In alignment with the *College of Health and Human Services (CHHS)*, the Department of Health Science (hereafter HSC) *and its faculty are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore,* HSC *promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind,* HSC *establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Evaluation of faculty members at all levels of review shall take into consideration the diversity of expertise within* HSC *and recognize this diversity as a source of strength that enables the department to grow in stature.*

In this HSC RTP Policy, *portions of the* CHHS *RTP Policy* (which may come directly from the University RTP Policy) *that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted. All* CHHS *RTP Policy insertions in the* HSC *RTP Policy are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the* CHHS *and* HSC *policies. Portions of the* CHHS *RTP Policy not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the original* CHHS *Policy.*

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Mission and Vision
1.2 CSULB enriches the lives of its students and its surrounding community through globally informed, high impact educational experiences with superior teaching, research, creative activity, and action for the public good.

California State University, Long Beach will be a force for good at the forefront of public education in California and the world.

In service to the university's and CHHS's *mission*s, HSC's mission is to aid and encourage students' development into knowledgeable professionals and life-long learners who will lead efforts to support health equity for all within the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education and other related areas. The program fosters the development of person- and community-centered health professionals who are culturally sensitive and responsive to the complex social determinants of health. Upon graduation, our students are able to support and enhance the physical, psychological and social well-being of people, individually and collectively, in a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic metropolitan context. Within this mission, the HSC department's goals are to: (1) contribute to the development and advancement of a skilled student body and faculty; (2) develop strong teaching and research or scholarly programs; and (3) maintain linkages with professionals, academics, and the community at large to foster effective collaborations that support population health.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1.2.1 *A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service is essential to accomplishing the missions of the university, college* and HSC*. 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* service *contributions to* HSC, the *college, university, community, and the profession.*

1.2.2 *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 member 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* HSC, *college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.*

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

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

1.3 Governing Documents

1.3.1 In alignment with CHHS, HSC *adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of the Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 09-10) 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 CHHS *or the university RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.3.2 This HSC RTP Policy *elaborates on standards* specific to the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education and related areas *in all areas of evaluation.* The discipline-specific standards guide faculty members and the HSC RTP committee in expectations that align with or go beyond the *university-level or college-level standards.*

1.3.3 *Collectively, the RTP policies of the university, college, and* HSC *shall be used to assess candidates' performance through the stages of their academic progress.*

1.4 Obligations
All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and HSC *RTP policies. In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.*

1.4.1 The candidate is responsible for submitting an RTP file according to the timeline required by Faculty Affairs. A complete RTP file should include all elements required per the HSC RTP policy as delineated in sections 2.0 (e.g. required documentation for each area of evaluation) and 3.0 (e.g., required files). The file must be submitted in the most current format required by Faculty Affairs (e.g., electronic submission in Interfolio).

1.4.2 The HSC RTP Committee must objectively evaluate the candidate's file according to the standards set forth in this RTP Policy based on the required and supplemental documentation provided in the candidates file (section 2.0). The HSC RTP Committee must assess the candidate's qualifications for advancement based on demonstration of meeting or exceeding standards across all three areas of evaluation.

1.5 Standards
Recommendations from the HSC *RTP* Committee, and *the* HSC *chair (if submitted), shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established* HSC *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* HSC. *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.* HSC-specific standards are set forth in section 2.0 within each area of evaluation.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks
RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying HSC-*specific criteria. Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The* HSC *RTP policy applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria* which are delineated in in section 2.0 within each area of evaluation.

1.7 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.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

In addition to following the minimum standards of *the university and the college,* HSC has *further* defined *the standards and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in* health science, public health, community health, health education and related areas*, consistent with the mission and needs of both the university and the college. RTP standards.* Criteria in section 2.0 and its subsections *articulate* HSC's *discipline-specific expectations for faculty member accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession*. *The* HSC *standards and criteria adopted* are *not lower than standards specified in* college and university RTP policies.

Candidates shall be evaluated for advancement based upon the quality of their performance of the three areas of evaluation. Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 elaborate on what should be considered when evaluating candidates. Elements of certain activities may fall into multiple areas of evaluation; if activities meet criteria set forth below (based on evidence provided), candidates shall be given credit in multiple areas of evaluation. The activities and examples delineated below are illustrative and are not all inclusive. Further, the items listed are not granted equal weight as, logically, certain items qualitatively have differing value to and impact on the contributions to one's discipline. To allow for thorough evaluation, candidates must provide evidence as noted below with descriptions of activities in the narrative, being sure to address

any anomalies or other issues to clarify activities and achievements. Candidates are encouraged to submit additional documentation to supplement the required documentation to demonstrate exceptional quality in each area of evaluation. Candidates whose contributions and activities exceed minimum standards will be commended for supporting the excellence of CSULB programs and achieving the missions of the department, college and university. Given the university's inclusive excellence priorities, diversity-related activities are highly valued. Diversity-related activities are defined as those that aim to improve the well-being and/or achievements of diverse and/or underserved groups (defined by the university, based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, and/or age). When candidates clearly illustrate that their instructional, RSCA and service activities significantly surpass minimum standards, the review committee will highlight meritorious efforts by faculty that far exceeded minimum standards.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities
Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Candidate's instruction and instructionally related activities will be evaluated in the following sub-areas: 1) Instructional philosophy and practice; 2) Student learning outcomes; and 3) Student response to instruction. Candidates may also provide other evidence of effectiveness in instruction and instructionally related activities. Each of these sub-areas *should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials* as described below.

