

Approved March 24, 2010
Effective August 23, 2010
Amended Fall 2020
Amended 3/8/2021
Amended 5/21/2021

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY, CRIMINAL JUSTICE, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

SCHOOL REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONS POLICY

PRINCIPLES FOR EXEMPLARY SERVICE AS A TEACHER-SCHOLAR

In concurrence with the exemplary status of California State University, Long Beach (CSULB), as an institution of higher education and to provide an instructional program that is responsive to the needs of 1) students, 2) the community, and 3) the justice professions, the School of Criminology, Criminal Justice, and Emergency Management (CCJEM) has developed an integrated Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy document, which clearly describes the expectations for faculty in the School of CCJEM as teacher-scholars.

The purpose of this integrated document is to (1) guide new faculty in their quest for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the framework of being teacher-scholars; (2) guide development of tenured faculty as teacher-scholars; (3) guide the School Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (RTP) in evaluating candidates for mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review; and (4) foster an environment that supports the missions of the School, the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), and the University.

These evaluative policies and procedures are intended to take into consideration the diversity of expertise within a School that is interdisciplinary and, when possible, transdisciplinary, thereby enabling the School to grow in strength and stature.

All University and CHHS RTP Policy insertions in this document are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the university and college policies and the language that is unique CCJEM. Portions of the university and/or college RTP policies that have not been included in this document are referenced by the section number used in the original university and/or college policies.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Mission and Vision

California State University Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service

for the people of California and the world. California State University Long Beach envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world. In service to the university's mission, the School of CCJEM seeks to educate our students to be ethical leaders in practice, policy, and scholarship; to produce informative and influential research; and to promote justice, equity, and safety through service to our communities.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 RSCA Supports Mission and Vision

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the mission and vision of the university, the CHHS, and the School of CCJEM. Faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the School of CCJEM, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession.

1.2.2 RSCA Decisions Should Be Unbiased

Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.

1.2.3 Quality and Impact

Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.

1.2.4 Innovation and Workload

This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; academic unit and college needs; and university mission.

1.2.5 High Standards

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the School of CCJEM, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior.

1.2.6 RTP Policy vs. RTP Appendices

Because the process of evaluating faculty members is holistic, all faculty members in the School of CCJEM are expected to be familiar with the provisions of this policy and comport their professional development in accordance with its letter and spirit. While candidates may choose to consult Appendices A and B for a shorter, user-friendly guide

to assembling the materials they must submit for mini-reviews, nothing in these appendices shall be construed as superseding the contents or requirements of the body of this RTP Policy.

1.3 Governing Documents

1.3.1 Adoption

The School adopts this document pursuant to the mandates of sections 3.5 of both the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 09-10) and the CHHS RTP Policy, and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). *If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university RTP policy, or the CHHS RTP policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.3.2 Specific Role of this School Policy

This School-level document serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the policies and procedures set forth in these other RTP policies specified in subsection 1.3.1 in a manner that provides concrete guidance to faculty in the School of CCEJM within the School's discipline-specific framework. As such, it is intended to be the primary document upon which faculty members in the School of CCJEM rely both as candidates and in their role assessing candidates' files.

1.4 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and School RTP policies.

1.4.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Start Process

In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.4.2 Completeness of Candidate's File

Candidates must furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation (e.g., for teaching, student evaluations, course syllabi, peer evaluations, and grade distributions; for RSCA, copies of manuscripts under review and/or presented at conferences; preprints or reprints of articles; letters accepting manuscripts for publication; etc.; for service, letters documenting the candidate's service which assess the quality of the service contributions).

1.4.3 Obligations of the School RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the School of CCJEM are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which the School RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating the evidence to support its recommendations.

1.5 Standards

Recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or directors

of academic units (if submitted) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit. Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation(s) must also be guided by the following expectations that apply to all School faculty members at all ranks.

1.5.1 Staying Current

Faculty members must stay current on scholarly and applied discourse in the relevant sub-fields of criminal justice, criminology, and justice-related studies applicable to the faculty member's area(s) of teaching and research interest(s).

1.5.2 Involvement in the Profession

Faculty members are expected to attend and participate in the annual meetings of relevant national and regional professional organizations (e.g., the American Society of Criminology, the American Sociological Association, the American Bar Association, the Western Society of Criminology).

