of the quality of their accomplishments. The following examples are meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive, of the possibilities:

- (i) **Published scholarship.** Published scholarship includes books, chapters in books, monographs, articles in professional journals, textbooks, conference proceedings, and electronically published documents. Indicators of quality for published research may include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality/prestige of the journal; (b) the journal review process, i.e., refereed (blind peer review) or invited; (c) the impact on the field of the journal as measured by audience, circulation, etc.; (d) citations in the literature and/or requests for reprints; (e) support from external scholars for the quality, impact, importance of the article.

The following terms shall be used to describe and document scholarship:

- “In press” refers to page proofs prior to publication. Evidence includes page proofs, written communication from the publisher/editor that accompanies the page proofs.

- “Accepted” refers to a manuscript that the publisher/editor has agreed to publish without further changes. Evidence is a letter of acceptance on letterhead or electronic communication from the publisher/editor, along with a copy of the manuscript.
- “Conditionally Accepted” refers to a manuscript that the publisher/editor has agreed to publish with minor corrections and without re-review. Evidence is a letter of acceptance on letterhead or electronic communication from the publisher/editor, along with a copy of the manuscript.
- “Revise and resubmit” refers to a manuscript under consideration as an article/book/book chapter that has been reviewed by a publisher/editor who has indicated a willingness to look at a revised version of the product without promise that the manuscript will be published. Evidence is the manuscript with a written communication on letterhead or an electronic communication from the publisher/editor with an invitation to revise.
- “Under Review” means that a manuscript has been completed and submitted to a publisher/editor for consideration as an article, book, or book chapter. Evidence is the manuscript with a written communication on letterhead or an electronic communication acknowledging receipt from the publisher/editor.

Candidates shall disclose any proprietary interest by themselves or family members in books, journals, or other venues in which their work appears.

Joint authorship or participation in scholarly and creative activities is normally valuable and creditable, but is often difficult to evaluate. Candidates shall identify the specific extent of their participation in jointly-authored activities.

Candidates may have publishing opportunities and responsibilities that are directed primarily at a public outside the academic disciplines. Candidates who participate in such activities and wish to be credited with them in the RTP process are cautioned that, on balance, their scholarly and creative activities shall be evaluated on their intellectual and professional merit, and that it is the responsibility of the candidate to develop a body of work that provides reviewers a basis for such evaluation.

- (ii) Work-in-progress. Work-in-progress includes ongoing research and writing projects and may be submitted as evidence of scholarly activity during the period under review. It is understood that work-in-progress refers to current work that offers the potential for conference presentation and/or publication. Ways of documenting work-in-progress include, but are not limited to: (a) a copy of the work-in-progress; (b) a clear statement of the intent and goals of the work-in-progress; (c) a time-line or other indication of the stage of the work-in-progress; and (d) peer review of the work-in-progress.
- (iii) Grant/Contract writing and management (internal or external). Both funded and unfunded grant proposals may be included. Candidates may include such information as: (a) granting organization reviewer feedback or rating sheets; (b) acceptance rate of

the granting organization; (c) prestige of the granting organization; (d) amount of the grant, and (e) information regarding grant management and annual reports to funders.

Since even strong proposals may be rejected, candidates may reference and submit evidence of both accepted and rejected proposals to demonstrate their grant/contract writing activities during the review period.

- (iv) Conference presentations. Conference presentations indicate acceptance by the field of work both completed and in-progress. Information shall include but not be limited to: (a) the standing or significance of the sponsoring organization; (b) the acceptance rate, if known; (c) the basis of acceptance, i.e., whether refereed or invited; and (d) the type of presentation, i.e., keynote, general session, paper panel, poster session, roundtable, or workshop. Participation in a conference can be documented by including a copy of the conference program's title page and a copy of the page on which the candidate's presentation appears.
- (v) Editorial or reviewer assignments. Include information on appointments related to recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media and describe the responsibilities of such assignments.
- (vi) Jury appointments. Describe and indicate the significance of appointments to selection panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, conference proposals, and other adjudication assignments calling for professional expertise.
- (vii) Applied research. Discuss professional activity that may use theory and knowledge of one or more disciplines to address practical problems of importance to the discipline and/or to society. Such applied professional activity may include software development, as well as research on instructional processes and outcomes.
- (viii) Scholarly activity with students. Describe activities that involve students in research and/or scholarly/creative projects.
- (ix) Other scholarly and creative activities.