Instructional activities recognized by HSC include, but are not limited to:
- *Curriculum development; academic and* HSC *advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical*, research, community, and center *settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and related activities involving student learning and student engagement*, such as internship preceptors.
- *Mentoring students; taking students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.*
- *Active involvement in instructionally related activities outside the classroom in such areas as academic advising, field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, thesis or project supervision, and student recruitment and/or retention efforts.* Career advising and mentorship (including writing letters of recommendation for training programs and advanced degrees) are additional instructionally related activities relevant to HSC faculty members.
- Committee work that is necessary for instructional program success (such as creating and grading program assessments) and continuous improvement, such as identifying program needs, planning and implementing responsive action, and development of new programming and course or curricular revision.
- As the preceding do not provide an exhaustive list, HSC considers activities that meet the following criteria as those that should be given credit under instructional activities:
  - Presentations, panels and/or workshops that provide instruction or training to students, staff and/or faculty (e.g., poster development workshop; responsible conduct of research (RCR) training; career trajectory panel discussion; objective assessment methods); activities delivered to students are given more weight.
  - Structured activities in which faculty members provide student learning opportunities that include development of a syllabus that delineates learning objectives, activities and timeline (e.g., student club advising, supervising directed research projects)

- Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the field, collaborative instructional activities are viewed favorably
- Instructional activities that support inclusivity and diversity-focused learning are given more weight.

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.* Instructional practices are expected to show the candidate's ability to integrate innovative evidence-based educational strategies.

A.1. Instructional philosophy for HSC faculty members should describe the candidate's values and principles about teaching. Primary elements, not to exceed one page, should include
- Description of what successful student learning entails and/or goals for student learning based on teaching values and principles
- Methods used to achieve student learning
- Approaches for effective student interaction that support their learning

Required Documentation
(1) Instructional philosophy section of narrative should include reflection on teaching practices and their impact on student learning.
(2) Examples of how candidates have applied their teaching philosophy to instruction (e.g., examples in courses taught) and instructionally related activities.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
(1) Instructional philosophy includes all required elements
(2) Demonstrated self-reflection
(3) Demonstrated commitment to addressing multiple learning styles
(4) At least three examples that illustrate effective application of philosophy are described in the narrative and are evident based on the documentation provided
(5) Evidence of integrating innovative best practices in teaching must be present
(6) Instructional philosophy and practices that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

A.2. Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness and professional development:
Thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness are expected of all HSC *faculty members.* These activities promote ongoing lifelong learning and model this value for students. *These actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:*
- *Regular interactions with colleagues regarding various pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development.*
- *Developing innovative approaches to teaching; fostering increased student learning in the classroom; and participating in the evaluation of instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.*

- *Involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center; teaching-development seminars or conferences sponsored by* HSC*, college, university or relevant professional organizations; and formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.*
- *Development of new curriculum, instructional programs or materials, including electronic or multimedia instructional software or new advising materials or programs.*
- Course revisions to support and/or enhance student learning, including strategies to support diverse students and integrate diversity issues into course content
- Professional development activities that support teaching effectiveness such as learning techniques for new teaching modalities (e.g., online and hybrid instruction), how to improve teaching and mentoring of diverse students, learning new technology or software, etc.

Required Documentation
(1) Evidence of participation in professional development and other activities to improve instruction (examples of professional development activities attended to enhance teaching effectiveness)
(2) Examples of curricular or course revision (e.g., multiple syllabi for the same course showing revisions), if applicable

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.
(1) Candidates engaged in appropriate and relevant activities to improve teaching effectiveness
(2) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:
- Candidates being evaluated for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must have engaged in an average of at least two activities per year since their initial appointment
- Candidates being evaluated for promotion to Full Professor must have engaged in an average of at least one activity for every year since their last promotion
(3) Instructional improvement and professional development activities that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

A.3. Alignment of instructional practices with course/curriculum goals and campus instructional policies is required of all HSC faculty members. Candidates must describe how their instructional activities align with curricular goals and policies. Alignment of instructional practices may be illustrated with materials such as, but not limited to:
- Syllabi/learning contracts that include required instructional policy statements
- Course/training lectures, handouts and resources
- Course assignments
- Course exams and other assessments

Required Documentation
(1) A complete list of teaching responsibilities for the review period in the PDS

(2) Narrative should summarize other instructionally related activities, such as thesis committees, training workshops given, etc. (see section 2.1).

(3) *Course materials*, such as syllabi, *that clearly convey to students, in behavioral terms, the learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education.*

(4) *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).* HSC faculty members must submit a syllabus for every course taught during the review period (if multiple sections of the same course are taught and the syllabus does not differ across sections, only one syllabus needs to be submitted for the course). This may include some form of contract (such as a syllabus or a document outlining objectives, expectations and timeline) for non-traditional courses or instructional activities in which the faculty member supervises students, such as thesis, independent and directed studies.

(5) Course materials, such as syllabi or assignments, clearly conveying to students, the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education goals.

(6) *Evidence of up-to-date instructional methods and materials that are appropriate to the courses taught and foster student learning*, such as application of innovative best practices including technological teaching methods related to virtual instruction, development of novel assignments that integrate learning across courses, flipped lectures, use of discussion boards, etc.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

(1) At minimum, all course syllabi must comply with the requirements of the current CHHS Standard Course Outline (SCO) to ensure alignment with current campus policies, such as accessibility standards. The absence of the SCO content in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence this RTP Policy is designed to facilitate.

(2) Syllabi may be further enhanced when they contain other types of information, such as:
- The measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
- Clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
- Instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and
- Readings and assignments that are up-to-date (dates for readings should generally be within the past 5-10 years with exceptions for seminal papers; assignments should align with current behaviors and practices within the field), appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of HSC, assigned readings from primary sources that support inclusivity and diversity, enhance the interdisciplinary and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.

(3) All instructional activities and related documentation submitted should be taken into account in the RTP committee's evaluation of the candidate's contributions to meeting instructional goals of HSC, CHHS and the university.

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes *Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.* Candidates may also describe any other evidence of student learning.

B.1. The candidate must illustrate effectiveness of instructional practices and course materials in conveying learning goals and student outcomes. This includes preparing lessons and course materials that lead to students achieving intended learning outcomes for a course or other instructionally related activity. To this end, candidates are required to provide grade distributions and scores from items relevant to student learning on SPOT evaluations.
  - The distribution of an instructor's grades serve as a metric of student learning and can help to contextualize students' evaluations and assist in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Thus, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor's teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices. 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.
  - Student perceptions of whether concepts presented and assignments supported their learning are reported on SPOT evaluations and should be included in the candidate's file for evaluation of student learning outcomes.

