



April 29, 2022

TO: Karyn Scissum Gunn, Provost *CB*

FROM: Curtis Bennett, Richard D. Green Dean

SUBJECT: CNSM RTP Policy – Section 3.1 Amendment for Provost Approval

Contents:

- Cover Memo with “before” and “after” language of proposed change that was voted upon by the T/TT CNSM Faculty.
 - Memo Reporting Favorable Vote by CNSM Tenured/Tenured Track Faculty
 - Amended RTP Policy’s Signature Approval Page, signed by:
 - Vas Narayanaswami, Chair, CNSM Faculty Council
 - Curtis Bennet, the CNSM Richard D. Green Dean
 - RTP Policy with amended language.
-

On February 14, 2022, the tenured and probationary faculty of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics approved an amendment to the narrative guidelines in Section 3.1 of the College’s RTP Policy.

Text of Section 3.1 prior to the vote of the faculty:

3.1. The CNSM candidate’s narrative should also include plans and goals for the coming five years and a discussion of how the candidate has addressed suggestions made during previous reviews. It is recommended that the narrative not exceed 23,000 words or 45 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins.

Text of Section 3.1 following faculty vote:

3.1. The CNSM candidate’s narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one- inch margins). The narrative should include a discussion of how the candidate addressed substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.

California State University, Long Beach
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

M E M O R A N D U M

February 14, 2022

TO: Curtis Bennett, Dean
Vasanthi Narayanswami, Chair, College Council
CNSM Faculty

FROM: Margaret Karteron
Operations Officer

SUBJECT: CNSM SPRING 2022 RTP AMENDMENT BALLOT RESULTS

The ballot for this election was created using Qualtrics and distributed via email to 119 CNSM faculty eligible to vote in the 2022 Spring Semester. A total of 91 responses were returned in response to the following question:

Do you accept the proposed amendment to the CNSM RTP Policy, Section 3.1?
Voting "YES" means adopting the language of the proposed change above (i.e., the CNSM candidate's narrative should not exceed 10,000 words and candidate shall address substantial concerns raised during previous reviews). Voting "NO" means that there will be no change: the guidance for the candidate's narrative will remain the same.

Qualtrics recorded the following:

YES: 82 Votes

No: 5 Votes

Abstain: 4 Votes

Per Section 8.5 of the CNSM RTP Policy, "Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members ... and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president or designee." Following concurrence, the amended RTP Policy will be posted on the Faculty Affairs webpage for RTP Policies.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

Revised: February 2022 Effective: August 2022

Approved by vote of department tenured and probationary faculty, and approved by College Faculty Council:

Vasanthi Naryanaswami
Chair of the Faculty Council (print name)

Vasanthi Narayanaswami
Chair of the Faculty Council (signature)

4/29/2022
Date

Approved by the Dean:

Curtis Bennett
CNSM Richard D. Green Dean (print name)

Curtis Bennett
CNSM Richard D. Green Dean (signature)

4/30/2022
Date

Approved by the Provost:

Karyn Scissum Gunn
Provost (print name)

Karyn Scissum Gunn
Provost (signature)

5/2/2022
Date

A completed, original signature page is to be attached to a hard copy of the approved department policy and forwarded to Faculty Affairs. The approved policy is also to be sent electronically to Faculty Affairs.

1 **COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS**
2 **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH**
3 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**
4
5

6 The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the College of Natural
7 Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) establishes college-wide standards of excellence
8 and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members
9 within the college for sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 of the university RTP policy (PS 09-
10 10), but readers should still consult the university policy for these sections.¹
11

12 **1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**
13 **(RTP)**
14

15 CNSM faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the
16 impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and
17 instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);
18 and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.
19 All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three
20 areas.
21

22 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three
23 areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate
24 demonstrating a sustained record of quality performance over the period of review and
25 evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making productive
26 contributions in all three areas of evaluation. Reappointment decisions are based on
27 evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing a record of evidence
28 that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.
29

30 **2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**
31

32 Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of
33 excellence in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly,
34 and creative activities; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the
35 community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for
36 reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP
37 policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards.
38 Candidates for RTP recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in
39 each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific
40 standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent and competent in each area of
41 evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. A candidate will not receive a
42 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet
43 requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or
44 promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area

¹ 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.

45 of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly
46 and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to
47 professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of
48 evaluation.

49

50 **2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

51 Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers and provide evidence of this
52 effectiveness in their files. Instruction and instructionally related activities include
53 teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom (classroom,
54 laboratory, and field). Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to,
55 curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student
56 research and fieldwork, and related activities involving student learning and student
57 engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to,
58 student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

59

60 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

61 Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject
62 matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty
63 members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and on ways
64 to assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning, which may lead to
65 adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-
66 classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent
67 with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate individual student learning
68 styles.

69

70 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and method

71 The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses
72 taught by other tenured/probationary faculty members in the discipline. Course
73 materials and teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to
74 the topic, and be of value in facilitating learning. Materials submitted by a candidate in
75 her/his file should include at least course syllabi and assessment materials. Teaching
76 materials, such as samples of student work with instructor feedback, should also be
77 submitted when available. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the
78 learning goals and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader
79 discipline. At a minimum, each course taught by the candidate should prepare the
80 students for later courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite. Course
81 policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to students, and the results of
82 grading practices should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same
83 or comparable courses taught by other tenured/probationary faculty members. The
84 most recent syllabus from each course taught during the evaluation period must be
85 included.

86

87 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher

88 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing
89 her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches
90 used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should
91 be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the
92 candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward

93 a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time
94 should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant
95 materials. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy,
96 classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the
97 Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or
98 conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that
99 contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

101 2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes

102 Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices
103 and course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and
104 goals. Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with
105 course goals.

107 2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction

108 In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and
109 university RTP policies, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student
110 response to instruction. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all
111 courses evaluated during the period under review. Note that evaluations for
112 independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department
113 seminar/colloquium courses should not be included in the candidate's file. Student
114 course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.
115 Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing
116 student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item
117 on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does
118 not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

119
120 Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means
121 and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and
122 material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical
123 ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the
124 instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to
125 student needs.

127 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

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

134 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to
135 suggestions for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations),
136 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of
137 circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4)
138 any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the
139 candidate's teaching effectiveness.

140

141 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly
142 rigor of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses
143 taught by tenured/probationary faculty members.

144

145 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness,
146 including a critical analysis of all student input. This analysis must assess the
147 significance of the candidate's student course evaluation data.

148

149 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and
150 content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating
151 the learning process.

152

153 2.2.5. As part of the review process, a minimum of four class visits shall be made by
154 at least two members of the department RTP committee. These class visits must be
155 conducted during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is
156 not teaching at CSULB that semester; in this case, the visitations from the prior year
157 shall be used). The candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur
158 during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to
159 the start of the classroom visit period, which will normally occur over a two to three
160 week period. The candidate may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the RTP
161 committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee to
162 choose most appropriate days for visits. The committee members' evaluations of the
163 candidate in the classroom should address such factors as instructional clarity,
164 communication with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use
165 of classroom time, currency and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course
166 materials, and, if used, audiovisual and electronic media or demonstrations. Written
167 reports based on class visits must be placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to
168 the candidate. The signed reports must include times and dates of the visits.

169

170 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the
171 candidate in supervisory courses.

172

173 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned
174 time for this activity, he/she should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this
175 effort and should address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in
176 meeting student needs.

177

178 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities

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

183

184 2.2.8.1. Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching;

185

186 2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;

187

- 188 2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis
189 research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation
190 of such research;
191
- 192 2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional
193 laboratories;
194
- 195 2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the
196 candidate's assigned workload, and mentoring of students;
197
- 198 2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;
199
- 200 2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and
201 computer-based materials;
202
- 203 2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for
204 Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of
205 improving instruction; and
206
- 207 2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other
208 forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of
209 novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.
210
- 211 2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:
212
- 213 2.2.9.1. Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;
214
- 215 2.2.9.2. Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the
216 same course unless the course has significantly changed over time);
217
- 218 2.2.9.3. Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and
219 homework sets; and,
220
- 221 2.2.9.4. If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to
222 students (e.g. a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).
223
- 224 2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.
225
- 226 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline
227 Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the
228 discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most
229 directly achieved through maintaining an active program of research or scholarly
230 activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific conferences and reading of
231 appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.
232
- 233 **2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**
234
- 235 2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA

236

237 College faculty members must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA
238 that demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty
239 members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute
240 to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are
241 disseminated to appropriate audiences. Candidates should refer to their respective
242 department policies for definitions and criteria for evaluation of RSCA. Department
243 standards may be higher than college-level standards. Candidates for tenure must
244 develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed
245 publications in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator. The
246 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the
247 candidate's scholarly activity and this narrative must identify the candidate's
248 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. A candidate's
249 research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the
250 faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged and departments must
251 define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement. The
252 department RTP policy shall provide specific additional departmental requirements in
253 research and shall list discipline-specific criteria used in evaluating RSCA. Candidates
254 for promotion to professor must have a record of RSCA activity after their promotion to
255 associate professor that results in peer-reviewed RSCA products.