1.5.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing

Faculty members must actively pursue a research and publishing agenda relevant to one or more of the following types of scholarship, all of which are equally valued regardless of reliance on quantitative, qualitative, or other discipline-appropriate methodologies (such as legal analysis or policy analysis):

- A. Scholarship of Discovery – the traditional research model in which new content knowledge is acquired and disseminated;
- B. Scholarship of Integration – the creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and making connections across disciplines or sub-disciplines;
- C. Scholarship of Application – the bridging of the gap between theory and practice through both research and action in ways that promote positive social change and/or promote policy-oriented problem solving; and
- D. Scholarship of Pedagogy – the discovery of the ways our students learn and the identification and assessment of methods used to foster learning.

1.5.4 High-Quality Instruction

Faculty members must involve students in active learning not only in the classroom, but also in their mentoring of students through:

- A. assigning and teaching meaningful work;
- B. assigning and teaching collaborative research, which allows for the development of skills such as critical inquiry and discovery;
- C. assigning and teaching service learning projects;
- D. assigning and promoting unique disciplinary interactions through directed

- readings and independent research projects;
- E. fostering socialization into a culture of intellectual discovery and professional communication (e.g., at conferences, during office hours, etc.);
- F. setting their own examples of service to the School of CCJEM; the College of Health and Human Services; the university; professional organizations; and in the community at large.

1.5.5 Meaningful, Collegial Service

Faculty members are expected to serve the School of CCJEM, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession as meaningfully contributing teacher-scholars.

- A. CSULB depends on faculty service contributions to ensure that it achieves its educational mission through effective and efficient operations. The university's commitment to participatory governance and the needs of academic programs and units necessitate a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all faculty members in the School are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in professional organizations.
- B. Faculty service contributions are expected to increase concomitantly with the institution's commitment to the individual. This means that faculty members are expected to accept more significant service responsibilities over time during the probationary period, and then even more at each higher rank.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

The School of CCJEM is comprised of a community of teacher-scholars and learners who are dedicated to free inquiry and open exchange. In accordance with the CSULB Mission, the School's faculty is dedicated "to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service for the people of California and the world." *Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank.* The School's expectations for achieving CSULB's mission and the standards contained in subsections 1.5.0 through 1.5.5 vary by rank. The specific criteria applicable to each academic rank are integrated throughout section 2.0 of this Policy and its subsections.

1.7 Candidate's Narrative

In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements. The narrative should be single-sided and in 12-point font with one-inch margins.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As section 2.0 of the university and CHHS RTP policies both make clear, *academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the*

mission and needs of the university, the college, and the particular academic unit. The subsections of section 2.0 in this Policy were crafted in fulfillment of that obligation. Accordingly, the provisions in section 2.0 and its subsections articulate the standards for faculty accomplishments and the criteria for evaluation of those accomplishments in three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) collegial service and engagement.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

While all of the expectations set forth in subsections 1.5.0 through 1.5.5 are heavily valued, Criminal Justice faculty members are expected, above all, to serve the missions of the School, college, and university through high-quality teaching that successfully integrates both discipline-specific and broad learning goals and objectives. The goal of higher education is to help develop educated, ethical, and productive citizens, as well as capable criminal justice professionals in a variety of disciplines and fields. In a rapidly changing world, a university education must provide students with more than the knowledge needed for success in a specific profession. It also must provide them with skills and attitudes that facilitate adaptation and constructive response to societal needs and changes. Accordingly, faculty at all ranks should aspire to be teachers of the first order.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student differences.

To help the RTP Committee evaluate a candidate's instructional philosophy and practice/teaching effectiveness, candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit four types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: student evaluations, peer evaluations, course syllabi, and grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the School RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy. Additionally, candidates may (but are not required to) submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher.

- A. Indicia of High-Quality Teaching – Although “high quality teaching” is to be assessed holistically, hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and practice include, but are not limited to:
- 1) subject mastery, currency, and ongoing growth in one's discipline;
 - 2) timeliness and professionalism in meeting classes and evaluating student work;
 - 3) rigor and transparency in evaluating student work;
 - 4) enthusiasm that arouses student interest, curiosity, motivation, and

participation;

- 5) purposeful experimentation with one's pedagogy in ways that foster engaging educational environments that are characterized by academic freedom, creative expressions, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and community engagement;
- 6) the creation and/or revision of courses and curricula in ways that foster a vibrant, intellectual community that is built around a shared commitment to scholarly inquiry;
- 7) thoughtful mentorship and advising that contribute to students' cultural, social, and intellectual lives; and
- 8) incorporation of one's scholarship into teaching, when appropriate, including the effective supervision of student research and the incorporation of students into one's own scholarly research, when appropriate.

