

Approved by Academic Affairs (Amendment to Section 2. RTP Areas of Evaluation): \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

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

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

CNSM 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) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three areas.

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

**2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of excellence in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards. Candidates for tenure and promotion recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent and competent in each area of evaluation for tenure and promotion. While written feedback during the reappointment review at the college level is required, the use of the specific terms excellent, competent, or deficient is discouraged. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of research, scholarly and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

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

52

**53 2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

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

62

**63 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

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

72

**73 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and method**

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

88

**89 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher**

90 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing her/his  
91 courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches used by assessing  
92 her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should be based on student  
93 evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the candidate. The candidate  
94 should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward a continuous improvement in  
95 teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time should be described by the candidate  
96 in the narrative and supported with relevant materials. This record may include interactions with  
97 colleagues on pedagogy, classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in  
98 programs of the Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars  
99 or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that  
100 contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

101

**102 2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes**

103 Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and  
104 course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and goals.  
105 Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with course goals.  
106

### 107 2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction

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

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

## 126 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

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

133 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to suggestions  
134 for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations), 2) comments on any  
135 changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of circumstances that might mitigate  
136 unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4) any additional information provided that  
137 may be of assistance in evaluating the  
138 candidate's teaching effectiveness.  
139

140 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly rigor of  
141 courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses taught by  
142 tenured/probationary faculty members.  
143

144 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness, including a  
145 critical analysis of all student input. This analysis must assess the significance of the candidate's  
146 student course evaluation data.  
147

148 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and content should be  
149 based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating the learning process.  
150

151 2.2.5. As part of the review process, a minimum of four class visits shall be made by at least  
152 two members of the department RTP committee. These class visits must be conducted during  
153 the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is not teaching at CSULB

154 that semester; in this case, the visitations from the prior year shall be used). The candidate  
 155 should be informed that the visits normally will occur during the open period. The candidate will  
 156 receive notice of at least five days prior to the start of the classroom visit period, which will  
 157 normally occur over a two to three week period. The candidate may submit course syllabi or  
 158 otherwise notify the RTP committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the  
 159 committee to  
 160 choose most appropriate days for visits. The committee members' evaluations of the candidate  
 161 in the classroom should address such factors as instructional clarity, communication with the  
 162 students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and  
 163 mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and  
 164 electronic media or demonstrations. Written  
 165 reports based on class visits must be placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to the  
 166 candidate. The signed reports must include times and dates of the visits.

167  
 168 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the candidate in  
 169 supervisory courses.

170  
 171 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned time for this  
 172 activity, he/she should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this effort and should  
 173 address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in meeting student needs.

174  
 175 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities

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

180  
 181 2.2.8.1. Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching;

182  
 183 2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;

184  
 185 2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis research  
 186 supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation of such research;

187  
 188 2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories;

189  
 190 2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the candidate's  
 191 assigned workload, and mentoring of students;

192  
 193 2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;

194  
 195 2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-  
 196 based materials;

197  
 198 2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for  
 199 Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of improving  
 200 instruction; and

201  
 202 2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other forums for the  
 203 dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of novel teaching methods  
 204 to faculty colleagues.

- 205  
206 2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:  
207  
208 2.2.9.1 Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;  
209  
210 2.2.9.2 Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the same course  
211 unless the course has significantly changed over time);  
212  
213 2.2.9.3 Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and homework sets;  
214 and,  
215  
216 2.2.9.4 If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to students (e.g.  
217 a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).  
218  
219 2.2.10 Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.  
220  
221 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline Candidates should present evidence  
222 that they have kept abreast of developments in the discipline and applied these in their  
223 instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most directly achieved through maintaining an active  
224 program of research or scholarly activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific  
225 conferences and reading of appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.  
226  
227 2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)  
228  
229 2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA  
230 College faculty members must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that  
231 demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty members are  
232 expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement,  
233 application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are disseminated to appropriate audiences.  
234 Candidates should refer to their respective department policies for definitions and criteria for  
235 evaluation of RSCA. Department standards may be higher than college-level standards.  
236 Candidates for tenure must develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in  
237 peer-reviewed publications in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator. The  
238 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the  
239 candidate's scholarly activity and this narrative must identify the candidate's responsibility and  
240 intellectual contribution to particular research projects. A candidate's research program must be  
241 conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the faculty at CSULB. Research  
242 collaborations are encouraged and departments must define how they are to be evaluated and  
243 meet the publication requirement. The department RTP policy shall provide specific additional  
244 departmental requirements in research and shall list discipline-specific criteria used in evaluating  
245 RSCA. Candidates for promotion to professor must have a record of RSCA activity after their  
246 promotion to associate professor that results in peer-reviewed RSCA products.  
247  
248 2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA  
249  
250 2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA element to  
251 consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The  
252 candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The  
253 evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific  
254 RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The candidate's  
255 documentation and the review of it will focus on continuing professional