256

257 2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA

258

259 2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA
260 element to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The
261 candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The
262 evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific
263 RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The candidate's
264 documentation and the review of it will focus on continuing professional development,
265 and this theme should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative.
266 The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to evaluators in understanding
267 the candidate's intellectual and professional achievements in this category, the nature of
268 student involvement in the candidate's RSCA (if applicable), and how the candidate
269 places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the department,
270 college, and university RTP policies.

271

272 2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted,
273 examples of the candidate's best work along with an explanation of why these materials
274 should be regarded as significant contributions. Reviewers will give particular
275 consideration to the quality of these examples. For jointly authored activities the
276 candidate must identify the specific extent of her/his participation. Documentation from
277 at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if
278 the candidate only has co-authored publications.

279

280 2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The
281 documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP
282 review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the
283 supplementary documentation binder.

284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331

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

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.

332

333 **2.4. Service**

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

342

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

346

347 **2.4.1. Criteria for Service**

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

355

356 **2.4.2. Evaluation of Service**

357 The emphasis in the evaluation of service shall be on: 1) the quality and significance of
 358 the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions
 359 of the university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and level of the
 360 candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service.
 361 Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based on
 362 information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence,
 363 which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda
 364 acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.

365

366 **2.4.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Service**

367 The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as
 368 service. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor
 369 exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in
 370 this category.

371

372 2.4.3.1. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the
 373 department, the college, or the university;

374

375 2.4.3.2. Sponsoring student groups;

376

377 2.4.3.3. Actively engaging in institutional educational and research programs;

378

379 2.4.3.4. Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing);

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
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426

- 2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media interviews;
- 2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations;
- 2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.

3.1. The CNSM candidate’s narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins). The narrative should include a discussion of how the candidate addressed substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.

3.2. Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. Such chair evaluations must be independent of the department RTP committee’s evaluation. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair 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 a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

Consult the university RTP policy.

5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

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

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

5.2. Awarding of Tenure

427 Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is
428 awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and increasingly distinguished
429 professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure
430 recommendations are based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's
431 overall record of accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the
432 continuation of this record.

433

434 **5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

435

436 5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate
437 professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty
438 members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction
439 and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service. A candidate will not receive a
440 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive
441 recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a
442 rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the
443 area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

444

445 5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to
446 be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in
447 Section 2.2.8 of this policy.

448

449 5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate
450 that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in
451 RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in Section 2.3.3 of
452 this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for
453 tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the departmental standards for
454 assessment of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments. All levels of review will
455 use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.

456

457 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to
458 the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in
459 service are listed in Section 2.4.3 of this policy.

460

461 **5.4. Promotion to Professor**

462

463 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for
464 tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the
465 departmental RTP policy. A professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record
466 of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular
467 development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that
468 includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of
469 her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have
470 disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international
471 level. In addition, a professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at
472 the university and in the community or the profession.

473

474 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if
475 deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a
476 candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.
477

478 **5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

479 Consult the university RTP policy.
480

481 **6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

482 Consult the university RTP policy.
483

484 **7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

485
486 All information in this policy applies to a faculty member appointed jointly to two or more
487 departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for
488 tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must
489 be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the
490 departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the
491 dean(s).
492

493 **8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

494
495 **8.1.** Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of
496 changes to the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural
497 changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,
498 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty members.
499

500 **8.2.** The tenured/probationary faculty members of the college, voting by secret ballot
501 (with pro and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy
502 and evaluation criteria section of this policy.
503

504 **8.3.** Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:
505

506 8.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured/
507 probationary faculty members or
508

509 8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.
510

511 **8.4.** Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for
512 the faculty members called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt
513 and shall be distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty members at
514 least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.
515

516 **8.5.** Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a
517 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members voting in a
518 secret ballot conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the
519 public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university
520 president or designee.
521

522 Approved by Academic Affairs August, 2016.
523
524 Effective: Fall 2016