B. Indicia of Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher

- 1) Keeping abreast of discipline developments through participation in discipline-specific conferences and continuing education activities.
- 2) Actively participating in the School's curricular assessment efforts.
- 3) Creating and/or assessing graduate students' comprehensive examination questions.
- 4) Mentoring graduate students through active participation on committees that supervise graduate student theses and research.
- 5) Actively engaging in the activities summarized in subsection 2.1.2 in a manner which evidences continuous efforts to improve student learning outcomes through the constant evolution of one's teaching.

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning *that should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials, [which may] include, but are not limited to:*

- A. *Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey to students—in measurable, behavioral terms—expected student learning outcomes.*
- B. *Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices, standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic responsibilities and/or individual personal growth).* For more information on syllabi, see subsection 2.1.5 in this Policy and CSULB Policy # 04-05 and/or its successor policies.
- C. Careful preparation and clear organization of lessons and pedagogical materials that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.
- D. Thoughtful, deliberate effort to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to:
 - 1) regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and

- consultation on course development; or
- 2) a sustained record of involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for Faculty Development; or
- 3) a sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the School, College, University or professional organizations; or
- 4) a sustained record of giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

- A. Required Documentation – In order to allow for complete consideration of student evaluations, all candidates, regardless of rank, must submit the evaluation summary sheets for all the courses in which university administered SPOT evaluations were given. If a candidate chooses to discuss or quote the qualitative feedback from one or more courses in their narrative, then the candidate must include all the qualitative feedback forms from those courses. If the candidate does not discuss or quote the qualitative feedback from a particular course, then those forms do not need to be submitted.
- B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – *Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.*
 - 1) *While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the School and/or the CHHS for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative (e.g., when teaching a new course for the first time, especially if offered at the graduate-level; when teaching under-enrolled courses which could easily result in skewed evaluations), overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages.*
 - 2) Student ratings of instruction are “consistently favorable” when the following criteria are met:
 - a) For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
 - b) For tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, student evaluations of teaching submitted by candidates must evidence a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
 - c) For promotion to the rank of Professor, student evaluations submitted by candidates must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.
- C. Caveat on the Use of Student Ratings – *Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to*

learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. For this reason, candidates must present other information, such as their syllabi, grade distributions, and peer evaluations of instruction. These additional materials serve to help the School RTP Committee contextualize student ratings.

2.1.4 Peer-Evaluations of Teaching

- A. Required Documentation –Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit *at least* three peer evaluations conducted within the three years prior to the application. Ideally, a candidate will ask for peer evaluations for each course topic they teach and such evaluations will be conducted by different tenured colleagues (unless there is a lack of sufficient tenured personnel to achieve this goal). Moreover, to show growth in response to feedback from peers, candidates are encouraged to seek a second peer evaluation from the same tenured colleague in a subsequent semester.
- B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – Peer evaluations must be based on observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. Peer evaluations must document whether: instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; content is up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and overall effectiveness of ways in which information is communicated to students in the classroom. To the maximum extent possible, peer evaluators should endeavor to learn as much as possible in order to be able to comment from an informed perspective about as many of the indicia of excellence in teaching listed in subsections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of this Policy. Peer evaluators should also inspect and comment upon the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials. To assist tenured colleagues in conducting these types of evaluations, peer evaluators must use the form contained in Appendix A.

2.1.5 Syllabi

At minimum, all course syllabi comply with the requirements of CSULB's official syllabi policy (see Policy # 11-07 and/or its successors). Pursuant to that policy, all syllabi must set forth course meetings, times, and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information; required books and other resources; an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy; an explanation of how the instructor will apply the University's course withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or schedule. Excellent syllabi, however, also contain other types of information, such as:

- A. the measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
- B. clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
- C. instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and

- D. readings and assignments that are up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of the School of CCJEM, assigned readings from primary sources that enhance the interdisciplinarity and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.

The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence this Policy is designed to facilitate.

2.1.6 Grade Distributions

Although there is no such thing as an "ideal" grade distribution, grade distributions can help to contextualize a candidate's student evaluations and assist in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The RTP Committee should evaluate a candidate's grade distributions within the context of how the candidates themselves commented upon them. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be expected in larger undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques might justify a grading distribution of all "A"s and "B"s in small, upper-level, or graduate seminars. Thus, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor's teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices.