Required Documentation
(1) All candidates must submit the grade distributions for all the courses taught during the review period.
  - Overall course GPAs should be presented in a table in the narrative with columns showing the relevant HSC and college averages for course level (i.e., lower division, upper division, graduate) that aligns with the courses taught (in addition, the candidate may choose to provide frequencies of the distribution of scores).
  - Narrative must describe how the grade distributions provide evidence of student learning, explaining what the ideal distribution is for each of their courses. For example, a class with all grades being "A" requires an explanation of how/why such distribution indicates learning vs. a balanced grade distribution.
(2) A summary table displaying SPOT evaluation scores for all courses taught within the review period with columns showing HSC and college averages should be included in the narrative.
  - For each course, median scores for the item, "Concepts were presented in a manner that helped me learn." should be displayed.
  - For each course, median scores for the item, "Assignments contributed to my learning." should be displayed.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
(1) Grade distributions are appropriate for the course content and instructional modalities
(2) For SPOT evaluation scores related to student learning outcomes, expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:

- Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in median scores across time or median scores equal to or above 5 in over half of classes evaluated since initial appointment.
- Student evaluations submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence of a sustained level of median scores above 5 for at least two-thirds of courses evaluated since initial appointment.
- Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has median scores above 5 for at least 75% of courses evaluated since last promotion.

B.2. Use of appropriate assessment methods is needed to observe and evaluate student learning. To this end, faculty members shall develop assessment tools for courses that provide evidence of student learning based on course learning objectives. Assessments should clearly convey expectations and/or criteria for success. Examples of such practices include, but are not limited to:
- Descriptions of clear linkage between course/learning activity student learning outcomes with course assignments/exam questions
- Assignment/assessment guidelines that detail what the assessment intends to measure
- Syllabi include clear grading information and how grading is tied to assessments
- Methods used to provide iterative feedback on assignments/assessments

Required Documentation
(1) Samples of assignments/assessments used in courses taught during the review period, such as exams and assignment guidelines with rubrics
(2) Syllabi that show how assessments align with learning objectives
(3) Candidates should provide evidence of any assessment methods described in the narrative

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
(1) Assessments used in course can provide evidence of student learning
(2) Assessments convey clear metrics for evaluation

B.3. In addition, candidates may describe and provide evidence of student learning in other forms, such as, but not limited to:
- Reports of student performance on assignments, exams and other assessments
- Student participation in course discussion boards
- De-identified samples of student work
- Evaluations of training presentations and workshops
- Informal evaluations conducted by the instructor
- Student comments and feedback on learning through informal communications

Suggested Documentation
(1) Other evidence of learning outcomes for courses and instructionally related practices described in the narrative, such as, but not limited to:
- De-identified, aggregate data displaying student performance in terms of intended learning outcomes from assignments/assessments, such as a culminating project

- Examples of successful student learning outcomes resulting from methods used to achieve student learning described in teaching philosophy

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
All documentation submitted should be taken into account in the RTP committee's evaluation of the candidate's ability to achieve student learning outcomes in terms of the learning objectives expected for the courses and/or instructional activities. The following provide examples of how evidence may be evaluated:
(1) Student performance indicators are clearly linked to learning objectives of the instructional activity and the grade distribution is appropriate (as described by the candidate)
(2) Teaching philosophy aligns with learning objectives of the instructional activity

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction *In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by* HSC *and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with the requirements of this* HSC *RTP Policy.*

C.1. SPOT evaluations enable student feedback to be evaluated based on university-defined metrics. Written comments on SPOT forms may provide further details and context for quantitative ratings.

Required Documentation
(1) All candidates, regardless of rank, must submit the evaluation summary sheets for all the courses in which university administered SPOT evaluations were given:
- *candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor* must *submit student evaluations of all sections of all courses taught since their initial appointment; and*
- *candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor* must *submit student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since their last promotion review.*
(2) If any written comments are submitted along with the summary sheets, the candidate must submit ALL of the written comments for that course.
(3) A summary table displaying SPOT evaluation scores for all courses taught within the review period with columns showing HSC and college averages should be included in the narrative.
- For each course, median scores for the item, "The instructor was effective at teaching the subject matter in this course" should be displayed.
- For each course, overall averages for all SPOT items should also be displayed
(4) *While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the academic units and/or the college for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative* (e.g., change in administration methods to online SPOTs, first time teaching a course)

Evaluation Criteria for 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. Overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and*

college averages. A faculty member's <u>median</u> scores on <u>the teaching effectiveness</u> item, in particular, <u>expected to</u> compare favorably to the averages for HSC and the college*.*

<u>(1) RTP committee must take into account any unusual circumstances that may have impacting SPOT evaluations in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness</u>

<u>(2) High-quality teaching is defined as:</u>

- <u>A median score of 5 or higher on the item "The instructor was effective at teaching the subject matter in this course" on each course SPOT; and</u>
- <u>An average score on overall averages of all SPOT items within one standard deviation of both the HSC and college averages (separate comparisons should be made for the department and college scores).</u>

<u>(3) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:</u>

- *Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.*
- *Student evaluations submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.*
- *Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.*

2.1.4 Other Evidence *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 peer evaluations of instruction.*

Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above. Examples include recognition of or awards for instructional effectiveness, student statements of teaching effectiveness (e.g., e-mails or cards from students expressing appreciation). If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee shall review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate's teaching effectiveness*.*

    D.1. *Positive teaching evaluations as assessed by peers who visit the classroom to observe teaching style, breadth, depth, and overall effectiveness* are required*. Such evaluations of classroom performance may be conducted by peers from* HSC*, the* HSC *RTP Committee, the chair of* HSC *and/or faculty members from other academic units with relevant expertise who are approved by the* HSC *RTP* Policy or *Committee* (e.g., statistics or research methods instructors from other departments). 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. Peer evaluators should also

evaluate the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials.

Peer evaluations are not limited to HSC courses taught by the candidate. Candidates may request peer evaluation of courses taught for training programs (e.g., summer training program, learning community), guest lectures given in HSC courses or courses in other departments where the candidate presented content relevant to HSC.