3.4.4.2 Work with K-12 schools and school districts is integral to the mission of the College, and is appropriately discussed in the categories of Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities [see 3.4.3. above] or Service [see 3.4.5 below]. In either case, candidates are urged to use this work to generate scholarly activity leading to professional presentation and publication.

3.4.5 Service

Service contributions shall be described in the Narrative Essay as professional expertise rendered to the University, the community, and the profession. The College values active involvement and leadership in all three service areas. Candidates shall describe and substantiate their various service contributions and provide exemplars of the quality of their activities.

- 3.4.5.1 Such activities as development of new programs in the College, cooperative development of interdepartmental programs, development of partnership arrangements with school districts, community colleges, and/or community or business agencies, and service to student groups may be considered as Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities or as Service to the community. The candidate shall have the option of presenting evidence for such activities under one or the other of these two areas, or discussing how different aspects of an activity relate to more than one category.
- 3.4.5.2 Candidates may have opportunities and responsibilities for consulting and related services to schools and/or other community agencies which may be provided *pro bono*. Candidates may also receive payment for their professional services. Candidates must establish how their service, paid and unpaid, is consistent with the mission of the department(s) and the College(s). Though extramural *pro bono* or paid professional service may enhance a candidate's achievements in the area of service, it does not lessen the responsibility to participate actively in campus governance and other University responsibilities.

3.4.5.3 University Service

- 3.4.5.3.1 Faculty governance of the University is a long-held tradition and responsibility. Accordingly, candidates shall discuss their participation and leadership on committees at all levels of the University, with emphasis at the Department and College levels for assistant and associate professors.
- 3.4.5.3.2 Supporting evidence may include, but is not limited to, such artifacts as letters from committee chairs describing contributions to the work of the committee; authorship of documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or Department missions or procedures; sponsorship of student groups, and participation in educational equity programs.

3.4.5.4 Community Service

- 3.4.5.4.1 Candidates may indicate their service to the community by discussing such activities as public presentations, service on local boards or associations, media appearances, alumni activities, participation in University-community linkages, work with practitioner groups, etc.

Service to the community may include consultancies, *pro bono* or paid, to public schools and community colleges, local government, and/or community service organizations. Community service, including paid or unpaid consultancies, shall be described in terms of its relevance to the candidate's professional expertise and its complementing the missions of the College and University and particularly the candidate's Department or program.

Creditable service activities must be clearly related to the professional expertise of candidates.

- 3.4.5.4.2 Supporting evidence may include but is not limited to letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, printed programs, contracts, and other appropriate documentation.

3.4.5.5 Service to the Profession

- 3.4.5.5.1 Candidates shall describe their service to professional organizations and in professionally related activities (at local, state, national, and/or international levels). Examples of creditable activities are committee work, proposal reviewing, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles and/or editorials, performances and/or displays.
- 3.4.5.5.2 Supporting evidence may include but is not limited to copies of letters, invitations, printed programs, journal mastheads, proposal reviews, minutes of meetings, honors and awards, and other appropriate documentation.

4.0 Responsibilities and Procedures

4.1 General Responsibilities

- 4.1.1 Responsibilities for RTP lie with the Dean, Department Chairs, Department and College review committees, candidates, and with mentor faculty. The review process is structured to ensure that candidates receive a fair and professional peer evaluation of their performance. To that end, participants in the RTP process shall adhere to guidelines and procedures for presentation and submission of materials, as outlined in Section 3.0, and guidelines for evaluation, as outlined in Section 5.0.
- 4.1.2 At all levels of review, evaluation shall be based on a reading of the candidate's record as represented in the Narrative Essay and documented in the Supplementary Documentation File(s). [CBA.15.12.c]
- 4.1.3 Reviewers have the responsibility to be flexible in interpreting a candidate's file so that the candidate is not inappropriately penalized for having assumed non-teaching responsibilities that serve the missions of the Department and the College.
- 4.1.4 Reviewers have the responsibility to be fully familiar with all related policies and guidelines and with the candidates' RTP status.
- 4.1.5 Since it is possible that reviewers may not possess the special knowledge needed for some areas of evaluation, at each level or review external evaluators may be called upon. The consent of the candidate is required and the process must follow Policy Statement 86-07, and be consistent with the University Procedure for External Evaluators. [CBA 15.12.d]

4.2 Responsibilities of the College Dean

- 4.2.1 The Dean shall provide general oversight of the RTP process within the College, assisting and instructing Department Chairs in their role, and encouraging Departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance. [CSULB.II.C.3]
- 4.2.2 The Dean shall be responsible, with the Department Chairs, for fostering a collegial climate surrounding the RTP process. As part of that responsibility, the Dean shall coordinate a

Mentor Alliance of voluntary senior faculty to assist probationary faculty in their professional development.