2.1.7 Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above in subsection 2.1.1 A. and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher as set forth in subsection 2.1.1 B. If candidates submit additional documentation, the RTP Committee shall review it and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Research and scholarly/creative activities (RSCA) represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and beneficial components of the professorial role for several reasons. First, advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one's knowledge has the potential for improving the quality education by keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline. Second, RSCA bring prestige and visibility to the University and the School. The most respected and successful universities support and encourage the acquisition of knowledge. This increases not only the likelihood that the School will attract high quality students and faculty, but also the likelihood of obtaining grants, equipment, and other financial support from the community, industry, and government agencies. Third, RSCA enhance teaching effectiveness and enrich the education of students. Fourth, RSCA, especially when funded, bring equipment, technology, and professional development opportunities to the School and its students. This, in turn, increases the likelihood that students will be well-trained and competitive when seeking employment. Fifth, professional survival requires that members generate a large portion of the knowledge upon which their profession is based. Scholarly activities enable professions to shape their own destiny, rather than allowing others to dominate the

course of events. For these reasons, faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. Accordingly, faculty members in the School of CCJEM must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research which demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of criminology, criminal justice, and/or related fields.

2.2.1 Variability within Criminology and Criminal Justice

- A. Variability in the Nature of Relevant RSCA – Criminology and criminal justice are interdisciplinary fields. Scholarship includes basic, applied, and pedagogical research, as well as outreach initiatives. Qualified faculty members may be trained in the social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, political science, and anthropology), the humanities (e.g., history and philosophy), the natural sciences (e.g., chemistry, biology, physics, engineering, computer science, and neuroscience), the professions (e.g., law, medicine, accountancy, nursing, and education), and/or in interdisciplinary programs (e.g., criminology, criminal justice, justice studies, and law and society). These varied disciplines use an array of research methodologies that are all equally valued. Thus, any application of standards needs to respect individual differences in scholarly programs and goals.
- B. Variations Due to Intense Service Roles – While intense service roles do not replace RSCA requirements, there may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in service, in particular, service for which the candidate has not received a reduction in teaching load. In such cases, a commensurate reduction in scholarship is understandable, and the RSCA expectation for RTP can be reduced provided there is evidence that the candidate's scholarly engagement has been maintained and has promise for full resumption when the other activities return to normal levels. It is the candidate's responsibility to justify any reductions in RSCA within their narrative.

2.2.2 Scholarly Research and Creative Activities

- A. Standards – The following provide the foundation for delineating our discipline-specific standards for teacher-scholar excellence and, therefore, shall be used for evaluating candidates' RSCA:
 - 1) high-quality work as judged by one's peers;
 - 2) scope of recognition at the national, regional, or local level;
 - 3) sustained effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment; and
 - 4) the impact of one's research and scholarly activities.
- B. Types of RSCA – All faculty members in the School of CCJEM are *required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, theoretical, and/or other discipline-appropriate scholarly research (such as policy analysis or legal analysis), as well as other scholarly and creative activities consistent with the provisions of this Policy.* Copies of all such scholarly work must be submitted so that the School RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.
 - 1) Required Types of RSCA
Publication of scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals is required of all

candidates at all levels of review. Specific publication requirements are set forth below in subsections C.2), D.1), and D.2).

- a) *“Research” involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as policy analysis or legal analysis) that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment. This type of data-based research is the most highly valued type of scholarly activity for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the School of CCJEM.*
- b) The following substitutions for up to two peer-reviewed articles per action will be allowed:
 1. Scholarly/University Press books or edited volumes can substitute peer-reviewed articles at a ratio of 1:1. In exceptional circumstances the book can count at a higher ratio of 2:1. Such circumstances include sole-authorship and extensive reach within and outside of the discipline. This substitution is limited to one per action.
 2. Funded federal, state, or large foundation grants can substitute peer-reviewed articles at a ratio of 1:1. Unfunded federal, state, or foundation grants that received strong reviews can also substitute peer-reviewed articles at a ratio of 1:1. This substitution is limited to one per action.
 3. The following enhancing RSCA activities can substitute peer-reviewed articles at a ratio of 4:1. This substitution is limited to one per action.
 - a. Interviews in national media venues (video, audio, or print)
 - b. Op-eds in national media venues
 - c. White papers
 - d. Journal editorship
 - e. Expert witness testimony
 - f. Invited keynote/plenary presentations at regional, national, and/or international conferences
 - g. Book chapters
 - h. Peer-reviewed review essays and commentaries published in scholarly journals

2) Enhancing Types of RSCA

- a. *Although other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, article reviews, encyclopedia entries, op-ed pieces published in local media venues, etc.) are valued (and therefore are detailed in subsection D below) these types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the School or CHHS RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate. In other words, these other forms of scholarly activity strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for*

peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B.1) a), C.2), D.1), and D.2).