Ideally, a candidate will ask for peer evaluations for each course topic they teach, and such evaluations will be conducted by different colleagues who have the experience and expertise to provide critical review of their teaching effectiveness. This may include non-tenured faculty members as well as lecturers who have been teaching a course longer than the candidate has or other peers with work expertise in the course content. 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.

<u>Required Documentation</u>
(1) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:
- Candidates for reappointment must provide at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since initial appointment.
- Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must provide at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since reappointment, in addition to three from the period between initial appointment and reappointment.
- Candidates for promotion to Full Professor must submit at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion.
(2) Candidates must request that peer evaluators use the standard Peer Evaluation of Teaching form; these completed forms must be included in the candidates file.

<u>Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee</u>
All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.
(1) *Candidates for reappointment must provide of either continued improvement* (item on peer evaluation form for "overall teaching effectiveness" increases across time) *in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching* (item on peer evaluation form for "overall teaching effectiveness" is at least proficient on over half of classes evaluated since initial appointment)*.*
(2) *Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the Associate Professor must provide evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching* (item on peer evaluation form for "overall teaching effectiveness" is Excellent on over half of classes evaluated since reappointment)*.*
(3) *Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence* (item on peer evaluation form for "overall teaching effectiveness" is Excellent and qualitative feedback on forms is overall positive on over 75% of classes evaluated since the last promotion)*.*

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to: books, journal articles that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly book chapters (whether or not *reviewed by professional peers*)*, scholarly presentations,* accepted research abstracts, *software and electronically published documents,* submitted *and awarded grants or contracts,* and invited lectures*. While some activities are required others enhance the candidate's portfolio, as described below.

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines *RTP candidates within* HSC and *the CHHS must demonstrate achievements in the area of research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in* the CHHS RTP *Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in* this HSC *RTP* policy*. RSCA standards* are *specified in* the following *subsections.* Accordingly, HSC faculty members must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of health science, public health, community health, health education, and related fields.

2.2.2 Research *Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, clinical, and/or other* research appropriate for the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education, and related areas*. Candidates must detail their research activities and show how those activities qualify as RSCA. Research activities recognized by HSC include, but are not limited to:

- *As used in this document, "research" involves* bench*, clinical, social,* behavioral, policy*, or* applied community-based investigations *that rely on or are derived from* primary (whether observational or experimental) or secondary data collection, including *qualitative research methods such as* content analysis of relevant sources of information and data, interviews and focus groups*.
- While securing funding is not required of candidates, faculty members are highly encouraged to seek support for RSCA through internal funding sources. These mechanisms are useful, particularly for early career faculty members, in garnering support to engage in RSCA to ensure they are on track for publication requirements.
- *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,* HSC*, 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.*
- In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, HSC values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to HSC's 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.

- As the preceding do not provide an exhaustive list, HSC also considers activities that meet the following criteria as those that should be given RSCA credit:
  - o Research products resulting from student thesis projects, such as completed final theses published by the university library, submitted and accepted conference abstracts and presentations as well as publications based on the thesis project; instruction of research courses that directly result in research dissemination products.
  - o Research mentorship to students in the department, to students working in CSULB research centers, and to students in formal research training programs that result in research products, as described above.
- Inclusivity and diversity focused RSCA that support achieving health equity and eliminate health disparities are viewed favorably.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA *Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to disseminate their research and other scholarly and creative activities to appropriate audiences through discipline-specific (or relevant interdisciplinary), peer reviewed publications and scholarly presentations.*

A.1. Peer reviewed work. Refereed articles that are accepted and published in public health journals, journals from related disciplines, and relevant electronic media (such as online journals) are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. 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, the finished works will be published and/or presented in a respected venue consistent with accepted disciplinary standards. RSCA activities are expected to have significant impact on students and community.
- *Publication of scholarly and creative works in peer reviewed journals is required of all candidates* at all levels of review.
- All RTP candidates are expected to present their research at academic conferences and professional meetings relevant to the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education or other related fields. *Conference proceedings* (e.g. abstracts, panel moderation, session chair, symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) *and presentations strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure and promotion to any rank.*

Required Documentation
(1) Complete list of peer-reviewed work should be provided in the PDS. For multiple-authored papers where the candidate is not the first author, the amount or nature of author contributions should be specified in the PDS listing of publications.
(2) Copies of all such scholarly work must be submitted so that the RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.
(3) Documentation of the impact of scholarship on students and/or the community should be provided. Indicators may include, but are not limited to:
  - Student impact: student co-authorship on presentations/publications, student awards for research presentations or papers, research mentee

pursuit of graduate training (e.g., undergraduates applying for master's or doctoral programs, or master's students applying to doctoral programs),

- Community impact: community partner co-authorship on presentations/ publications, translation and dissemination of research to support community members' health and well-being, 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.

<u>Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee</u> Evaluation of quality shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, whether a research presentation is regional, national, or international in scope) and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work. All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards. Impact of RSCA should also be evaluated using guidelines below.

(1) High-quality work as judged by one's peers should be based on assessment of the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published and the degree of the candidate's contribution to the publication must always be considered when assessing the significance of any publication.

- Authorship: First-authored and senior-authored (last author as principal investigator or lead researcher) works as well as works published with student collaborators, are evaluated most positively. Due to the collaborative nature the fields related HSC research, sole-authored works are less common and more difficult to complete, thus are also viewed quite favorably, but are not required. Second-authored works also indicate primary roles of the candidate and are viewed favorably. Absent unusual circumstances (such as using a unique methodology or participating in long-term grant research with other scholars, etc.), all Given the collaborative nature of the field, RTP candidates who contribute to multiple-authored and collaborative research projects and publication should be evaluated positively.
- Journals: Must be peer-reviewed; metrics available for journal ranking (e.g., impact factor, usage metrics, etc.) should be evaluated; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal; status of the journal within the subfield (for open access journals, particularly those that require payment by the researcher, evidence of the journal credibility and peer-review standards should be identified; if a candidate publishes in a journal that requires payment for publication, the peer reviews for the publication must be submitted with the publication in the candidate file); 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.
- Conference Presentations: Must be peer reviewed; the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local) should be taken into account.

