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REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

(This policy supersedes Policy Statement 09-10 and 96-12)

(This policy statement was approved by the CSULB Academic Senate on October 19, 2023, approved by the CSULB President on November 28, 2023)

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the mission, vision, and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members (including coaches, librarians, and Counseling and Psychological Services faculty) eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The university RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.

# MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES

## University Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.

## Principles

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's mission. A university policy establishing standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing flexibility to recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual disciplines. This policy strives to balance clarity and flexibility by establishing roles and university-wide expectations and giving directions to college and department[1](#_bookmark0) RTP policies. In particular, college and department policies must be consistent with this policy, meaning that college and department policies must observe inclusions/exclusion and minima/maxima articulated in this policy, but they may match or exceed within the boundaries established by this policy. Colleges, and departments, where department policies exist, must create specific guidelines for how faculty can fulfill the University's academic mission, while abiding by these principles:

* + 1. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in all three of the following areas:
       - instructional activities;
       - research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and
       - service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.
    2. RTP reviews must be clear, fair, transparent, and unbiased at all levels. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.

1 Throughout this document the term “department” should be construed to refer to departments and recognized independent programs.

* + 1. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards consistent with the department, college and university RTP policies for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

## Values

The criteria according to which decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are made are among the clearest expressions of the university community’s values. The criteria in this policy are based on, and all college and department RTP policies should embody, the following values:

* + 1. CSULB values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should reflect these values.

CSULB recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

* + 1. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive, inclusive, collegial environment benefiting the CSULB community. This policy should be interpreted as valuing these actions. All college and department RTP policies should implement mechanisms to recognize these contributions, and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.
    2. CSULB recognizes that faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should value diverse forms of RSCA and create mechanisms to recognize and reward them.
    3. Shared governance is vital to CSULB’s mission. Good academic citizenship requires all faculty, especially those privileged with tenure, to contribute to shared governance at more than one level. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should acknowledge and reward service in shared governance.
    4. All faculty must contribute to CSULB’s mission in all three areas: instruction, RSCA, and service. However, since faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting CSULB’s mission, this policy should be construed as allowing for adjustments in the weights assigned to instruction, RSCA, and service based upon faculty strengths as well as department, college, and university needs.

# RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instructional activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

The work of advising and mentoring is often discipline specific, cutting across multiple evaluation areas. Colleges and departments shall articulate expectations and possibilities for advising and mentorship as appropriate to each area of evaluation.

## Instructional Activities

As a comprehensive public university, all CSULB faculty members are expected to demonstrate they are effective at teaching a diverse student body, regardless of instructional mode. However, instruction, as defined in this policy, encompasses many activities. Instruction is any action designed to engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to their success, regardless of whether it is part of formal coursework.

Colleges and departments are strongly encouraged to provide examples of instructional activities in their

own policies. Instructional activities could include but are not limited to classroom instruction; chairing thesis committees; supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study, research, internships, honors, student teaching; and instructionally-related mentoring and advising students and other faculty. Curriculum and course development may also be instructional activities. Colleges and departments should make clear where faculty members must disclose and describe any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time.

CSULB recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CSULB also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:

* continuous professional learning,
* thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction, and
* the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals.

The following subsections are designed to guide candidates, their evaluators, and those revising college and department RTP policies to understand how this document defines effective instruction, its assessment, and to provide parameters for candidates documenting & committees evaluating instruction.

College or department RTP policies should further delineate or specify instructional activities, the kinds and amount of supporting evidence candidates may submit, as well as include other examples of supporting evidence.

Colleges and departments should employ multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and must not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms as evidence.

* + 1. Continuous Professional Learning

Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) what they have invested in their own learning and growth as instructors.

Within their supporting documentation, candidates should provide evidence documenting this professional learning. Evidence supporting the narrative could include, but is not limited to, participation in on or off campus professional development activities, conferences, and lessons learned observing or discussing the instruction of peers.

* + 1. Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective instruction requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning. Effective teaching is thoughtful teaching. Deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and change their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate the need to do so.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and the committees should consider) their formative assessment practices, including (1) discussion of one or more course goals, aims, or practices the candidate decided to change, (2) the evidence alerting the candidate something needed to change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided the course(s) would change.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes,

and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes.

* + 1. Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

Effective instruction engages and helps students learn the desired course outcomes. Instructional methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) effective instructional strategies for student learning.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), assessments, syllabi, peer observations, a short video clip of the candidate’s teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, support letters, qualitative or quantitative student perception data, and other supporting documentation.

## Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

CSULB faculty engage in a variety of valuable scholarly and creative activities. Because academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), the University RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees engaged in evaluating scholarly work. Departments and colleges must develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA, including examples of specific accomplishments. These definitions, standards, and criteria should value scholarly contributions which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities.

Evaluation criteria should recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and values discussed in section 1, including the importance of involving students in RSCA.

In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Examples below

**should not** be construed as exhaustive or recommended:

* Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.
* Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.
* Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.
* Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.

Departments and colleges, however, **should not limit** candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments. Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.

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.

Within their narratives candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) their scholarly vision or program--the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work and aims or expected outcomes of their work. They should discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities are high quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. The narrative is not meant to be merely a list of activities and candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment. Candidates are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their fields. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

## Service

Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, and the academic profession and strengthens shared governance processes. Universities cannot and should not function without faculty service contributions. Therefore, service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators. It is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation.