- b. *Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.* These forms of scholarly activity strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals except as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B.1) a), C.2), D.1), and D.2).

C. Evolution of RSCA – Although scholarly activities take many forms, faculty members must develop a scholarly research agenda and a record of scholarly publication that flows from the pursuit of that research agenda.

1. Scholarly Research Agenda – Teacher-scholars in the School of CCJEM are expected to establish and maintain an ongoing program of scholarship that is marked by continued scholarly research activity and dissemination. Teacher-scholars may concentrate on one type of research specified in subsection 1.5.3, or may distribute their scholarship across the different types. Rates of dissemination may vary with specific scholarly goals. An important element of all RTP reviews is the teacher-scholar's future plans and goals. While the primary focus is clearly on accomplished contributions during the probationary years, it is important to respect and support the continued vibrancy of scholarly activity after the award of tenure and promotion. While the focus of scholarly activity can be expected to change with the seasons of an academic career, continuity, reflection, and growth are expected to persist. We recognize that sometimes staying involved and remaining vibrant means taking risks to change focus, adopt a new methodological approach, or develop a new application. As a community of vibrant teacher-scholars, we are committed to recognizing, valuing, and supporting each other's unique paths of professional growth. Toward these ends:

- a) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to formulate and pursue a scholarly research agenda.
- b) Reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require evidence that the candidate's scholarly research has been productive as evidenced by publications in suitable, scholarly venues (see subsection 2 below). Moreover, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be able to demonstrate how their research agenda is both continuing and evolving.
- c) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained pattern of achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly record.

- 2) Scholarly Publications – The quality of work is defined by its significance

in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to validate the work's significance. Normally, this means that the finished works will be published and/or presented in a respected venue consistent with accepted disciplinary standards (discussed in more detail in subsection D of subsection 2.2.2). This level of accomplishment is required and is the most important evidence for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion within the RSCA area.

- a) RTP Committee members doing mini-reviews must be mindful of the fact in the early probationary years, faculty are likely to just be starting to advance a research agenda. Thus, in the first year, new faculty might be more likely to publish book reviews, encyclopedia entries, invited essays, monographs, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. New faculty, however, are expected to be working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals for editorial consideration in their first two years. New faculty members are especially encouraged to transform their dissertations into at least one or two peer-reviewed journal articles, or allowable substitutions as specified in 2.2.2 B.2). Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- b) By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have at least two peer-reviewed journal articles either in-print or formally accepted for publication; three or more peer-reviewed journal articles are preferred. Allowable substitutions are specified in 2.2.2 B.2). Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than three pieces of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- c) After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period (typically years four through six), faculty should be publishing in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least five scholarly articles in refereed venues (an average of roughly one publication per year). Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Thus, for example, a dozen publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing three or four articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship

shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement. Allowable substitutions are specified in 2.2.2 B.2).

- d) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have produced, on average, at least one scholarly publication in a refereed journal each year since the last promotion. As with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, however, quality is more important than quantity. Thus, multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner are not likely to result in a favorable recommendation for promotion. Conversely, three or four publications in high-quality journals, or a book or two with a well-respected scholarly press or leading commercial publishing house may warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement. Allowable substitutions are specified in 2.2.2 B.2).

- 3) Significance of Scholarly Engagement of Students and/or Community – In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, the School of CCJEM values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to our role in serving the communities in which we work and live. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends shall be considered enhancing evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement.
- 4) Sponsored Research – *Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank.*

D. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of Specific Forms of RSCA – The following tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality can be used to guide choices of scholarship dissemination outlets.

1. Authorship – Sole-authored and first-authored works, as well as works published with student collaborators, are evaluated most positively. For multiple-authored works, the amount or nature of author contributions should be specified.
2. Refereed Journal Articles – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of articles: peer-review; acceptance/rejection rates for the journal; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of

the journal; status of the journal within the subfield; status of the members of the journal editorial board within the subfield; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and/or citations to the article.

- a) Venues – Refereed articles that are accepted and published in criminal justice/criminology journals, journals from related social sciences and/or cognate disciplines, justice-related professional journals and newsletters, law reviews, and relevant electronic media are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The degree of value, however, depends on the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published, the degree of the candidate's contribution to the publication, and the impact of the publication on the discipline. The RTP Committee must always take these factors into account when it is assessing the significance of any publication.
- b) Exceptional Scholarship – Publishing exceptionally high-quality scholarship in high-tier journals constitutes the strongest evidence of scholarly achievement that contributes to the meaningful advancement of the discipline. RTP Committee members, therefore, usually give significant, positive weight to such publications in their evaluation of a candidate's RSCA contributions for reappointment, tenure, and promotions decision purposes.
- c) Books – The following factors will be taken into consideration by the RTP Committee when it is evaluating books: academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.
 1. Both scholarly books and textbooks are valued for RTP purposes.
 2. Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.
- d) Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process.
- e) Invited Publications and/or Presentations – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of invited publications and/or presentations: the stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.
- f) Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of invited conference

presentations: a peer-review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e., international, national, regional, or local). Presentations at the international conferences of the American Society of Criminology, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the Society for the Study of Law and Society, and similar nationally-recognized organizations are paramount. Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Rather, conference presentations represent a form of scholarly activity that enhances, but does not supplant, the requirement that candidate's produce peer-reviewed publications in discipline-appropriate venues.

- g) Editorial Roles – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of invited conference presentations: activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer on journal submissions; membership on a grant-review panel; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications. Such roles augment a faculty member's required program of RSCA, but are insufficient to meet the School RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.
- h) Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports and the frequency and range of clients for consulting activities are both valued for RTP purposes.
- i) Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of activities supported by RSCAs, sabbaticals, and other forms of support for scholarly research funded by CSULB are all valued for RTP purposes.
- j) Professional Recognition– The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of professional honors, awards, and other forms of recognition: election as an officer of a professional organization, (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); recognition through fellowship status in a professional organization, including consideration of the scope of the organization; awards, prizes, and other forms of recognition, including consideration of the scope of the organization presenting the award.

E. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of the Impact of RSCA

1. Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary

journals. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).

2. Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. The School of CCJEM evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses). Publications and presentations that include student co-authors are highly valued.
3. Community Impact – We recognize impact in various types of community (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at different levels of community effort (local, state, national, and international communities).

The impact of scholarship on students and the community is more difficult to demonstrate tangibly than the impact on the discipline. Nevertheless, these are highly-valued areas of impact. There are no clearly-established criteria for scholarly contributions in these areas. Documentation of this type of impact is thus particularly important. Indicators may include student co-authorship on presentations/publications, undergraduate research mentee pursuit of graduate training, scholarship used to provide community testimony on use of technical reports or consultation to address issues of public policy, expert review or letters about the quality and impact of applied work, and external evaluation of engaged scholarship.

- F. Weighting of the Body of Work – The applicant's entire body of scholarly work provides evidence for the pattern of continuing scholarship in support of mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, but works finished since appointment at CSULB carry greater weight for mini-reviews, reappointment, and tenure, while works finished since the last promotion carry greater weight for any subsequent promotion.

2.3 Service

Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments

All faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance through service to their academic units, the college, and the university. The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are required to have made quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection.

A. Service within the University

- 1) *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in university or college service; however, they are expected to perform quality service within the School of CCJEM as demonstrated by:*
 - a) advising student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;
 - b) participating actively and meaningfully in School committees, (especially by chairing a School committee such as the Awards, Scholarship, and Banquet Committee or the Assessment Committee);
 - c) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the School;
 - d) attending and meaningfully participating in School faculty meetings;
 - e) attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the School, the college, the university, and professional organizations; and
 - f) actively participating in student programs.
- 2) *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to both the School of CCJEM (as discussed above) and to service contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, such as serving on college-wide committees and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the college. University-level service is desirable, but not required.*
- 3) *For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership at the School, college, and university levels. In doing so, they must contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution, including, but not limited to:*
 - a) chairing major School committees;
 - b) holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
 - c) serving an administrative role within the School, College, or University;
 - d) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university, college, or School;
 - e) creating or significantly revising entire School/program curricula.

B. Service to the Community and/or the Profession – *All faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession.*

- 1) *Community Service* – *If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member such that they apply academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional, national, or international problems.*
 - a) For reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, such community service may include:

1. *consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.*
 2. helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise; and/or
 3. acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.
- b) For promotion to the rank of full Professor, such community service is expected to include a record of meaningful service in the community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international problems), such as:
1. taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;
 2. holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to the candidate's professional expertise;
 3. consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
 4. serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or
 5. engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to criminal justice; serving as a media consultant (by giving interviews or otherwise) for justice-related events or news stories; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with justice-related missions; writing justice-relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines or newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.
- 2) Professional Service – Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected offices in a criminal-justice related professional organization. Such professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for the American Society of Criminology, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, the Western Society of Criminology, and the criminal justice divisions of law societies and/or bar associations.

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments and Participation

The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in subsection 2.3.1. Accordingly, the RTP Committee must not merely summarize the breadth and/or quantity of a candidate's service contributions, but rather must evaluate the depth, quality, and significance of service activities. In doing so, the Committee should consider:

- A. *the nature of the service commitment in terms of the time, energy, and*

- dedication it takes to participate meaningfully in the particular service activities;
- B. *the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, the college, and/or to the School of CCJEM;*
 - C. the significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the university, college, and/or School, including participation on committees and/or with student organizations;
 - D. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional, and prospective students;
 - E. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the School's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;
 - F. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers their services; and
 - G. most importantly, the degree of leadership exhibited by the candidate. In evaluating this criterion, the RTP Committee must be mindful of the fact that leadership is not exclusively defined by one's position in a hierarchical structure, but rather is something that can be demonstrated at all levels by influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the group in which they serve. Effective leaders create results, attain goals, realize vision, and guide others by modeling more quickly and at a higher level of quality than do ineffective leaders.

2.4 Evaluation of Service: Candidate's Responsibility

The candidate must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative criteria in their narrative.

- A. Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance.
- B. Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the academic unit, School RTP committee, the Director of the School of CCJEM, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the RTP committee of the academic unit, the chair or director of the academic unit, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP shall make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the School Director, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all information and supporting materials specified in all applicable RTP policies. The candidate must clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes their goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 The School RTP Policy

The content of this RTP policy, belonging to the School of CCJEM, specifies in-writing the standards and criteria to be applied in evaluating teaching performance, RSCA, and service. As administered by the School, the standards are equal to or in excess of both university and CHHS standards. These standards are derived from and support the mission of the university, the college, and the School. *This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the School of CCJEM and to approval by the college Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost. Additionally, this Policy shall be subject to regular review by the School's tenured and probationary faculty.*

3.3 The School RTP Committee

The School of CCJEM RTP Committee *has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Academic unit RTP committee members are responsible for critically analyzing the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the academic unit. The committee shall forward its evaluation and recommendation with supporting materials to the college RTP committee.*

3.3.1 Election of Committee

The RTP Committee of the School of CCJEM is composed of at least three tenured

members elected by majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the School.

- A. Election – Membership on the RTP Committee reflects, at a minimum, all requirements specified in the university and college RTP policies. To wit:
- 1) *The Committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be comprised of tenured Associate and full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be comprised of tenured full Professors.*
 - 2) *Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on the RTP Committee.*
 - 3) *Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the President. However, the RTP Committee may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.*
 - 4) *The School Director may serve as a member of the RTP Committee, if elected, subject to the provisions of subsection 3.3.2 B.*
- B. Single vs. Multiple Committees – Subject to the exception provided in subsection 3.3.6 governing joint appointments, all recommendations for advancement (promotion) to a given rank, for tenure, or for reappointment shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the School who are eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3.2 Committee Composition

The following provisions shall govern the composition of the School RTP Committee.

- A. Membership Rank – *Members of the School of CCJEM RTP Committee who participate in promotion recommendations must be tenured and must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. They must not themselves be candidates for promotion.*
- B. School Director – The Director of the School of CCJEM generally does not serve as a member of the School RTP Committee so that he or she may write an independent evaluation of the candidate pursuant to the provisions of subsection 3.4.2 of this document. However, in the event that there are an insufficient number of faculty members qualified to serve on the School RTP Committee (or other unusual circumstances that so warrant), the School Director may serve as a member of the School RTP Committee, if elected. If elected to such service, though, the Director *may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to*

Section 3.4 of this policy. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, the School Director may not sit with the School RTP Committee during the time that the Committee is considering their own materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

- C. Vacancies – In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the School RTP Committee, either a meeting of the School faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the Director of the School of CCJEM. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).
- D. Director of the School RTP Committee – The School of CCJEM RTP Committee shall elect a chair from among its own members.