- 4.2.3 The Dean, or designee, shall discuss the RTP process and its requirements with candidates early in their employment and at regular intervals thereafter. [CSULB.II.C.3]
- 4.2.4 The Dean, or designee, shall conduct an RTP process meeting late in each Spring semester for RTP candidates for the following year. The Dean shall advise candidates how to access documents listed below:
- CSULB Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (96-12)
 - College of Education Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
 - Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Evaluation and Recommendation Form(s) used by review committees
 - Any Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion documents that serve to supplement the College RTP document
 - Articles relevant to Appointment, Tenure, Promotion and Evaluation from the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)
 - Joint Appointments for Faculty Personnel Policy (94-11)
 - Procedures for External Evaluators (86-07)
- 4.2.5 The Dean, or designee, shall convene the members of the College and Department RTP committees early in the Fall semester to: 1) clarify the due dates of various candidates' evaluations; 2) review the RTP process; 3) address special circumstances of joint appointments; and 4) ensure that peer review committees have access to copies of the following documents:
- CSULB Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (96-12)
 - College of Education Policy On Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
 - Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Evaluation and Recommendation Form(s) used by review committees
 - Any Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion documents that serve to supplement the College RTP document
 - Articles relevant to Appointment, Tenure, Promotion and Evaluation from the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)
 - Joint Appointments for Faculty Personnel Policy (94-11)
 - Procedures for External Evaluators (86-07)
- 4.2.6 The Dean shall publish a list of all candidates for RTP action(s) early in the Fall semester with instructions for how faculty, students, alumni, and other interested parties may submit signed written letters and/or documents to the Open File. Public notification may include memoranda to permanent and temporary faculty, notices posted on bulletin boards in the College, or messages via email or other electronic means.
- 4.2.7 The Dean shall be responsible for establishing separate and secure locations in which to store and review RTP files for Department and College RTP committees. Access shall be limited to persons involved in the review process. RTP Files are not to be removed from the CSULB campus.

4.2.8 The Dean shall forward an independent recommendation of each candidate to the Provost and Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs as required by University Guidelines.

4.2.9 The Dean may request an external evaluation, as described in 4.1.5 above.

4.3 Responsibilities of the Department Chair

4.3.1 The Department Chair shall share responsibility with the Dean for fostering a collegial climate surrounding the RTP process.

4.3.2 The Department Chair, or designee, shall advise and support candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University community. [CSULB.II.B]

4.3.3 The Department Chair shall have the responsibility for communicating Department, College, and University RTP policies to all candidates. [CSULB.II.B.2]

4.3.4 The Department Chair has a number of responsibilities, particularly with regard to probationary faculty, that require her/him to be the primary source of information regarding Department procedures and deadlines. [CSULB.II.B.2]

(i) The Department Chair shall meet with new faculty members early in the first semester of employment to discuss the RTP process, in general, and the initial “Mini” Periodic Evaluation process, calendar, and appropriate documentation of performance.

(ii) The Department Chair shall also provide guidance to candidates over time as to whether their performance is consistent with Department expectations. The Chair shall initiate collegial discussions with faculty about their overall career development and provide professional mentoring, as appropriate. [CSULB.II.B.2]

4.3.5 The Department Chair is responsible for maintaining the Open File of each candidate, as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and for forwarding the contents to the Department RTP Committee and a copy of the contents to the candidate at the close of the Open File Period. [CSULB.II.B]

4.3.6 Department Chairs may make separate recommendations. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to subsequent levels of review by being placed in the Primary File. If the chair makes a separate recommendation, he/she shall not participate as a member of either peer committee [CBA 15.34.b].

4.4 Responsibilities of the Review Committees

4.4.1 It is expected that service on RTP committees should be shared equitably among eligible faculty. Each committee shall elect a chair who shall be responsible for facilitating the work of the committee.