All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of shared governance on campus and to maintain active engagement benefitting the university, community, and/or profession through high-quality service contributions and activities throughout their careers.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles. The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive:

* Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university, CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to CFA.
* Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise.
* Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.

The University RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees engaged in evaluating service work. Colleges and departments must develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of service.

. Departments and colleges must make clear to candidates the types of service appropriate to faculty rank, experience, and course load. In no case shall departments and colleges limit candidates to an exclusive list of service activities or accomplishments necessary for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Differential workloads may result in varied service expectations.

Department and college criteria should recognize not only quantity of service activity but also its quality and duration. Evaluation criteria should also consider the value and impact of each candidate’s service activities. Departments and colleges may decide to emphasize balanced service across campus, community, and

profession. All faculty, however, are expected to contribute to shared governance activities on campus.

As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first- generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. Service activities like these (whether academic or personal, supporting faculty or students), may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways. Department and college policy should specify the evaluation criteria and the process to recognize their importance and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.

Department and college evaluation criteria should also be based on recognition that service to the community or profession should connect to candidates’ academic expertise and professional goals. Departments and colleges are encouraged to outline criteria that acknowledge work done in support of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, on campus and off campus as well as in support of racial and social justice, including for instance the elimination of anti-Blackness more broadly.

Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity. In general, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or actions (for instance, what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and then describe outcomes or impact of the work. Student mentoring or advising (when being considered as service) could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g., numbers of students, extent of work) and impact of the candidate's work, highlighting student success. Candidates can describe off-campus or profession-linked work in terms of what the work is, how it utilizes the candidate's academic expertise, and how it impacts the profession or wider community. In general, candidates should discuss and (when possible) document the importance, scope, and length of their service accomplishments, noting the time, effort, and amount of work involved in the activities as well as (when possible) the overall impact of the service and the number of individuals impacted.

Candidates should describe, and department and colleges should recognize and take into account as part of the service workload activities supporting our diverse student population, including underserved, first- generation, and/or underrepresented students.

# RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, 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 department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

## Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional trainings and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for

collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate’s documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes 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 to the university, community, and/or profession. 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.

## Department RTP Policy

The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college- level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.

The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department’s tenure-track and tenured faculty.

## Department RTP Committee

The department 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. Department RTP committee members are responsible for evaluating the candidate’s performance by applying the criteria of the department.

The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the department’s RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full- time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

No single individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

## Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring. The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university processes and procedures.

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

## College RTP Policy

The college RTP policy must specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with the university RTP policy. The college RTP policy must ensure consistency of standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the college.

The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the college.

## College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate’s file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee must take into serious account the department’s specific standards for evaluating the candidate. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.

## Dean of the College

The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, facilitates mechanisms for guiding/mentoring candidates in the RTP process, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

The dean of the college shall review the candidate’s file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

## 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 department RTP committees.

The provost shall review the candidate’s file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

## 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.

# TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenure-track and tenured undergo performance review and evaluation. Tenure-track 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.

## Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Reappointment

In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the college dean. The periodic evaluation in the first year may just be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean.

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.

## Evaluation of Tenure-track 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 tenure-track 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.

## Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under 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.

# REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION 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.

## Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that they are making significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

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 their program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

## 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 work over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive in all three areas. 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 areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

## Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

An associate professor is expected to teach well, foster quality learning experiences, and be responsive to the needs of CSULB’s diverse students and 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 their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have made high- quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.

## Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Standards for promotion to full 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. Successful candidates will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. Candidates are expected to have disseminated a substantial body of professionally and/or peer-reviewed work at the local, national and/or international levels. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession.

## Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and 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. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

* + 1. Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in exceptional cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways. The candidate's record 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 of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

* + 1. Early Promotion

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 that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways.

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

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.

# STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

* 1. The Office of Faculty 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).
  2. The Office of Faculty Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.
  3. Departments must post outside the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. Departments must also disseminate this list to department faculty unit employees, staff, and students electronically. The announcements shall invite statements about qualifications and work of the candidate and its impact. These submissions may be electronic, but cannot be anonymous.
  4. A copy of all statements submitted during the open period shall be provided to the candidate by the department RTP committee chair or department chair. The department RTP committee chair or department chair collects, prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate’s file, and submits the materials via the university approved process.
  5. Candidates prepare materials for review and submit them via the university-approved process by the deadline.
  6. The department 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.
  7. The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee, reviews the candidate’s materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.
  8. 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.
  9. The dean reviews the candidate’s materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President (or designee) by the deadline.
  10. The President (or designee) reviews the candidate’s materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation. The President (or designee) makes final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or designee) notifies the candidate (and all levels of review) in writing of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline. The decision letter shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.

# ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

* 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.
  2. If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP file shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.
  3. Either the candidate or evaluators may ask to have new materials placed in the file after the deadline. Such additions shall be limited to items that became available after the file was submitted as verified by the College RTP Committee. Copies of the added material shall be provided to the faculty unit employee. When material has been added to the file in this manner, the file shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee (the Department RTP Committee) for review, evaluation, and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review.
  4. At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the evaluation and recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before it 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 (as defined in the CBA) following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate’s rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP file as it advances and shall also be sent to any previous review levels.
  5. The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

7.6. When ratings (e.g., excellent, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) are used in evaluation reports, the definition and scales of rating must be provided to the candidate.

# 8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

Changes to CSULB RTP *procedures* may occur because of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs, and these changes should be communicated in a timely manner.

**EFFECTIVE: Fall 2024**