CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

PREAMBLE

The ability of a college to serve fully its diverse university community, to progress in teaching, research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA), and to achieve excellence in these endeavors depends upon the individual and collective performance of the faculty. Therefore, the success and reputation of a college are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among its faculty and the effectiveness with which these talents are utilized and recognized to accomplish the mission of the college.

To achieve and maintain high quality education in the College of Engineering (COE) an effective and fair faculty evaluation process is essential. The goal of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process involves the evaluation of achievements and professional development of a faculty member in creating high-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities, RSCA, and services that benefit the university community, the people of California and the world. The faculty review process should also encourage professional growth, excellence in performance, and continuous improvement, while permitting flexibility in recognizing the unique contributions of individual faculty members in the context of individual disciplines. The core emphasis of the faculty review process should be the quality of performance, with measurable impacts on academic and professional growth as well as the advancement of the missions of the college and the university.

This document is the COE Policy for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) for the Engineering and Computer Science probationary and tenured faculty. This policy was developed in accordance with the University RTP Policy (PS 23-24), which governs and supersedes the COE Policy. Additionally, the RTP Policy for the COE faculty should be in compliance with the Unit 3 (faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA).

The objectives of this policy are to:
- clarify and define areas, criteria, and standards for evaluating COE faculty in alignment with the university policy;
- provide guidelines for candidates, departments, review committees, and administrators in understanding the specific standards/criteria appropriate for RTP considerations in the COE;
- guide candidates to assemble necessary evidence to document the activities evaluated in the RTP process;
- promote and encourage equitable college standards.

This policy recognizes the diversity of departments and programs within the College and considers the needs and priorities of each department, while providing guidelines for the development of department policies and appropriate evaluation criteria. It requires that each department provide their specific standards and criteria related to the discipline and consistent with college and university policy.

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The College of Engineering (COE) is dedicated to excellence in the following three areas of faculty evaluation:
- instructional activities;
- research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);
- service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

Faculty members shall be evaluated on their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the review period in all three areas.

The COE RTP process is intended to be a rigorous assessment of the faculty in all three areas of evaluation, while fully acknowledging that the strength of the College is derived from the diversity of its members and their individual, unique contributions to the mission and goals of the College. The COE values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, this policy aims to minimize the inequality caused by cultural and identity taxations. In this context, the process of faculty reviews and evaluations within all COE departments shall include:
- clarity of expectations and responsibilities;
- consistent standards;
- constructive and proactive evaluation;
- formative feedback;
- review by peers and students.

In line with the COE's mission and vision, the College RTP process shall recognize and encourage:
- excellence in instructional activities and in research, scholarly and creative activities;
- commitment to teaching and learning;
- professional development and involvement in professional activities;
- commitment to student success;
- faculty mentoring and advising;
- professionalism;
- assessment for continuous improvement;
- shared governance and service at more than one level to the Department, College, and University;
- service to the community, and profession.

Since faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting CSULB's mission, this policy allows for adjustments in the weights assigned to instruction, RSCA, and service based upon faculty

strengths as well as department, college, and university needs. This policy also recognizes faculty contributions that support the mission of the college and the university that result as part of cultural and identity taxation. 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.

2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION AND REVIEW

Faculty shall be evaluated in the following areas:
- Instructional activities;
- Research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);
- Service.

2.1 INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

In alignment with CSULB's commitment to effective teaching across diverse instructional modes, all faculty members within the COE are expected to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness through a range of activities designed to teach, engage students, support their learning, and contribute to their success. Instruction involves various activities aimed at engaging students and facilitating their academic achievements, including but not limited to delivering appropriate content, clearly communicating objectives, and utilizing appropriate assessment methods to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes. Evaluation areas should include, but are not limited to:
- Assessment of teaching effectiveness of the instructor;
- Organization and quality of teaching materials and methods;
- Efforts to improve and update the curriculum and instructional methods to enhance students' learning, such as developing new courses and laboratories, employing innovative teaching strategies, enhancing the overall learning environment, creating a new degree, certificate, etc.

Each department shall specify the types of instructional activities for which faculty members must report, especially those involving reassigned time for instructionally related activities. The process of effective instruction is recognized as an evolving practice, influenced by various modes, levels, and types of instruction, including High Impact Practices that enhance student learning opportunities. Effective teaching practices may include, but are not limited to:

2.1.1   Continuous Professional Learning: Faculty should remain updated on both their subject matter and pedagogical strategies to effectively support a diverse student population. This includes participating in professional development, conferences, and learning from peer feedback. Candidates shall document their professional growth and provide evidence such as participation records and reflections on peer feedback.