- (i) In addition to attendance at the Dean's fall informational meeting, the chair and/or a designated member of the Department and College RTP committee must attend an RTP informational session scheduled each fall semester by the University Office for Academic Personnel. Those individuals who attend are responsible for briefing other committee members.
- (ii) For candidates who have joint appointments with other Departments and/or Colleges, review committees shall be formed from the respective Department and College RTP committees – with recommendations forwarded to the dean of the administratively responsible college. Pursuant to CSULB PS 94-11, as closely as possible, each department shall be represented on the committee in equal proportion to the proportion of the appointee's position assigned to each academic unit. Committee members are expected to be available to meet with other Department/College Committees so that recommendations can be completed within the specified University timelines.
- (iii) All deliberations of the review committees are to remain confidential among committee members. All voting on RTP matters shall be conducted in executive session. All meetings are closed to non-committee members.
- (iv) Each review committee evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. [CBA.15.39]
- (v) Members of either the Department or the College RTP committees have the right to submit a minority report to the chair of their RTP committee who will then forward the report to the next level of review for placement in the candidate's Primary File alongside the respective committee's evaluation document. [CBA.15.5]

4.4.2 Responsibilities of the Department RTP Committee

- (i) The Department RTP committee has initial responsibility for evaluation of the work of the candidate and makes a recommendation regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department RTP committee is the primary means by which the professional standards and practices of individual academic disciplines are communicated to other levels of review. Therefore, the committee's report is to be evaluative in nature.
- (ii) Each Department shall elect from its full-time tenured faculty an RTP committee comprised of at least three members with the rank of full professor. Election shall be by secret ballot.
- (iii) Members of Department RTP committees shall be elected after the results of the College RTP committee election have been announced, and before the end of the Spring semester. Elected members of Department RTP committees shall serve staggered two-year terms. No member shall serve more than four consecutive years.
- (iv) If a Department does not have three members with the rank of full professor, that Department may elect qualified professors from another Department in the College of

Education or from outside the College, where appropriate. Alternatively, a Department may elect members with the rank of associate professor if the RTP committee does not review candidates seeking promotion to full professor.

- (v) Students may, with the concurrence of the Department and College or University administrator, be provided an opportunity to consult with the Department RTP committee. [CBA.15.15]

4.4.3 Responsibilities of the College RTP Committee

- (i) It is the College RTP committee's responsibility to ensure consistency of standards across the College.
- (ii) The College RTP committee shall consist of five full-time, tenured, full professors elected by secret ballot from the College as a whole. No more than three members may be from one Department. A College RTP committee member cannot serve on a Department RTP committee simultaneously.
- (iii) College RTP committee members shall serve staggered two-year terms, but no member shall serve more than four consecutive years.
- (iv) Elections for the College RTP committee shall take place during the Spring semester preceding the academic year the members will serve. Elections shall be by secret ballot cast by all tenured/tenure track faculty in the College.

4.5 Responsibilities of Candidates

- 4.5.1 Candidates should make every effort to seek advice and guidance on the RTP process within the Department and the College. Regular discussions with Department Chairs and experienced colleagues are necessary if faculty members are to understand the process and participate in it effectively.
- 4.5.2 Candidates are strongly urged to attend RTP sessions conducted by the Dean, the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel, the Faculty Center for Professional Development, and the California Faculty Association.
- 4.5.3 Candidates shall clearly articulate in the Narrative Essay and document in the Supplementary Documentation File(s) their job description for each semester of each year of the period under review.
- 4.5.4 At all levels of review, the candidate's formal job description, as well as formal out-of-the-ordinary responsibilities that are consistent with the Department, College, and University missions, shall be of foremost consideration.
- 4.5.5 Candidates are responsible for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments for review. This may include soliciting letters of support from peers, colleagues, and students within and outside the University for submission to the Open File.

4.5.6 Candidates should be familiar with the Collective Bargaining Agreement sections on RTP, the University RTP policy, this College of Education document, and the Department-level Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion Evaluation and Recommendation Form.

4.6 Procedures

4.6.1 Candidates may access their Open File until the close of the Open File Period to photocopy documents for inclusion in the Supplementary Documentation File(s) and to make the correspondent changes in the Narrative Essay and the Tables(s) of Contents. Candidates may choose to respond to or rebut materials submitted during the Open Period. Such responses are to be included in the Primary File along with any other candidate responses or rebuttals.