256 development, and this theme should be the central organizing element of the  
 257 candidate's narrative. The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to  
 258 evaluators in understanding the candidate's intellectual and professional  
 259 achievements in this category, the nature of student involvement in the candidate's  
 260 RSCA (if applicable), and how the candidate places this work in relation to the  
 261 evaluation criteria described in the department, college, and university RTP policies.  
 262

263 2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted, examples of the  
 264 candidate's best work along with an explanation of why these materials should be  
 265 regarded as significant contributions. Reviewers will give particular consideration to  
 266 the quality of these examples. For jointly authored activities the candidate must  
 267 identify the specific extent of her/his participation. Documentation from at least one  
 268 senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if the  
 269 candidate only has co-authored publications.  
 270

271 2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The  
 272 documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP  
 273 review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the  
 274 supplementary documentation binder.  
 275

276 2.3.2.4. External evaluations of the candidate's contributions to the discipline will be  
 277 considered, consistent with the provisions of the current CBA and university policy.  
 278

### 279 2.3.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to RSCA

280 Candidates are expected to be involved in multiple RSCA related activities beyond the peer  
 281 review publication expectations defined by the departments for tenure and promotion. The list  
 282 below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities  
 283 that may be considered by RTP evaluators in this category. Peer-reviewed RSCA products are  
 284 given greater weight than non peer-reviewed products.  
 285

286 2.3.3.1. Publication of additional peer-reviewed paper(s) in established journals in the area of  
 287 expertise;  
 288

289 2.3.3.2. Publication of a peer-reviewed book or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book;  
 290

291 2.3.3.3. Successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship of  
 292 publications and presentations with students as evidenced by student presentations  
 293 at scientific meetings;  
 294

295 2.3.3.4. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings and conferences;  
 296

297 2.3.3.5. Awards of peer-reviewed applications for external funding;  
 298

299 2.3.3.6. Applications for external funds to support ongoing RSCA;  
 300

301 2.3.3.7. Citations of the candidate's work in other authors' peer-reviewed works or in books;  
 302

303 2.3.3.8. Applied research or professional activity to address problems of importance to the  
 304 disciplines and society;  
 305

306 2.3.3.9. Awards of internal grants;

307 2.3.3.10. Editorial/reviewer assignments with recognized professional publications or review  
308 panels for research grants calling for professional expertise;

309  
310 2.3.3.11. Textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses beyond the  
311 candidate's own personal teaching; or  
312

313 2.3.3.12. Patents that resulted from the candidate's research or professional activity.  
314

315 The department RTP policy shall list specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for  
316 tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate, disseminated to  
317 appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to the disciplines or to  
318 interdisciplinary studies.  
319

## 320 2.4. Service

321 Service consists of activities other than teaching and RSCA that result from the candidate's  
322 academic expertise and contribute to the mission of the university. It includes service to the  
323 discipline, the department, the college, the university, and the community. The college  
324 recognizes that the departments have different expectations with regard to service. However,  
325 after reappointment, candidates are expected to expand the scope of participation beyond their  
326 department, and candidates for promotion to professor are expected to assume a leadership  
327 role in some aspect of service.  
328

329 The candidate's narrative should address the nature, the outcomes, and the  
330 contributions of this service to the missions of the university, the college, or the  
331 department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise.  
332

### 333 2.4.1. Criteria for Service

334 Faculty members must participate actively in faculty governance through active involvement on  
335 committees at the department and college levels to receive a positive recommendation for  
336 tenure and promotion to associate professor. A faculty member being considered for promotion  
337 to full professor must demonstrate significant service at the college, university, or CSU system  
338 level. A candidate's service to her/his respective profession will be given consideration. The  
339 quality of service is the primary consideration, rather than mere membership on a number of  
340 committees.  
341

### 342 2.4.2. Evaluation of Service

343 The emphasis in the evaluation of service shall be on: 1) the quality and significance of the  
344 activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions of the  
345 university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and level of the candidate's  
346 involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service. Assessment of the  
347 service to both the university and community shall be based on information described in the  
348 candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence, which may include, but shall not be  
349 limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or  
350 printed programs.  
351