2.1.2 Reflection and Instructional Adaptation: Effective teaching involves ongoing reflection on instructional practices and their impact on student learning. Faculty should engage in formative assessments, reflect on the results, and adapt their teaching methods as needed. Candidates shall discuss any changes made to their courses based on formative assessment, and provide evidence of these changes through syllabi, assignments, and other relevant materials.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Faculty should use instructional methods that align with course and curriculum goals, accommodate diverse student needs, and facilitate achievement of desired outcomes. Candidates shall present evidence of effective and appropriate instructional strategies, which may include student work samples, assessments, peer observations, teaching videos, and other relevant materials. Assessment of course learning outcomes and/or student learning outcomes required for program review or accreditation are strongly encouraged to demonstrate effective instructional practices and learning.

Departments shall use a range of evidence to assess effectiveness of instructional activities, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation beyond just required student evaluations. This may include, but is not limited to, student work samples such as assignments, projects, and exams that demonstrate student learning and achievement; assessment results from quizzes, tests, and other tools that reflect student performance; detailed syllabi showing clear course learning outcomes and course organization ; peer observations with feedback from colleagues; creation and use of educational materials such as textbooks, monographs, lab manuals, hardware and software; organizing field trips and industrial tours to enhance learning; supervision of independent studies, research projects, theses, and dissertations; incorporating research findings into teaching; implementing best practices in advising and mentoring; application of best practices to encourage academic integrity; contributing to student success through various initiatives; and responding to industry needs by adjusting teaching and curriculum to meet current and future demands of the engineering and technology sectors.

Evaluators should consider a holistic review of all the multiple modes of evidence provided and student evaluations should be complementary; considered within context, and as a tool for continuous improvement of the instructional practices. Evaluators must not rely solely on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms or course GPA as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)

Engineering and computer science are dynamic, fast developing, and constantly evolving fields of study. Consequently, research and scholarly activities and achievements are critical to the development of the faculty and to fulfill the mission of the College of Engineering. The contribution to research and scholarly activities provides the faculty with insight and knowledge that can be applied to curricular development and classroom presentation, as well as expanding the student learning experience by engaging them in the research and publication process.

Every member of the COE faculty is expected to develop an ongoing research program and make significant contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community demonstrated through a peer review process or other appropriate processes. As outlined in the University Policy, RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take diverse forms. Examples can include but are not limited to:

- 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 refereed journal and refereed conference publications appropriate to the discipline (departments may determine the appropriate journals and conferences), patents, patent applications, invited talks, grant proposals, development of software/hardware systems, and/or other.

- 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, book chapters, industrial standards/manuals, technical reports, grant proposals, meta-analyses, and/or others.

- 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/industrial reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, mentorship of students in RSCA activities, and/or others.

- 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, grant proposals supporting instructional activities, and/or others.

Other types of evidence may include citation of research; research awards, recognitions and honors by professional societies, government agencies, and industry; research collaboration with academic, professional organizations, and industry; research fellowships and other recognitions. Each department should consider additional details and areas of evaluation as appropriate. Departments 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.

2.3 SERVICE

COE faculty are expected to demonstrate commitment to the mission and the goals of the department, College, University, community, and profession. Faculty contributions in service should be acknowledged and valued and not be diminished or considered less important than instruction and RSCA. Acceptable service activities may take both informal and formal forms within a structured role, and the evaluative areas of services outlined below should not be construed as exhaustive:

- Campus Service: Active participation and appropriate leadership roles in the department, College, University, CSU systemwide committees, and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs and facilities; supervision of student workers; engagement in student organizations; and service to the CFA, etc.

- Service to the Profession: Participation in professional activities such as serving as a chair/organizer of professional meetings, membership on technical program committees, leadership in professional societies, external grant reviewer, peer-reviewer for scholarly publications, and mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students, etc.

- Community Service: Participation and engagement in community activities, services, and board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise, etc.

Each department must clearly communicate to the candidates the types of service appropriate to their faculty rank, experience, and course load. Both candidates and evaluators should assess service activities not only in terms of quantity but also with a focus on their quality, duration, and impact. Contribution to diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, both on campus and off campus, as well as supporting racial and social justice – including, but not limited to, the elimination of anti-Blackness – broadly should be acknowledged and valued.

As stated in section 2.3 of the University Policy, 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. Although service activities like these may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways, evaluators should recognize their importance, and candidates should endeavor to describe and provide evidence of these activities.

Additional guidelines can be found in the University RTP Policy.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES

As stated in Section 3 of the University RTP Policy.

4. TIMELINES FOR RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 4 of the University RTP Policy.

5. REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

5.1 **Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty**
Consistent with the university considerations/criteria stated in Section. 5.1 of the University Policy, the candidate must demonstrate and provide evidence of:
   1. Effective teaching that is, for example, responsive to the learning needs of the COE's diverse students and to the college and university educational mission and goals.
   2. Adequate progress and promise in research, scholarly and creative activities as evidenced by, for example, publications/presentations, writing and submitting grant proposals, establishing research lab/program, supervising and engaging students in research.
   3. Service to department, college, university, community, and profession consistent with the level of review/reappointment, for example, participation in at least one level of committee service at the department, college, or university.

Specific criteria and requirements for each area of review should be specified by department RTP policy.

5.2 Awarding Tenure

Awarding tenure is the long-term commitment of university to faculty and requires clear and effective demonstration of the ability to make on-going and increasingly impactful contributions to the university and the profession. The candidate for tenure must demonstrate:
   1. Effective teaching, as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.1 above and Section 5.2 of university policy, as well as the promise and evidence of continued growth and fulfillment of instructional and programmatic needs after awarding of tenure.
   2. Research progress and accomplishment as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.2 above and Section 5.2 of university policy, as well as evidence of continued and sustained growth in research and scholarly activities.
   3. Service as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.3 above and Section 5.2 of university policy as well as evidence of continued service to department, college, university, and profession.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department RTP policy.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate must demonstrate:
1. Effective teaching, as evidenced and documented in Section 2.1 above and Section 5.3 of university policy as well as establishment of teaching area responsive to the needs of diverse students and the COE educational mission.
2. Research progress and promise as evidenced and documented according to Section 2.2 above and Section 5.3 of university policy, as well as establishment of one's research area.
3. Service as evidenced by and documented in Section 2.3 above and Section 5.3 of university policy.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department RTP policy.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

A full professor is expected to demonstrate a continuous and consistent record of achievement in all areas of evaluation. The candidate must demonstrate:
1. Consistent record of excellence in instruction teaching and instructionally related activities as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.1 above and Section 5.4 of university policy.
2. Proven research achievements and high-quality and impactful contributions to the field as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.2 above and Section 5.4 of university policy.
3. Continued and significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.3 above and Section 5.4 of the university policy.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department RTP policy.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

Early tenure and/or early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and college dean regarding requirements, criteria, and expectations for early tenure and/or early promotion. The candidate must satisfy the criteria stated in the university policy Section 5.5 (5.5.1 for early tenure and/or 5.5.2 for early promotion as applicable).

The candidate must demonstrate distinctive achievements in all three areas of evaluation. For instructionally related activities, the candidate should have developed or taught a robust number of courses in the discipline spanning undergraduate and graduate levels; developed creative and effective pedagogies; and achieved consistently high student evaluations in all categories. For RSCA, the candidate should have developed an established research program at CSULB, acquired a substantial amount of externally funded research grants as a principal investigator; and published

a substantial number of papers in prestigious peer-reviewed journals/conferences. External evaluation of research impact is strongly encouraged according to the University Policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities. For service, the candidate should have demonstrated a consistent and substantial leadership role in key campus committees as well as professional societies.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department RTP policy.

6.   STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 6 of the University RTP Policy.

7.   ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

As stated in Section 7 of the University RTP Policy.

8.   CHANGES TO COE RTP POLICY

Changes to the COE RTP Policy may occur as a result of:

1. Changes in the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), as well as changes in the University RTP Policy and/or Procedures
2. Amendments approved by the majority vote of the COE tenured and probationary faculty and approved by the College Dean and the University Provost

Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and probationary faculty to the College Dean

2. By action of the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

College RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

College of Engineering

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below)	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature	Date
01/21/2025	Shailesh Chandra *Shailesh Chandra*	01/21/2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below)	College Dean Name & Signature	Date
1/21/25	Jinny Rhee *Jinny Rhee*	1/21/25

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below)	AVPFA Name & Signature	Date
1/21/25	Patricia Perez *Patricia Perez*	1/21/25

Provost Signature	Date
signature	01/22/25