4.6.2 The Department committee shall begin review of candidates' files after the close of the Open File Period. Materials that become accessible after this date may be admitted to a candidate's file only if they already have been noted in the Narrative Essay and the Professional Data Sheet. Such items can be added to the RTP File only with the approval of the College RTP committee and shall be shared with all levels of review for evaluation and comment. [CBA.15.12.b]

4.6.3 The Department RTP committee chair shall notify the College RTP committee chair of the availability of RTP files, complete with Department evaluations and recommendations, by the University specified timeline for Department review.

4.6.4 The College RTP committee shall review the files forwarded by the Department committees and shall forward its own independent recommendation, via the College Dean, to the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel. The College committee shall notify the Dean by the specified timeline when files are available for review.

4.6.5 If it is discovered that reviewers' evaluations/recommendations are missing, in whole or in part, from the RTP Primary File, the appropriate review committee (or administrator) shall be notified. Accordingly, such materials are to be provided in a timely manner. [CBA.15.12.b] Review of the candidate's file shall continue and be concluded upon receipt of the missing evaluation document(s).

4.6.6 If documentation in a candidate's RTP evaluation file(s) is missing at one level of review, request for the missing documentation shall be made. Review of the candidate's file(s) shall continue and be concluded upon receipt of the appropriate documentation. It is expected that this process will be completed in conformance with the University timeline.

4.6.7 Reviewers shall evaluate the candidate's file in each of the three review categories according to the following rubric.

(i) Superior

(ii) Satisfactory with commendation

(iii) Satisfactory

- (iv) Satisfactory with reservations
- (v) Unsatisfactory

4.6.8 Reviewers' recommendations for action regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion shall be made in one of the following classifications:

- (i) Recommended
- (ii) Not recommended

Candidates must be evaluated minimally as "satisfactory with reservations" in each of the three review categories to be recommended for retention.

Candidates must be evaluated minimally as "satisfactory" in each of the three review categories to be recommended for tenure and/or promotion.

For successful early tenure or early promotion, candidates must be evaluated as "superior" in all three review categories.

Review committees are obligated to provide explicit written commentary for each candidate reflecting their assessment of the quality of a candidate's accomplishments. Committees shall also make suggestions for improvement, where appropriate.

4.6.9 Justifications for evaluation in each of the three review categories as well as for recommendation or non-recommendation for retention or promotion, and a full summary of the evidence, shall be the responsibility of each level of review through the Dean. Evaluations and recommendations on Department and College forms shall be signed by each member of the RTP committee. Reviewers of either the department or college review committees may submit a minority report if they do not agree with the position of the committee.

4.6.10 In order to honor the confidentiality required by the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, RTP committee forms or letters of evaluation and/or recommendation are to be typed only by the staff member assigned by the Department Chair, for the Department evaluation, and the staff member assigned by the Dean for the College evaluation and the Dean's evaluation.

4.6.11 The candidate may respond in writing to an evaluation within 7 days of receiving it. Within the same time period, the candidate may also request a meeting to discuss the recommendation.

4.6.12 Reviews at all levels within the College shall be made available to reviewers at every level by the appropriate committee chair or the Dean, as appropriate.

4.6.13 The Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel shall receive and assist the Provost and Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs in reviewing all materials submitted by prior levels of review.

- 4.6.14 The Provost and Senior Vice-President has the authority to make final decisions for the University with respect to tenure. The Provost also makes final decisions on retention or promotion if there has been a negative recommendation by either the Department or College committees or the Dean.

5.0 Reviewers' Guidelines for Evaluation

- 5.1 Professional performance within the three review categories – (1) Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, (2) Scholarly and Creative Activities, and (3) Service – forms the basic structure for evaluation of faculty accomplishments, as represented by the Primary File and the Supplementary Documentation File.

- 5.2 Each evaluator is expected to take into consideration the context, circumstances, and professional lives of individual candidates as reflected in their RTP files.

Each evaluator shall review RTP files within the framework of the candidate's job description and work assignment, and her/his professional interests and goals as they correspond with the missions of the Department, College, and University. Within this framework, it is the candidate's entire body of accomplishments during the period under review that should guide reviewers in their evaluation and recommendation for personnel action.

- 5.3 Each evaluator shall review a candidate's entire documentation record in Instruction, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service. Evaluators shall give particular attention to "best examples" of performance in any of the three review categories that candidates may choose to highlight as "enhancing" performance indicators.

- 5.4 Neither a wide variety of activities nor a greater quantity of participation in a narrow range of pursuits shall replace demonstrated quality of "essential" and "enhancing" performance in the three review categories.

- 5.5 Each evaluator shall review the extent to which the candidate has explained and documented her/his response to areas needing improvement, if cited in prior reviews.

- 5.6 Computers and network technology provide alternative modes of professional activity and new methods of dissemination, and may pose special problems for evaluators. Likewise, assessing interdisciplinary, international, and inter-institutional efforts poses additional challenges. Reviewers need to be especially aware that such contributions require appropriate and informed evaluation and credit, and that external assistance may be appropriate.

- 5.7 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities: Work accomplished in this category shall be reviewed in the framework of:

- Pedagogical Approach and Methods
- Student Response to Instruction
- Ongoing Professional Development

Note: Because administrative assignments represent markedly different responsibilities, the review of administrator-candidates' non-instructional accomplishments is described below in 5.9 (iii), Instructionally Related Non-Classroom Assignments.

Specific areas for review in this category include classroom teaching and supervision of field work, as well as instructionally related non-classroom assignments, such as thesis supervision, curriculum and program development, academic advisement, program coordination, and related activities directly involving students. In reviewing candidates' accomplishments in the category of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, evaluators shall be guided, in particular, by the following:

- (i) *Classroom Teaching*: Effectiveness in classroom teaching is singularly significant within the category of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities for candidates whose major responsibility is teaching (an average of six or more units per semester during the period under review). Evaluators shall consider multiple indicators of a candidate's teaching, and shall take into account performance over time rather than in a few classes or over a brief period.

When reviewing teaching effectiveness, evaluators shall consider a candidate's entire teaching spectrum, including: course materials (syllabi, reading lists, assignments, exams, grading practices, etc.); evidence of improved student ratings; student written comments on raw evaluation forms, if submitted; whether the course has been taught for the first time; the number of new preparations for a candidate; the total number of students in all sections in courses submitted for review; whether courses are required or elective; whether courses are undergraduate or post-baccalaureate; and peer classroom visitation reports, when appropriate; etc. Reviewers shall also regard candidates' efforts to experiment with a variety of instructional strategies and instructor-developed approaches to soliciting informal student feedback. Candidates' attempts to improve regularly taught courses shall also be considered.

Student response to instruction is a valid consideration when evaluating instructional effectiveness. However, student ratings shall not be used as the principal criterion of teaching effectiveness nor shall undue emphasis be given to Summary Reports of student ratings.

As one measure of teaching, the Department committee may use a grid based on the global item from the Summary Reports of the University Student Evaluation of Instruction forms. Student ratings on the grid shall be compared to Department and College averages.

- (ii) *Supervision of Fieldwork*: Among other evidence provided, evaluation shall be based on the Summary Reports from results of the University Evaluation of Supervisor forms. Evaluators may also review letters from colleagues with direct knowledge of the candidate's performance and/or from recent graduates.
- (iii) *Instructionally Related Non-Classroom Assignments*: Candidates with non-classroom workload assignments shall be evaluated in the area of Instruction and Instructionally-

Related Activities within the definition of their job description and shall not be penalized for carrying a reduced teaching assignment.

For all other areas included in the category of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, exemplary performance or leadership may be evaluated by such means as support letters from colleagues and/or thesis/project students.