3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

A. Candidates

- 1) *The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.*
- 2) *Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations.*

B. School of CCJEM RTP Committee

- 1) Mini-Reviews – The School RTP shall conduct an assessment of all probationary faculty members at least once per year during probationary years in which the candidate is not scheduled for a formal RTP review. While such mini-reviews do not result in any job actions (e.g., reappointment, tenure, or promotion), they must provide guidance for professional development. Thus, mini-reviews shall commend probationary faculty members for meeting or exceeding expectations for instruction and instructionally-related activities, RSCA, and service, while providing written guidance for making improvements in areas which need strengthening. See Appendix B for the streamlined procedures to be used for mini-reviews.
- 2) Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews – RTP reviews shall be conducted by the School of CCJEM RTP Committee on the schedule set by the University. The School of CCJEM RTP Committee is accountable for its recommendations by (a) supplying the College RTP Committee with a substantive evaluation to support its recommendations; and (b) submitting candidates' RTP portfolios and supporting documents on-time in accordance with established deadlines.

3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members of the School, as specified in this policy, are eligible to serve on the School RTP Committee, *then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:*

- A. Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.*
- B. After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RPT Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election.*

3.3.6 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy Statement 94-11 (or any successor policy).

3.4 School Director

The Director of the School of CCJEM is responsible for communicating the School, college, and university policies to candidates. The Director also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with School expectations. The Director, in collaboration with mentors from School and/or the college, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

3.4.1 Meeting with Committee

The Chair shall meet with the School RTP Committee prior to the beginning of the School evaluation process to review the School, college, and university processes and procedures.

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by the Chair

The School Director may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the Director is elected to the School of CCJEM RTP Committee. In promotion considerations, however, the School Director must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may the School Director participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4.3 Candidate's Rights

At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review

level, candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the candidate's file and also be sent to all previous levels of review. This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members undergo performance review and evaluation. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years.

The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.

4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

4.1.1 Periodic Review ("Mini-Review")

In the first year and second years of service, as well as in successive probationary years during which a candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review ("mini-review"). The periodic review is conducted by the academic unit RTP committee, the chair or director of the academic unit, and the college Dean. The periodic review provides guidance for professional development, especially with regard to the candidate's progress toward reappointment and, later, tenure. Thus, periodic reviews shall commend probationary faculty member for meeting or exceeding expectations in the relevant areas of review, while providing written guidance for making improvements in areas which need strengthening. See Appendix B for the streamlined procedures to be used for mini-reviews.

4.1.2 Reappointment Review

In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years. If reappointed for three years, probationary faculty shall continue to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process. If, however, candidates are reappointed for a shorter period of time, then they are to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process until such time as they undergo another formal reappointment review.

4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the

annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion. A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to the rank of Professor in the fifth year at the rank of Associate Professor. A tenured Associate Professor, however, may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.5 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in relevant Academic Senate policy documents.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

Section 5 of the university and CHHS RTP policies outline the general standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This RTP Policy elaborates on those policies by providing the specific criteria under which RTP candidates from the School of CCJEM will be reviewed. Candidates are referred to the CHHS policy for specific information on early tenure and promotion.

6.0 STERPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

6.1 Academic Affairs Sets Dates

The Division of Academic Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including deadlines for the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period, completion of all RTP reviews by all review levels, and final decision notification to the candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be consistent with the requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

6.2 Academic Affairs Notifies Candidates of Eligibility

The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.

6.3 Posting of Notice of Open Period

Academic units shall post in their offices a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The chairperson of the academic unit RTP committee prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.

6.4 Preparation and Submission of RTP File

Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the academic unit RTP committee by the deadline.

6.5 Review by School RTP Committee

The RTP Committee of the School of CCJEM reviews the candidate's materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.6 Review by School Director

The chair or director of the academic unit, if eligible and if not an elected member of the academic unit RTP committee, may review the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.7 Review College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.8 Review by Dean

The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.

6.9 Review by Provost

The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 Withdrawal

Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

7.2 Missing Documentation

If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.

7.3 Rebuttal

At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as to any previous review levels.

7.4 External Review

The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations (see Policy 86-07 or its successor).

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

8.1 Ratification

This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the School of CCJEM and to approval by the CHHS Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.

8.2 Amendments

Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent of the entire full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the School of CCJEM. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Dean of the College (either directly or through the School Director as the Dean's designee) shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the faculty members in the School of CCJEM at least two weeks (i.e., 14 calendar days) prior to voting.

8.2.1 Voting on Amendments

Voting on amendments shall be by ballot prior to the close of the preceding academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

8.2.2 Majority Needed to Adopt

To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the CHHS Faculty Council, the CHHS Dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8.2.3 Voting Rights

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the School of CCJEM—including those on leave, sabbatical, and FERP—are eligible to vote on RTP policy matters.