(2) The impact of scholarly works must always be taken into account when assessing the significance of any publication. Candidates must show

evidence of impact of their peer reviewed work in at least one of the following areas (having impact in more than one area is viewed more favorably):

- Impact on Students: CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. HSC 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.
- Community Impact: HSC recognizes the impact of RSCA in various types of community settings (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at different levels of community effort (local, state, national, and international communities).

(3) The RTP Committee shall apply the following standards for evaluation of the candidate's peer reviewed work:

- During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related scholarly activities, significant time must be allocated to grant administrative responsibilities, thus allowances should be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly journal articles. Such allowances must recognize that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming and, therefore, if a candidate does not meet the minimum standards set for each rank below due to extensive grant administration duties, the HSC and college RTP committees must consider reasonable exceptions to the minimum publication standard.
- For mini reviews during the early probationary years, faculty members are likely to just be starting to advance a research agenda. Thus, in the first year, new faculty members might be more likely to publish books or literature reviews, invited essays, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. Prior to initial reappointment (during their first two years), probationary faculty members are expected to be submitting abstracts, presenting at conferences, and/or working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals for editorial consideration. It is the duty of the HSC RTP committee to assess and provide feedback on the candidate's trajectory toward meeting department expectations to ensure the candidate is on track to meet requirements for reappointment.
- By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have peer-reviewed scholarly work either in-print or formally accepted for publication. Quality, however, is more important than quantity. At minimum, candidate must have at least one accepted or published peer-reviewed article to be recommended for the maximum of three years of reappointment. Exceeding these baseline expectations by a greater publishing output shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement. Candidates who have multiple published/ accepted peer-reviewed conference abstracts or manuscripts under review may be recommended for reappointment for less than the three-year maximum (i.e., one- or two-year reappointment) when all other RSCA requirements have been met.
- After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period

(typically years four through six), faculty members should be publishing in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least four scholarly articles in refereed venues. As in other evaluative areas, quality, however, is more important than quantity. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

- 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 peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have published one peer reviewed article for each year of service since the last promotion. Quantity does not substitute for quality.
- Research products that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated favorably.

A.2. Sponsored research. Procurement of RSCA funding can greatly enhance opportunities for engagement in significant scholarly activities and dissemination of research. Internal funding from the university and college are important strategies for supporting RSCA and developing grant writing skills that can facilitate obtaining external funding. Securing external sponsored research opportunities shall constitute a significantly enhancing criterion that is given extremely positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.

- Internal funding opportunities may include, but are not limited to, awards offered through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (e.g., RSCA, Mini Grants/Summer Stipends, Multidisciplinary Research Grants) the Ukleja Center, research training programs (e.g., BUILD, UROP, etc), and Academic Affairs (e.g., sabbatical leave).
- External funding opportunities may include, but are not limited to, federal funding (e.g., NIH, CDC, SAMHSA, USDA, USDE), CSU funding opportunities to support students (e.g., Sally Casanova, Chancellor's Doctoral Incentive Program), state funding, awards from private entities as well as foundations and non-profit organizations.

Suggested Documentation. While there are no requirements to secure research funding, candidates that do should submit evidence of proposal submissions and research awards. These may include, but are not limited to:
(1) Evidence of submissions
(2) Award letters

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
(1) The number and scope of activities supported by sabbaticals, and other forms of internal support for scholarly research funded by CSULB should be assessed.
(2) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the

applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the entirety of the probationary period, merely applying for sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant writing skills.

(3) While not required, candidates for promotion to full professor are encouraged to provide evidence of externally funded grants.

(4) Funding that explicitly supports efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

2.2.4 Advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one's knowledge has the potential for improving the quality of education by introducing state-of-the-art methods for the field and keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline.

B.1. All candidates are expected to contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy in health science, public health, community health, health education, and related fields or interdisciplinary studies. Candidates should demonstrate their contributions through various methods, such as, but not limited to:

- Engaging in innovative and novel RSCA that increases the knowledge base of the field (e.g., new populations, new methodologies, new technology)
- Building inter/trans/multidisciplinary collaborations that generate new and/or enhance the knowledge upon which the profession is based
- The impact of RSCA on the discipline

Required Documentation
(1) Candidates should describe how their RSCA advances the field in the narrative
(2) Products, letters or other evidence supporting the descriptions in the narrative
(3) Impact on the discipline should be demonstrated with a citation analysis that provides an estimate of the number of times published work was cited by other researchers. There are several options and metrics available for this metric (e.g., citation index, H-index) which can be obtained from online data bases that provide citation information

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
(1) RSCA are novel and utilize effective methods to expand the knowledge base of the discipline and support interdisciplinary work. Across successive publications, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).
(2) Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge): is based on the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress (e.g., addresses a public health priority) and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary journals; thus, results of citation analysis for peer reviewed should be considered in evaluating disciplinary impact.
(3) RSCA that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

2.2.5 Other Evidence. Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences quality RSCA as set forth above. If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee shall review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate's RSCA achievements.

D.1. The following provides examples of other RSCA that may be included in the candidate's file. While the list in not exhaustive, it is intended to provide the candidate and RTP Committee guidance in what activities strengthen the candidate's RSCA portfolio.

- *Other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, article reviews*, and invited research lectures*) are valued and strengthen the candidate's portfolio. These types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the college* and HSC *RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate.* Examples may include:
  - Books, including textbooks, and book chapters provide illustrations of synthesizing research and scientific facts for academic and lay audiences which contribute to further development of the field. Thus, original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully advance theory, theoretically based scholarly writing may also constitute "research," depending on the candidate's area of expertise, even if it does not include the quantitative or qualitative examination of empirical data.
  - Invited research presentations (e.g., keynote speaker, panelist, etc) for colloquia series offered by the university, other institutions or professional organizations.
  - Design of community surveys, health interventions, and program evaluations
  - Committee work that supports dissemination and exposure to faculty research across the campus, particularly for students to learn about possible research opportunities.
  - Research products related to building or supporting community efforts to solve community issues, such as policy briefs, white papers, policy testimony.
- *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 types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the college and HSC RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate. Examples may include:
  - 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.