### 352 2.4.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Service

353 The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as service. The list  
354 below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities  
355 that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category.  
356

357 2.4.3.1. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department,

- 358 the college, or the university;
- 359
- 360 2.4.3.2. Sponsoring student groups;
- 361
- 362 2.4.3.3. Actively engaging in institutional educational and research programs;
- 363
- 364 2.4.3.4. Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing);
- 365
- 366 2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through
- 367 discipline-oriented activities such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media
- 368 interviews;
- 369
- 370 2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments, and
- 371 community service organizations;
- 372
- 373 2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships,
- 374 awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in
- 375 the discipline.
- 376

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

378 Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.

379

380 3.1. The CNSM candidate's narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20

381 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins). The narrative should include a

382 discussion of how the candidate addressed substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.

383

384 3.2. Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write evaluations of all RTP candidates

385 unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. Such chair

386 evaluations must be independent of the department RTP committee's evaluation. However, in

387 promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being

388 considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In

389 no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more

390 than one level of review.

391

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

393 Consult the university RTP policy.

394

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

#### 397 **5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

398

399 5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon

400 criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show

401 evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

402

403 5.1.2. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching

404 responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse body of students and to the university's

405 educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in her/his program of ongoing

406 RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is

407 expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental level consistent with

408 departmental and college service expectations.



409

**410 5.2. Awarding of Tenure**

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

416

**417 5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

418

419 5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor  
420 normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty members who have  
421 met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction and instructionally related  
422 activities, RSCA, and service. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure  
423 or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to  
424 associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and  
425 instructionally related activities or in the area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

426

427 5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to be effective  
428 teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in Section 2.2.8 of this  
429 policy.

430

431 5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that the  
432 candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in RSCA. Activities used  
433 in assessing excellence in research are listed in Section 2.3.3 of this policy. The department  
434 RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for tenure and promotion to associate  
435 professor along with the departmental standards for assessment of the quality of the candidate's  
436 accomplishments. All levels of review will use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the  
437 college and university criteria.

438

439 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the  
440 university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in service are  
441 listed in Section 2.4.3 of this policy.

442

**443 5.4. Promotion to Professor**

444

445 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for tenure and  
446 promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the departmental RTP policy. A  
447 professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of effectiveness in teaching, student  
448 engagement, and course or curricular development. The successful candidate will have a  
449 proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to the advancement,  
450 application, or pedagogy of her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is  
451 expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or  
452 international level. In addition, a professor shall have provided significant service and leadership  
453 at the university and in the community or the profession.

454

455 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if deficient in any  
456 area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a candidate must earn at least  
457 one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

458

**459 5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

460 Consult the university RTP policy.

461

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

463 Consult the university RTP policy.

464

465 **7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

466

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

472

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

474

475 **8.1.** Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of changes to  
476 the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to  
477 accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to  
478 procedures do not require a vote by the faculty members.

479

480 **8.2.** The tenured/probationary faculty members of the college, voting by secret ballot (with  
481 pro and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy and evaluation  
482 criteria section of this policy.

483

484 **8.3.** Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

485

486 8.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured/probationary  
487 faculty members or

488

489 8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.

490

491 **8.4.** Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the  
492 faculty members called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be  
493 distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty members at least five (5) instructional  
494 days before the public hearing.

495

496 **8.5.** Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable  
497 vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members voting in a secret ballot  
498 conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and  
499 they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president or designee.

500

501 Approved by Academic Affairs August, 2016.

502

503 Effective: Fall 2016

504

505 \_\_\_\_\_

506 Amendment History:

507 Section 3.1: Narrative guidelines.

508 - Approved by the Faculty of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics: 2/22/2022

509 - Approved by the NSM Faculty Council: 4/29/2022

- 510 - Approved by the CNSM Richard D. Green Dean Dean, Curtis Bennett: 4/30/2022
- 511 - Approved by Faculty Affairs: 5/2/2022
- 512 Section 2.0: RTP Areas of Evaluation – Drop Rankings for Reappointment
- 513 - Approved by the Faculty of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics: 2/20/2024
- 514 - Approved by the NSM Faculty Council: 5/30/2024
- 515 - Approved by the CNSM Richard D. Green Dean Dean, Curtis Bennett: 5/30/2024
- 516 - Approved by Faculty Affairs: