

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

4  
5                   **DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE EDUCATION**  
6                   **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY (RTP)**  
7

8  
9 Candidates must read the CSULB and College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics RTP  
10 Policies. These policies, along with the Science Education RTP Policy, shall guide candidates  
11 and their evaluators in documenting their achievements and growth as faculty members at  
12 California State University, Long Beach.  
13

14 The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the College of Natural  
15 Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) establishes college-wide standards of excellence  
16 and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty within the  
17 college for sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 of the university RTP policy (PS 09-10), but  
18 readers should still consult the university policy for these sections.<sup>1</sup>  
19

20 **1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**  
21 **(RTP)**  
22

23 CNSM faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the  
24 impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and  
25 instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);  
26 and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.  
27 All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three  
28 areas.  
29

30 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three  
31 areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate  
32 demonstrating a sustained record of quality performance over the period of review and  
33 evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making productive  
34 contributions in all three areas of evaluation. Reappointment decisions are based on  
35 evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing a record of evidence  
36 that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.  
37

38 **2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**  
39

40 Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of  
41 excellence in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly,  
42 and creative activities; and 3) professional service and engagement at the university, in

---

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

43 the community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for  
44 reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP  
45 policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards.  
46 Candidates for RTP recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in  
47 each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific  
48 standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent and competent in each area of  
49 evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. A candidate will not receive a  
50 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet  
51 requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or  
52 promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area  
53 of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly  
54 and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to  
55 full professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the  
56 areas of evaluation.

57

## 58 **2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

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

67

68 Faculty members in the Department of Science Education are expected to be effective teachers  
69 and advisors, and to participate in professional development activities. Effective teaching is  
70 characterized by developing appropriate student learning outcomes, engaging students with  
71 appropriate and varied pedagogies, using a variety of assessment techniques, critically analyzing  
72 one's teaching, and reflecting on constructive feedback. Candidates are expected to remain  
73 current in their content knowledge, teach meaningful lessons, and strive to continually improve  
74 their instructional effectiveness. Candidates should describe in their narrative how they have met  
75 these expectations. A description of the sorts of evidence that could be included can be found in  
76 section 2.2.

77

### 78 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

79 Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject  
80 matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty  
81 members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and on ways  
82 to assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning, which may lead to  
83 adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-  
84 classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent  
85 with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate individual student learning  
86 styles.

87

#### 88 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and method

89 The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses  
90 taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty in the discipline. Course materials and  
91 teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be  
92 of value in facilitating learning. Materials submitted by a candidate in her/his file should  
93 include at least course syllabi and assessment materials. Teaching materials, such as  
94 samples of student work with instructor feedback, should also be submitted when  
95 available. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the learning goals  
96 and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline. At a  
97 minimum, each course taught by the candidate should prepare the students for later  
98 courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite. Course policies and grading  
99 practices should be clearly conveyed to students, and the results of grading practices  
100 should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same or comparable  
101 courses taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty. The most recent syllabus from  
102 each course taught during the evaluation period must be included.

103  
104 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher  
105 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing  
106 her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches  
107 used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should  
108 be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the  
109 candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward  
110 a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time  
111 should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant  
112 materials. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy,  
113 classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the  
114 Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or  
115 conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that  
116 contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

117  
118 2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes  
119 Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices  
120 and course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and  
121 goals. Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with  
122 course goals.

123  
124 2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction  
125 In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and  
126 university RTP policies, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student  
127 response to instruction. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all  
128 courses evaluated during the period under review. Note that evaluations for  
129 independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department  
130 seminar/colloquium courses should not be included in the candidate's file. Student  
131 course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.  
132 Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing  
133 student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item

134 on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does  
135 not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

136  
137 Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means  
138 and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and  
139 material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical  
140 ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the  
141 instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to  
142 student needs.

143

## 144 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

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

150

151 Candidates should provide evidence of instructional effectiveness, student learning, and efforts  
152 to improve instruction. Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are described through the  
153 narrative, with supporting documentation. Candidates should discuss instructional improvements  
154 they have made, as well as the rationale leading to those changes. Supporting documentation also  
155 provides evidence of the changes. Modifications to instruction made as a result of feedback from  
156 prior reviews are expected. Candidates should address these changes in their narrative.

157 Candidates should refer to the CNSM RTP Policy in regards to which instructionally related  
158 artifacts must be included in the file.

159

160 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to  
161 suggestions for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations),  
162 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of  
163 circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4)  
164 any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the  
165 candidate's teaching effectiveness.

166

167 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly  
168 rigor of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses  
169 taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty.

170

171 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness,  
172 including a critical analysis of all student input. This analysis must assess the  
173 significance of the candidate's student course evaluation data.

174

175 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and  
176 content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating  
177 the learning process.

178

179 2.2.5. As part of the review process, a minimum of four class visits shall be made by  
180 at least two members of the department RTP committee. These class visits must be  
181 conducted during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is  
182 not teaching at CSULB that semester; in this case, the visitations from the prior year  
183 shall be used). The candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur  
184 during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to  
185 the start of classroom visits, but otherwise visits will be unannounced. The candidate  
186 may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the RTP committee when tests or other  
187 activities are scheduled to permit the committee to choose most appropriate days for  
188 visits. The committee members' evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should  
189 address such factors as instructional clarity, communication with the students, student  
190 engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery  
191 of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and  
192 electronic media or demonstrations. Written reports based on class visits must be  
193 placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to the candidate. The signed reports  
194 must include times and dates of the visits.

195  
196 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the  
197 candidate in supervisory courses.

198  
199 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned  
200 time for this activity, he/she should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this  
201 effort and should address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in  
202 meeting student needs.

203  
204 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities

205 The college recognizes that there is a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and  
206 complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. The list  
207 below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the  
208 possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category.

209  
210 2.2.8.1. Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching;

211  
212 2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;

213  
214 2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis  
215 research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation  
216 of such research;

217  
218 2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional  
219 laboratories;

220  
221 2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the  
222 candidate's assigned workload, and mentoring of students;

223  
224 2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;

- 225  
226 2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and  
227 computer-based materials;  
228  
229 2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for  
230 Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of  
231 improving instruction; and  
232  
233 2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other  
234 forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of  
235 novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.  
236  
237 2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:  
238  
239 2.2.9.1. Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;  
240  
241 2.2.9.2. Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the  
242 same course unless the course has significantly changed over time);  
243  
244 2.2.9.3. Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and  
245 homework sets; and,  
246  
247 2.2.9.4. If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to  
248 students (e.g. a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).  
249  
250 2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.  
251  
252 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline  
253 Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the  
254 discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most  
255 directly achieved through maintaining an active program of research or scholarly  
256 activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific conferences and reading of  
257 appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.  
258

## 259 **2.2.12 Criteria for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor**

### 260 **i. Rating of Competent**

261 A rating of competent for tenure or promotion to associate professor requires knowledge of the  
262 skills and concepts taught, pedagogical content knowledge, attention to student learning, and  
263 effectiveness as an instructor. Successful candidates will document how they have worked to  
264 improve their instructional effectiveness, their work with students in a variety of settings to  
265 enhance student learning and growth, and participation (as a learner) in at least one  
266 instructionally related professional development activity per year.  
267

### 268 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

269 To earn a rating of excellent, candidates must provide evidence of consistently high quality  
270 teaching in the classroom with multiple artifacts to support the claims. Candidates must have

271 significant involvement in instructionally related activities beyond their own courses as defined  
272 in the CNSM policy as delineated in section 2.2.8. Candidates provide evidence of how the  
273 annual professional development impacts their own instruction. Successful candidates will  
274 document how they have worked to improve their instructional effectiveness, their work with  
275 students in a variety of settings to enhance student learning and growth, and participation (as a  
276 learner) in at least one instructionally related professional development activity per year  
277

## 278 **2.2.13 Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

### 279 **i. Rating of Competent**

280 Successful candidates will document how they have worked to improve their instructional  
281 effectiveness, their work with students in a variety of settings to enhance student learning and  
282 growth, and participation (as a learner) in at least one instructionally related professional  
283 development activity per year. A rating of competent for promotion to professor requires  
284 evidence of a sustained record of teaching effectiveness as well as a record of continued efforts  
285 to remain current in subjects associated with the faculty member's teaching responsibilities.  
286 Faculty should take a leadership role in helping to support best-practice teaching and learning  
287 outside their own courses at local, regional or national levels.  
288

### 289 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

290 Successful candidates will document how they have worked to improve their instructional  
291 effectiveness, their work with students in a variety of settings to enhance student learning and  
292 growth, and participation (as a learner) in at least one instructionally related professional  
293 development activity per year. To earn a rating of excellent, candidates must show evidence of  
294 consistently high quality teaching in the classroom with multiple artifacts to support the claims.  
295 Candidates must have significant involvement in instructionally related activities beyond their  
296 own courses as defined in the CNSM policy. Candidates provide evidence of how the annual  
297 professional development activities impact their own instruction.  
298

## 299 **2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

### 301 **2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA**

302  
303 College faculty must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that  
304 demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty  
305 members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute  
306 to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are  
307 disseminated to appropriate audiences. Candidates should refer to their respective  
308 department policies for definitions and criteria for evaluation of RSCA. Department  
309 standards may be higher than college-level standards. Candidates for tenure must  
310 develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed  
311 publications in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator. The  
312 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the  
313 candidate's scholarly activity and this narrative must identify the candidate's  
314 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. A candidate's  
315 research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the  
316 faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged and departments must  
317 define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement. The

318 department RTP policy shall provide specific additional departmental requirements in  
319 research and shall list discipline-specific criteria used in evaluating RSCA. Candidates  
320 for promotion to full professor must have a record of RSCA activity after their promotion  
321 to associate professor that results in peer-reviewed RSCA products.

322  
323 Science education as a field is interdisciplinary with collaborations across departments, colleges,  
324 campuses, educational levels, and venues. The Department of Science Education values  
325 collaboration and recognizes that it takes time to build collaborative endeavors. Collaborative  
326 endeavors often result in end-products that are of higher quality and value than products  
327 developed individually. Candidates must clearly describe their roles in collaborative endeavors  
328 and their contributions to published products. Candidates who do not have two research  
329 publications in which they are identified as a senior investigator (first author) must document  
330 equivalent contributions via letters from collaborators detailing their contributions.

331

332

### 333 2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA

334

335 2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA  
336 element to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The  
337 candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The  
338 evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific  
339 RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The candidate's  
340 documentation and the review of it will focus on continuing professional development,  
341 and this theme should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative.  
342 The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to evaluators in understanding  
343 the candidate's intellectual and professional achievements in this category, the nature of  
344 student involvement in the candidate's RSCA (if applicable), and how the candidate  
345 places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the department,  
346 college, and university RTP policies.

347

348 2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted,  
349 examples of the candidate's best work along with an explanation of why these materials  
350 should be regarded as significant contributions. Reviewers will give particular  
351 consideration to the quality of these examples. For jointly authored activities the  
352 candidate must identify the specific extent of her/his participation. Documentation from  
353 at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if  
354 the candidate only has co-authored publications.

355

356 2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The  
357 documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP  
358 review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the  
359 supplementary documentation binder.

360

361 2.3.2.4. External evaluations of the candidate's contributions to the discipline will  
362 be considered, consistent with the provisions of the current CBA and university policy.

363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408

2.3.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to RSCA

Candidates are expected to be involved in multiple RSCA related activities beyond the peer review publication expectations defined by the departments for tenure and promotion. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by RTP evaluators in this category. Peer-reviewed RSCA products are given greater weight than non peer-reviewed products.

- 2.3.3.1. Publication of additional peer-reviewed paper(s) in established journals in the area of expertise;
- 2.3.3.2. Publication of a peer-reviewed book or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book;
- 2.3.3.3. Successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship of publications and presentations with students as evidenced by student presentations at scientific meetings;
- 2.3.3.4. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings and conferences;
- 2.3.3.5. Awards of peer-reviewed applications for external funding;
- 2.3.3.6. Applications for external funds to support ongoing RSCA;
- 2.3.3.7. Citations of the candidate's work in other authors' peer-reviewed works or in books;
- 2.3.3.8. Applied research or professional activity to address problems of importance to the disciplines and society;
- 2.3.3.9. Awards of internal grants;
- 2.3.3.10. Editorial/reviewer assignments with recognized professional publications or review panels for research grants calling for professional expertise;
- 2.3.3.11. Textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses beyond the candidate's own personal teaching; or
- 2.3.3.12. Patents that resulted from the candidate's research or professional activity.

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

409 **2.3.4 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

410 The Department expects candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor to create a  
411 sustained record of research and scholarly work. Candidates shall demonstrate a record of  
412 ongoing productivity related to RSCA products throughout the period of review.

413  
414 Candidates shall provide evidence that they can communicate with both research and practitioner  
415 audiences. In addition to demonstrating ability to communicate with academic peers candidates  
416 are expected to share research findings or research based best practices with practitioners so that  
417 the finding will be implemented.

418  
419 Examples of RSCA products are delineated in the CNSM RTP Policy in section 2.3.3. The  
420 candidate shall provide evidence that demonstrates communication to diverse audiences.

421  
422 The quality of the candidates' performance and their continuing productivity are the primary  
423 criteria for evaluation. Candidates bear primary responsibilities for explaining the significance of  
424 activities in this category. Candidates should include drafts of work under review as well as other  
425 products in progress that are discussed in the narrative.

426  
427 **i. Rating of Competent**

428 To earn a rating of competent, candidates will have at least two peer-reviewed, research  
429 publications with results of research based on data generated while a faculty member at CSULB,  
430 one of which must be a research article. The other could be published in a practitioner-oriented  
431 publication. Faculty members are expected to present at least one peer-reviewed presentation  
432 every other year. Additionally candidates must also have evidence of peer-reviewed RSCA  
433 products focused for the practitioner audience. The deadline for meeting these requirements is  
434 the deadline for the submission of the file to the department RTP committee.

435  
436 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

437 To earn a rating of excellent candidates must have at least eleven peer-reviewed RSCA products,  
438 four of which must be publications (at least two of the publications must be based on research  
439 generated at CSULB and at least one must be in a research journal written for research  
440 colleagues). The candidate must present at least one presentation every other year. Candidates  
441 shall provide evidence of peer-reviewed RSCA products that are focused for the practitioner  
442 audience.

443  
444 **2.3.5 Promotion to Professor**

445 Candidates for promotion to professor must show continued productivity. The quality of the  
446 candidates' performance and their record of productivity are the primary criteria for evaluation

447  
448 **i. Rating of Competent**

449 To earn a rating of competent for promotion to professor candidates shall have a minimum of  
450 two peer-reviewed publications since promotion to associate professor, one of which must be a  
451 research publication with data generated at CSULB. Faculty members are expected to make an  
452 average of one peer-reviewed presentation every other year. Candidates for professor must have  
453 served as thesis advisor for at least one master's student through the completion of that student's  
454 thesis.

455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500

**ii. Rating of Excellent**

To earn a rating of excellent candidates must have at least eleven peer-reviewed RSCA products since promotion to associate professor. These include at least three publications, two of which must be based on research generated at CSULB with at least one in a research journal written for research colleagues and an average of one peer-reviewed presentation every other year. Candidates shall provide evidence of peer-reviewed RSCA products that are focused for the practitioner audience. Candidates for professor must have served as thesis advisor for at least two master’s student through the completion of those students’ theses.

**2.4. Professional Service**

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

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

Science Education faculty are expected to participate actively in department level governance and responsibilities, which include participation in department seminars, attending thesis defenses and faculty meetings, and coordinating courses and policies within our department and the teacher education programs.

By virtue of the discipline and nature of their position, Science Education faculty members have service responsibilities/opportunities that regularly expand beyond the department and campus community. Service is a critical aspect of a Science Education faculty member’s assignment. It is likely that faculty members will be involved in service throughout the university as well as outreach and collaboration with educational partners outside our campus.

**2.4.1. Criteria for Professional Service**

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

501 2.4.2. Evaluation of Professional Service  
502 The emphasis in the evaluation of professional service shall be on: 1) the quality and  
503 significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes  
504 to the missions of the university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and  
505 level of the candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward  
506 service. Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based  
507 on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence,  
508 which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda  
509 acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.

511 2.4.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Professional Service  
512 The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as  
513 professional service. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither  
514 ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP  
515 committee in this category.

517 2.4.3.1. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the  
518 department, the college, or the university;

520 2.4.3.2. Sponsoring student groups;

522 2.4.3.3. Actively engaging in institutional educational and research programs;

524 2.4.3.4. Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing);

526 2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international  
527 levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees,  
528 workshops, speeches, and media interviews;

530 2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments,  
531 and community service organizations;

533 2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants,  
534 fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for  
535 general expertise in the discipline.

#### 537 **2.4.4 Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor**

##### 538 **i. Rating of Competent**

539 Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor are expected to participate in standard  
540 departmental service (department seminars, thesis defenses, faculty meetings, and course  
541 coordination) plus an average of at least one other service activity every year during the  
542 probationary period. In addition, candidates must serve on a college, university, or professional  
543 committee for at least one year (see CNSM policy for examples).

##### 545 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

546 To earn a rating of excellent candidates must meet the minimum service requirements for  
547 reappointment/promotion. In addition, candidates must either serve at least one year in a  
548 leadership position in a college, university, or professional committee or they must serve in  
549 multiple service roles beyond the minimum requirements for reappointment/promotion.  
550 Candidates bear the responsibilities for clarifying the nature of their participation and leadership.

551

## 552 **2.4.5 Promotion to Professor**

### 553 **i. Rating of Competent**

554 To earn a rating of competent for promotion to professor, candidates are required to participate in  
555 an average of at least one extra-departmental service activity every two years since promotion or  
556 appointment to associate professor. Candidates must demonstrate continued service to the  
557 department as described above. In addition, promotion to professor requires leadership in at least  
558 one college, university, or CSU system committee for at least one year or they must serve in  
559 multiple service roles beyond the minimum required for promotion.

560

### 561 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

562 To earn a rating of excellent candidates must exceed the minimum service requirements for  
563 promotion to professor. Candidates record of service can include both on-campus and off-  
564 campus activities. In addition, candidates must either serve at least one year in a leadership  
565 position in a college, university, or professional committee. Candidates bear the responsibilities  
566 for making the case for their participation and leadership.

567

568

## 569 **3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

570 Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.

571

572 **3.1.** The CNSM candidate's narrative should also include plans and goals for the  
573 coming five years and a discussion of how the candidate has addressed suggestions  
574 made during previous reviews.

575

576 **3.2.** Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write evaluations of all RTP  
577 candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee.  
578 Such chair evaluations must be independent of the department RTP committee's  
579 evaluation. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a  
580 higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a  
581 review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair  
582 participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

583

584 **3.3** The Department of Science Education RTP Committee shall consist of three members  
585 elected by secret ballot from among the department's tenured faculty. If there are not three  
586 eligible faculty members the committee will be filled by a faculty member from a related  
587 department if elected by the tenured and probationary faculty in the Department.

588

589 All department probationary and tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and may vote for  
590 any number of candidates up to the number of open slots. The faculty members receiving the  
591 highest number of votes in the secret ballot will join the department RTP committee. The three

592 members shall serve one year terms with annual elections. If an elected member resigns or  
593 otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which he/she was elected, the department will  
594 elect a replacement to serve the rest of the term.

595  
596

#### 597 **4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

598 Consult the university RTP policy.

599

#### 600 **5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

601

##### 602 **5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

603

604 5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based  
605 upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for  
606 reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

607

608 5.1.2. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective  
609 teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse body of students and to  
610 the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in  
611 her/his program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative  
612 achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily  
613 at the departmental level consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

614

##### 615 **5.2. Awarding of Tenure**

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

622

##### 623 **5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

624

625 5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate  
626 professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty  
627 members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction  
628 and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and professional service. A candidate will  
629 not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area.  
630 For a positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a  
631 candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally  
632 related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

633

634 5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to  
635 be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in  
636 sections 2.2.8 of this policy.

637

638 5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate’s research program must demonstrate  
639 that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in  
640 RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in sections 2.3.3 of  
641 this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for  
642 tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the departmental standards for  
643 assessment of the quality of the candidate’s accomplishments. All levels of review will  
644 use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.  
645

646 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to  
647 the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in  
648 service are listed in section 2.4.3 of this policy.  
649

#### 650 **5.4. Promotion to Professor**

651  
652 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than those for  
653 tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the  
654 departmental RTP policy. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent  
655 record of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular  
656 development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that  
657 includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of  
658 her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have  
659 disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international  
660 level. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership  
661 at the university and in the community or the profession.  
662

663 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if  
664 deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a  
665 candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.  
666

#### 667 **5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

668 Consult the university RTP policy.  
669

### 670 **6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

671 Consult the university RTP policy.  
672

### 673 **7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

674  
675 All information in this policy applies to faculty appointed jointly to two or more  
676 departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for  
677 tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must  
678 be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the  
679 departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the  
680 dean(s).  
681

### 682 **8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

683

684 **8.1.** Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of  
685 changes to the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural  
686 changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,  
687 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

688  
689 **8.2.** The tenured/tenure-track faculty of the college, voting by secret ballot (with pro  
690 and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy and  
691 evaluation criteria section of this policy.

692  
693 **8.3.** Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

694  
695 8.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the  
696 tenured/tenure-track faculty or

697  
698 8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.

699  
700 **8.4.** Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for  
701 the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be  
702 distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional  
703 days before the public hearing.

704  
705 **8.5.** Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a  
706 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty voting in a secret ballot  
707 conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public  
708 hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president  
709 or designee.

## 710 711 **8.6 Amendments to the Department RTP Policy**

712  
713 Proposed amendments to the department RTP policy shall be submitted in writing to the  
714 department chair to be discussed at a department meeting within fifteen (15) instructional days of  
715 their receipt. The proposed amendments will be distributed by the chair to the department at least  
716 five (5) instructional days before the department meeting at which they will be discussed.

717  
718 Voting on amendment(s) shall be by secret ballot by the tenured and probationary faculty. To be  
719 effective, proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible tenured  
720 and probationary voters and be approved by the college council, the dean and the provost.

721  
722 The approved amendment(s) shall go into effect at the beginning of the following academic year.

723  
724 College RTP Policy approved by CNSM faculty February 23, 2010.

725 Approved by Academic Affairs February 24, 2010.

726  
727 Effective: Fall 2010

728  
729 02/23/10 – CNSM RTP Policy approved by vote of the CNSM faculty

730 11/10/10 – Science Education RTP Policy approved by the College Council