Suggested Documentation. While there are no requirements to submit additional evidence, candidates should submit documentation that provides evidence of excellence in RSCA. These may include, but are not limited to:
(1) Copies of all such scholarly works
(2) Invitations to serve

<u>Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee</u>
(1) Books and chapters: The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency should be evaluated.
- Both scholarly books and textbooks as well as book chapters are valued for RTP purposes.
- Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books and chapters written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.

(2) Invited Publications and/or Presentations: Evaluation should consider 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).

(3) Editorial Roles: Researchers that serve as editors/editor-related roles (e.g. editor-in-chief, associate editor, invited editor, editorial board) are recognized for their expertise within the field as their evaluation and judgement of research is highly valued. Candidates who have achieved the role of editor are positively evaluated for this recognition in the field.

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. Service to HSC is required of all candidates at all ranks.

2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments *All* HSC *faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance through service to* HSC*, the college, and the university. Additionally,* HSC *faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession.* It is expected that early career faculty members will be protected from excessive service obligations so that they may focus their time on achieving teaching excellence and developing their research agenda to reach publication requirements; thus, faculty members at higher ranks should be engaging in significant service to the department throughout their tenure.

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments *The quality of contributions to service is fundamental to meeting* HSC service requirements*. The evaluation of service shall be based on the quality and significance of the service activity.* HSC committee responsibilities and charge documents should be consulted to provide information on the quality and significance of activities. *Relevant factors* for assessment are noted below in evaluation criteria for the RTP Committee.

A.1. Department service: All faculty members must serve on department committees, contribute to activities (which may be scholarly and/or administrative) to support program implementation and improvement (e.g., conducting course assessments for program review, completing surveys for accreditation, reporting numbers for program evaluation, etc) and participate in program governance. A non-exhaustive list of possible activities includes:
- Student advising and mentorship, including career advising, and provision of or referrals to relevant resources;

- Serving as an internship preceptor for non-HSC students;
- Advising HSC student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies, i.e., Health Science Graduate Association, Health Science Student Association and Eta Sigma Gama Honor Society. Participation in activities that are sponsored by student organizations are recognized as service to the department, although advising roles are weighted heavier;
- Mentoring colleagues is highly encouraged and valued;
- Participating actively and substantially in departmental committees, (especially by chairing a department committee);
- Engaging in activities to establish, maintain and improve departmental operations, such as revision of policies, development of bylaws, handbooks and other department guiding documents
- Committee work that is necessary for instructional program success, such as reviewing applications for admission to the graduate program
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department such as preparing program reviews, accreditation reports, or certification;
- Attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;
- Creating, promoting and/or implementing workforce development opportunities made available to units within the university as well as the community and other professional organizations and institutions
- Examples of service activities that are expected of tenured faculty members include, but are not limited to:
  - Mentoring early career faculty members
  - Chairing the department, serving as the graduate advisor or undergraduate advisor, chair program reviews or accreditation review process;
  - Chairing major departmental committees (e.g., search committee, RTP committee, chair voting committee, program assessment/accreditation committees);
  - Creating or significantly revising entire department/program curricula or developing new courses (e.g., development of programs to support instruction, guidelines to outline program expectations).

A.2. College service: Service to the CHHS may include, but is not limited to, serving on CHHS committees, engaging in activities to represent and support the CHHS mission and strategic initiatives and supporting programs and their students in other departments within CHHS. Possible activities may include, but are not limited to:
- Serving on the CHHS RTP Committee, Faculty Council, Graduate Council, Educational Policies Committee, CHHS General Education Committee, Research Committee; Awards/Scholarships Committee, Professional Leave Committee, etc. as well as other committees on which the College invited the candidate to serve;
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to CHHS
- Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing CHHS committees, organizations and/or task forces;
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university, college, or department;

- Participating in CHHS activities, including academic (e.g., convocation, commencement, roundtable events with community) and social events (e.g. meet the department); taking lead roles or assisting in organization of any of these activities is given more weight.

A.3. University service: University service requires that candidates contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of CSULB. Service to the university may include, but is not limited to, serving on university-level committees, engaging in activities that promote the reputation of and support the CSULB mission and strategic initiatives (e.g. Beach 2030) and supporting programs and their students in other colleges within the university. A non-exhaustive list of possible activities includes:
- Since face-to-face/virtual responsible conduct of research training workshops are offered to faculty and students across the university, service credit is given for providing these workshops;
- Providing training workshops that are open to faculty and/or staff across the university;
- Serving on university committees, such as IRB, University Awards; Committee; Assigned Time Committee, etc. as well as other committees on which the College invited the candidate to serve;
- Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing university-wide committees, organizations or task forces;
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university;

A.4. Service to the Community: *If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member* such that he or she applies academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional, national, or international issues. For any research-related projects/collaborations/ partnerships, only activities that go above and beyond those required for the research will count as community service. Possible activities include, but are not limited to:
- *Consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.*
- Participating in community service events organized by student clubs and organizations;
- Attending community events sponsored by community organizations and partners;
- Providing technical assistance and/or training to community organizations.
- Helping to organize or facilitate events for charities health and civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise;
- Acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for community and educational organizations, government, business, or industry.
- Taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;
- Serving as a director, co-director, and/or affiliate of a research center whose mission is to serve the community

- Holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to the candidate's professional expertise;
- Consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
- Serving on governing boards and/or advisory boards, and chairing meetings of public health and health education-focused organizations (program planning committees; external scholarship committees; external research review committees)
- Engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to public health; serving as a health-related consultant; provide events or news stories; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with health-related missions; writing relevant health editorials in non-academic media outlets, such as newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by
- holding a position as an elected civil officer.
- Facilitating community outreach and/or assessment in partnership with schools, health and human services agencies and organizations, local, state, federal, or international governments, and/or community organizations.

A.5. Service to the Field and/or Profession: *Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews/articles and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected professional offices* in a health or public health related professional organization. Professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for the American Public Health Association, Society for Public Health Education, or other health-related professional organizations. Possible activities include, but are not limited to:
- Professional consulting activities (whether paid or volunteer) that may, but are not required to, result in technical reports, grant proposal applications or other products.
- Professional honors, awards, and other forms of recognition
- Election as an officer of a professional organization
- Serving as a journal reviewer and/or editorial board member (must describe and provide evidence of manuscript reviews, e.g., Publons profile information, or other relevant activities, such as compiling a special issue)

A.6. As the preceding do not provide exhaustive lists, HSC considers activities that meet the following criteria as those that should be given service credit:
- In absence of HSC faculty members receiving instructional units for thesis advising, the time spent advising and reviewing, is credited toward service for any student within the department. Serving on thesis committees in other departments will count towards service to the college where the student is housed. Thesis advising also enhances the field, therefore service to the field is acknowledged for these efforts.
- Development of courses or instructional programs outside of HSC that enhance the capacities of campus entities to meet their missions and support students earning highly valued degrees
- Advising or research commitments to students outside of HSC and/or programs that support students in other units across the university—credit is given to the unit that the program serves (e.g., ANDALE serves CHHS while BUILD and UROP research training programs serve the university)

- Reviewing applications for student admission to educational, training and/or research programs.
- Reviewing applications for internal funding award mechanisms.
- Directing research centers that provide internship placements for students for the administration and management of volunteer and internship programs
- Administration, management and/or operation of programs, funded grant awards, and research centers (such as the Center for Health Equity Research and Center for Latino Community Health Education and Leadership Training)
- Service activities that promote and support inclusive excellence, serving the needs of underrepresented groups, and achieving health equity and eliminating health disparities are given more weight.

Required Documentation *The candidate must provide a documented narrative of his or her service contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative criteria in his/her narrative.*

(1) *Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance in addition to documenting their attendance and participation.* The narrative should provide an explanation of the quality and significance of their service within the specific domain (i.e., to the department, college, university, community, or the profession). Candidates should cite the HSC committee responsibilities and charges to support illustration of the quality and significance of services, including required time commitment. Beyond simply listing service activities, the candidate must provide details of (in the PDS or narrative) contributions and accomplishments of service activities to facilitate evaluation of quality.

(2) *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.*

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee
All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

(1) Assessment of the depth, quality of service should consider, but is not limited to:
- Committee responsibility and charge documents must be consulted to inform evaluators about the required service commitments in evaluation of the quality and significance of service;
- Invited service on College and University activities indicate recognition of the candidate's expertise and shall indicate high quality service;
- *The nature of the service commitment,* particularly in terms of the time commitment required (total time commitment/percent of work week hours needed to complete the service activities), duration (length of service) and impact;
- The depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students;
- The significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and/or social climate of the university, college, and/or department;
- 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;

- *The degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, college, and/or* HSC*;*
- The depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers his/her services; and
- Most importantly, *the degree of the candidate's leadership in the service activity.* 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 (e.g., taking initiative to equally share the burden of service needs, proactively seeking out and/or implementing service efforts; collegiality, teamwork and collaboration to move service efforts forward).
- For consulting activities, considerations may include the number and scope of technical reports, and the frequency and range of clients for which consulting activities were provided
- For professional recognition, considerations may include, the scope of the 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 for service activities, including consideration of the scope of the organization presenting the award.
- Letters and/or other communications (whether formal or informal) from peers and/or colleagues affirming the quality of the candidate's service.

(2) Faculty members who were assigned to a committee or other service activity but did not contribute to the activities shall be evaluated as not having met HSC expectations for service.

(3) Faculty members who mentor early career faculty members should be evaluated very favorably.

(4) *The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience.*

- *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in college and university service; however, they are expected to perform quality service at the academic unit level.* If faculty members at this level take on service activities that are expected of tenured faculty members, this shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of exceptional service.
- *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to* HSC *and to* CHHS*. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have made quality service contributions to the community and/or to the profession.* University-level service is desirable, but not required.
- *For promotion to the rank of Full Professor (consistent with Section 5.4 of the University RTP policy and Section 5.4 of* the CHHS *Policy), faculty members are required to have provided significant, quality service and*

leadership in HSC, CHHS, and the *university, as well as a sustained pattern of quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession.* Faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor who have actively protected early career faculty members from excessive service obligations through their commitment and participation in service shall be commended.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the academic unit, the academic unit *RTP committee, the chair or director of the academic unit, 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 chair or director of his/her academic unit, 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 his or her 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 his or her 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. It is recommended that the narrative be between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins. *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.* Candidates are encouraged to provide a table that lists the RTP evaluation criteria and provides a summary of what is included in their file to illustrate how they have met criteria.

3.2 Academic Unit RTP Policy
Each academic unit shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Academic unit *standards shall not be lower than the university- and college-level standards. The RTP policy* of each

academic unit *is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members* in the specific academic unit *and to approval by the college faculty council, the Dean, and the Provost.* Academic unit *RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the* academic unit's *tenured and probationary faculty.*

3.3 Academic Unit RTP Committee
The academic unit 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 tenured and probationary faculty members of an academic unit elect representatives to their unit's RTP committee.*
        (A) *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.*
        (B) *Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on an academic unit RTP committee.*
        (C) *Faculty members participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP committees of academic units if* elected by a *majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the President. However, academic unit RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty members participating in the FERP.*
        (D) *Chairs or directors of academic units may serve as members of their unit RTP committee, if elected. However, if they serve as a member of the academic unit RTP committee, they may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this document. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, chairs or directors of academic units may not sit with an academic unit RTP committee during the time that it is considering his or her own materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.*

    3.3.2 Committee Composition
        (A) *Members of academic unit RTP committees who participate in promotion recommendations must not only be tenured, but also must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. Moreover, they must not themselves be candidates for promotion.*
        (B) *Within each academic unit, all RTP recommendations 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 academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of 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.*

    3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

(A) *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.*

(B) *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.*

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, as specified in the academic unit RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, 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 RTP 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.*

3.4 Chair or Director of the Academic Unit

The chair or director of the academic unit (hereinafter referred to as "the chair") is responsible for communicating the academic unit*, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with* academic unit *expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college and/or academic unit mentors, 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* academic unit *RTP committee prior to the beginning of the* academic unit *evaluation process to review the* academic unit*, college, and university processes and procedures.*

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by Director or Chair Directors or *chairs* of academic units *may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the* director or *chair is elected to the RTP committee of their academic unit. However, in promotion considerations, a* director or *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* director or *chair 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.*

3.5 College RTP Policy
This document serves as the official college RTP policy. It shall be interpreted to ensure consistency of standards across the college to the maximum extent possible in light of the breadth of disciplinary diversity and expertise within the CHHS.

3.5.1 Ratification *The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members with the CHHS, and to approval by the Dean and the Provost.*

3.5.2 Review for Currency *The college RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.*

3.6 College RTP Committee *The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate, the RTP committees of academic units within the college, and, when submitted, the evaluations and recommendations of chairs or directors of academic units.*

3.6.1 Duties *The college RTP committee shall conduct evaluations of all candidates' files in accordance with Section 3.6.6 of this document, which shall include a recommendation to the college Dean for a personnel action in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.*

3.6.2 Membership *The college RTP committee shall consist of five (5) tenured, full-time faculty members, each of whom holds the rank of Professor.*

3.6.3 Election, Service, and Terms
(A) Members of the college RTP committee shall be elected by secret ballot of the college faculty.
(B) There shall be no more than one member from any one academic unit.
(C) Members shall serve staggered, two-year terms.
(D) Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e., more than four consecutive years). After one year has elapsed, an individual is again eligible to be elected to serve on the college RTP committee.

3.6.4 Vacancies *In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the college RTP committee, either a meeting of the college faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the office of the Dean of the college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).*

3.6.5 Chair *A chair shall be elected from among the members of the college RTP committee.*

3.6.6 Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files
(A) *The college RTP committee shall evaluate all candidates' files in accordance with standards established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university.*
(B) *The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the academic unit's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.*
(C) *The college committee shall prepare and forward an independent, written evaluation to the college Dean concerning each RTP candidate. The evaluation must conclude with a personnel action recommendation in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.*

3.6.7 Recommendations
(A) *For all candidates seeking reappointment or tenure, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit as part of its evaluation of the candidate and recommend whether reappointment or tenure should be granted or denied.*
(B) *For all candidates seeking promotion, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit and make a positive or negative recommendation with respect to the proposed action.*
(C) *The college RTP Committee shall forward to the Dean the entire candidate file, including its own evaluations and recommendations and those from the academic unit.*
(D) *The college committee shall inform all candidates of the committee's recommendation in writing.*

3.7 Dean of the College
The Dean has a unique role in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college.

3.7.1 General Responsibilities *The Dean mentors the chairs and directors of academic units regarding their roles in the RTP process; encourages academic units to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance; provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee; and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with the policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university. The Dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.*

3.7.2 Responsibilities with Regard to RTP Recommendations *The Dean shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations and recommendations from academic units and the college RTP committee, and provide a written, independent recommendation to the Provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier* in Sections 2.1 to 2.3.3.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and academic units' RTP committees. The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9 President
The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.

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 *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. 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.

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.*

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.

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 associate rank. 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. 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
Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty
The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he or she is making significant progress toward tenure. Based upon criteria established by the academic unit and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress (i.e., engaging in research activities that support peer-reviewed publications) *in his or her program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements* (i.e., at last one peer-reviewed publication)*. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the* academic unit *level and consistent with* academic unit *and college service expectations.*

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in his or her 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 academic unit *level and consistent with* academic unit *and college service expectations.*

5.2 Awarding of Tenure
The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served. The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, college, and the university. For review of an Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor normally are awarded together.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor
An Associate Professor is expected to be an excellent teacher who is highly effective in the classroom, fosters quality learning experiences, and is responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA. The candidate is expected to have produced high-quality peer reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The

candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor
Standards for promotion to the rank of Professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to Associate Professor. A Full Professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer reviewed work at the national or international levels. In addition, a Full Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university, as well as either in the community or to the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion
A potential candidate shall receive initial guidance from the chair or director of his or her academic unit and the Dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant Professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Tenured Associate Professors may apply for early promotion to the rank of Full Professor. However, non-tenured faculty members who hold the rank of Associate Professor may not apply for early promotion to Full Professor without also seeking early tenure.

5.5.1 Early Tenure *Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.*

In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

5.5.2 Early Promotion *In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or Full Professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the academic unit and college policies.*

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion, but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

6.1 *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 *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 Office staff of *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.* An email with the list of candidates will also be sent to all faculty, staff and students. During times when campus is not open, HSC will post the list of candidates on the faculty and student BeachBoard sites. *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 *Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the academic unit RTP committee by the deadline.*

6.5 *The* HSC *RTP committee 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 *The chair or director of* HSC*, 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 *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 *The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.*

6.9 *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 *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 *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 *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 (10) 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 *The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.*

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 HSC and to approval by the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.

8.2 University Approval of this Document
The RTP policies and procedures of the academic units and the college are subject to the review and approval of the Provost.

8.3 Amendments
Amendments to this document may be initiated by petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the entire full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of HSC*. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the* HSC Department Chair *shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the* department *faculty at least two weeks* (i.e., 14 calendar days) *prior to voting.*

This policy must always align with CHHS and University requirements and policies. Thus, amendments to this policy may be required to remain in compliance with University policies. Upon receiving a notice of required amendment by the university or CHHS, the HSC Department Chair shall communicate the required amendment(s) to the tenured and probationary faculty members in the Department and the policy shall be amended accordingly.

8.3.1 Voting *Voting on amendments shall be by secret ballot of the preceding academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CBA.*

8.3.2 Majority Approval Required *To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the Dean and the Provost.*

8.3.3 Voting Rights *Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the CHHS, including those on leave and those participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) during a semester of active service, are eligible to vote on RTP policy matters.*