- 5.8 Scholarly and Creative Activities: Scholarly and Creative Activities shall be evaluated on their intellectual and professional merits. In reference to the terminology listed in 3.4.4.1 (i), evaluators shall consider multiple indicators of the quality and significance of candidates' scholarly and creative accomplishments. Reviewers should be cautioned against accepting any single criterion as the sole indicator of quality. External criteria shall not substitute for evaluators' own informed reading of candidates' work.
- (i) Candidates may have publishing opportunities directed at a public primarily outside the academic disciplines. Such activity shall be evaluated in the context of: (a) its relevance to the candidate's assignment, including teaching, administration, research, college to community linkages, etc.; (b) the missions of the Department, College, and University; and (c) its relation to the candidate's continuous intellectual engagement with the field.
 - (ii) Reviewers shall view impartially the varying methodologies of scholarly work (e.g., quantitative and qualitative), as well as the appropriateness of both systematic programs of research and eclectic scholarly agendas.
 - (iii) In evaluating the files of probationary faculty in their first academic appointment, reviewers shall exercise flexibility while the candidates become accustomed to higher education and to the culture of the Department, the College, and the University and during which time candidates may gain direction for their scholarly interests.
 - (iv) Joint authorship or participation in scholarly and creative activities is normally valuable and creditable, but is often difficult to evaluate. Evaluators shall carefully determine the extent of candidates' participation in joint enterprises.
- 5.9 Service: Service to the University, community, and/or profession – whether voluntary or paid – shall directly involve the professional expertise of the candidate. Regardless of the type of service or the level of leadership, quality of service shall be the primary consideration. In particular, the College values active and creative participation and leadership in University service, particularly on key committees, more highly than it does nominal committee membership. Candidates shall be expected to demonstrate increasing involvement with University governance after the initial appointment.

6.0 Adoption, Amendments, Grievances

- 6.1 This document is subject to approval by the College of Education Faculty Council and to ratification by a majority of the College's voting faculty members (tenured and probationary), the Dean, and the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel.

- 6.2 This document shall be subject to periodic review by the College faculty in order to keep it consistent with the mission of the College, the current state of the field, and University RTP policy.
- 6.3 The faculty of the College of Education, voting by secret mail ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may amend this document.
- (i) Amendments may be proposed in either of two ways: (1) by direct faculty action via petition from twenty percent (20%) of the faculty to the Dean of the College; or (2) by action of the Faculty Council.
 - (ii) Proposed amendments shall be submitted to discussion at a College meeting following their receipt by the Dean. Proposed amendments shall be distributed by the Dean to the faculty at least seven (7) calendar days before the College meeting. Amendments shall be adopted when they have received an affirmative vote by a majority of the eligible faculty voting in secret ballot conducted by the Dean within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the College meeting, and they have the concurrence of the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel.
- 6.4 Department documents: Departments have the option of adopting a Department RTP document or of being governed by this document.
- Department RTP documents are subject to ratification by a simple majority of tenured and probationary Department faculty members voting, and to approval by the Faculty Council and Dean. Department RTP documents shall be subject to regular review by the Department faculty in order to keep them consistent with the Department and College missions, the current state of the discipline, and University RTP policy.
- 6.5 Grievance Procedures. See Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the Board of Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association, Unit 3 – Faculty.
- 6.6 This document shall be effective Fall, 2005.

Adopted by the Faculty of the CSULB College of Education _____.

RELATED DOCUMENTS

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION RTP ORGANIZATIONAL GUIDE

The Narrative (Recommended length: 10-20 pages, double-spaced, 12 point font, including all tables).

- A. The narrative provides the opportunity for candidates to “bring alive” their accomplishments to assist reviewers in understanding candidates’ interests, goals, and values as they relate to:
 1. The discipline
 2. The missions of the Department, College, and University
 3. The context of the candidates’ goals, as related to their job description and responsibilities

- B. The narrative includes: [See Section 3.4.*]
 1. Job description and current responsibilities
 2. Area(s) of special competence or expertise
 3. Summary of accomplishments prior to the review period
 4. Discussion of responses to recommendations from past reviews, if any
 5. Description of accomplishments during review period in the 3 categories below (Instruction, Scholarship, Service)
 6. An indication of direction(s) and goals for the future

- C. “Essential” and/or “Enhancing” elements: Candidates shall review their accomplishments and distinguish between those that are “essential” and those that are “enhancing.” [See Section 3.1.6.*]
 1. “Essential” refers to those contributions that are consistent with the candidate’s job description and that are required according to the assigned responsibilities during the period of review.
 2. “Enhancing” elements are those aspects of the candidate’s record that go beyond expected performance.

- D. The three major review categories include specific elements.
 1. **Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities** [All items are to be covered. See Section 3.4.3.*]
 - a. Instruction
 - b. Pedagogical Approach and Methods
 - c. Student Response to Instruction (include Summary Course Evaluation and GPA Grid).
 - d. Ongoing Professional Development
 - e. Instructionally Related Activities

 2. **Scholarly and Creative Activities** [Respond to those items that are relevant. See Section 3.4.4.*]
 - a. Published scholarship
 - b. Work-in-progress
 - c. Grant writing and management
 - d. Conference presentations
 - e. Editorial or reviewer assignments
 - f. Jury appointments (appointments to selection panels related to Scholarly and Creative Activity)
 - g. Applied research
 - h. Scholarly activity with students

 3. **Service** [Explain leadership roles, accomplishments, or significant involvement. See Section 3.4.5.*]
 - a. University and/or system-wide service (All items, if possible, are to be covered.)
 - b. University level
 - c. College level
 - d. Department level
 - e. Community service
 - f. Service to the profession

Supplementary Documentation

Evidence should be placed in three loose-leaf binders (one for each review category and preferably no thicker than 1” to 2” apiece), following the guidelines in Section 3.3 of the CED RTP policy. Candidates are urged to prioritize documentation to emphasize “best examples,” i.e. the evidence of strong performance or “enhancing” contributions. (See the CED web site for the document “Appropriate Use of Support Materials in RTP Files by the CSULB Faculty Personnel Policies Council, 2001.)

* Numeric references denote sections in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy of the CSULB College of Education.

California State University, Long Beach
College of Education

PERFORMANCE REVIEW INFORMATION (PRI)

Candidate: _____

Academic year of candidacy: _____

Department(s): _____

Departmental Program Affiliation(s) _____

If a joint appointment, Administrative Department: _____

Requested RTP action(s): _____

If retention, type of retention (See "Status Sheet" from Academic Personnel): _____

If request for RTP action(s) is early, year candidate would normally be considered: _____

Due date of file: _____ Open File Period: _____

Current rank: _____

Date of appointment: _____

Service credit (years granted toward tenure/sabbatical leave): _____

Total number of probationary years completed (including service credit): _____

* Period of time under review: From _____ to _____
Semester/Year Semester/Year

* NOTE:

Retention candidates: Review period represents the probationary period (including years of prior service credit, if applicable) with emphasis on work accomplished since the last RTP action.

Tenure candidates: Review period represents the entire probationary period (including years of prior service credit, if applicable).

Promotion candidates: Review period represents the time since the last promotion **OR** since appointment at the current rank. Although continuing academic merit of earlier activities may be noted, and may in fact be necessary to demonstrate continuity of professional development, accomplishments credited to a prior promotion action may not be credited again.

CED Professional Data Sheet

Please give listings in reverse chronological order. You may list publications and committee work prior to the period of review. Please use a double line across the page to separate activities during the period of review from those prior to the period of review.

A. Academic Preparation and Honors

1. Degree, institution, year, major, other education
2. Academic awards and honors

B. Instruction / Primary Work Assignment

1. Current teaching and/or administrative assignment
2. History of teaching and/or administrative assignments
List teaching assignments, assigned time, and other primary work assignments during period of review.
3. Other
List other activities related to primary work assignment, as appropriate.

C. Scholarly and Creative Activities

List activities in the order given below. [Respond only to those items that are relevant. See Section 3.4.4.] For “Full” reviews, please give journal acceptance rates or other indicators of quality described in CED RTP Policy; this information is optional for Mini-Reviews. Indicate whether publications have been invited or juried / refereed.

- a. Publications
- b. Work-in-Progress
- c. Grant writing and management
- d. Conference presentations
- e. Editorial or reviewer assignments
- f. Jury appointments (appointments to selection panels related to Scholarly and Creative Activity)
- g. Applied research
- h. Scholarly activity with students

D. Service

1. Faculty Committees
List University, College, and Department committee service, in that order. Include dates and describe any unusual degree of participation or responsibility such as reports authored, programs or policies implemented, and offices held.
2. Community Service
List activities, dates of activities, positions held, etc., which are related to your professional field or which bring substantial beneficial recognition to the University.
3. Service to Profession

E. Other

List any other contributions that have an unusual bearing upon your teaching, scholarship, or service.

MISSION STATEMENT OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Our mission is to foster a learning and teaching community committed to educational excellence. Our community

- Promotes intellectual, personal, and interpersonal growth for all students;
- Prepares socially responsible leaders for a rapidly changing, technologically-rich world;
- Values diversity and prepares students for a diverse world;
- Serves and collaborates with other educators and the community;
- Promotes school improvement for all students; and
- Engages in research, scholarly activity, and ongoing evaluation.

CED THEME

Teaching for Life-Long Learning, Professional Growth, and Social Responsibility