CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for the College of Education establishes the vision, commitment and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This policy is informed by the vision and commitment of California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) and the College of Education (CED) and other guiding principles that are discussed below.

1.0 CED VISION, COMMITMENT, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES

1.1 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.

1.2 CED Vision and Commitment
Vision: Leaders in Advancing Equity and Urban Education
Commitment Statement: CSULB's College of Education is committed to advancing equity and urban education by enacting racial and social justice. We illuminate sources of knowledge and truths through our intersectional scholarship, pedagogy, and practice. We collaborate with and are responsive to historically marginalized communities. We cultivate critical and innovative educators, counselors, leaders, and life-long learners to transform urban education, locally and globally.

1.3 Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)
Faculty who are committed to teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service are essential to accomplishing the vision and commitment of both the university and the college. Faculty members are expected to:
- Provide high quality instruction;
- Produce quality research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) achievements that contribute to the advancement of scholarship and/or pedagogy within the discipline;
- Make significant and ongoing service contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession; and
- Engage in instructional activities, RSCA, and service activities guided by the college and the university's vision and commitment statement.

This CED policy establishes 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.

1.3.1 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.

The CED values faculty who link their teaching, RSCA, and service. These linkages lead to complex and dynamic interrelationships among these three areas.

1.3.2 RTP reviews must be clear, fair, transparent, and mitigate bias at all levels. The RTP review process must ensure that quality teaching, RSCA, and service aligned with the vision and mission of the College, are rewarded and that faculty members who meet CED and university standards and expectations will advance.

All candidates will be evaluated in each of the three areas as having: Met expectations or Not met expectations. Candidates seeking early promotion and/or early tenure will be evaluated as having: Exceeded expectations, Met expectations; or Not Met Expectations.

1.3.3 Faculty achievements may vary yet still meet the standards consistent with the department, college and university RTP policies for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment, department and college needs, and university mission.

1.4 Values

The criteria for decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are among the clearest expressions of the university community's values. The criteria in this RTP policy are based on the following values:

1.4.1 CED values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility and this RTP policy reflects these values.

In alignment with the university policy, CED recognizes that cultural and identity taxation (i.e., invisible labor - see Lawless, 2017; Matthew, 2016) has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. As such reviews of candidates should consider the ways in which taxation mediates faculty workload and productivity in each area. Examples of these kinds of taxation may include, but not be limited to, excessive service responsibilities due to identity-status, unassigned student advising, scholarship that may be considered non-traditional in the discipline, course assignments that include in-depth exploration of the impact of sociohistorical and political forces on education, etc.

1.4.2 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. The CED policy recognizes these contributions, and guides candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.

1.4.3 CED recognizes that faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways and the college values diverse forms of RSCA and the RSCA section below shows the college commitment to this broad understanding of RSCA.

1.4.4 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.

1.4.5 All faculty must contribute to CSULB's values and strategic plan 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.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

In this policy, the CED defines the standards of quality (i.e. meets expectations) and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instructional activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the college, 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. CED policy articulates expectations and possibilities for advising and mentorship as appropriate to each area of evaluation.

2.1 Instructional Activities

Instruction as defined by this policy incorporates many activities. Instructional activities could include but are not limited to classroom instruction; chairing thesis and dissertations; supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study; faculty-led study abroad classes, internships, honors, clinical practice/student teaching, service learning; program coordination; and instructionally related mentoring and advising students. Curriculum and course development may also be instructional activities. Note that these examples are mentioned to illustrate valued activities rather than set requirements. The most highly valued instructional activities are those that fulfill the college vision and commitments.

CED faculty are expected to demonstrate they are effective at teaching a diverse student body, regardless of instructional mode. Faculty are encouraged to continually engage in self-reflection on their teaching effectiveness, based on their own self-assessment and students' responses to instruction. Faculty are expected to reflect on their commitment to working successfully with our diverse student population, which includes individuals from various racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, with differing prior education experience and current lived experiences. In their narrative, faculty should share how the practice of self-reflection contributes to enhanced teaching effectiveness. To demonstrate ongoing reflection, effective 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.

Materials that may be submitted to reflect the quality of instructional activities include, but are not limited to, syllabi, student learning outcomes (SLOs), sample assessments/assignments, rationale for text selection, summaries of peer observation of instruction, curriculum documents, academic and department advising documents, student learning and engagement activities, and administrative assignments (e.g., program coordinator, area coordinator, assessment coordinator). Submission of student perception of teaching (SPOT) forms (quantitative results/scores; or a combination of quantitative scores and qualitative comments) are mandatory, These materials are limited to 6 pieces of evidence for the period under review (excluding the SPOT Table that is created by the department office) and should be discussed in the narrative.

Reviewers should take a humanizing lens when reviewing candidate files. For instructional activities reviewers should provide feedback that can help faculty reflect on how their practice, pedagogy, and positionality in the classroom shape student learning outcomes. Reviewers should consider the student population of the courses being taught (e.g. undergraduates, credential candidates, graduate students), course content, and mode of instruction. Reviewers should take a holistic approach to evaluating candidate files that includes all areas of instructional activities included in this section and triangulate evidence from the file, not privileging one evidence type over another.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy

Effective teaching requires that faculty members adopt an instructional philosophy that fits their discipline and the needs of their students, considering the diversity of the students in the CED. The faculty member's narrative should clearly articulate their instructional philosophy and how that philosophy is translated into effective, high-quality teaching. They should reflect on their teaching practices as noted above and assess their impact on student learning. This should serve as the foundation for the entire section that focuses on instructional activities.

2.1.2 Continuous Professional Learning

Effective instructors stay current not only with their course content but also with 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. Essentially, how did this professional learning transform their teaching?

Within their supporting documentation, candidates may 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 from observing or discussing the instruction of peers.

2.1.3 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning.

Instructional practices and course materials should clearly state expected learning outcomes and goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. Faculty members are expected to make thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may involve adopting new teaching methodologies. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and adjust their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate a need for change. Instructors in the CED are expected to differentiate instruction to accommodate the diverse students in their classes.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss 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 of a need for change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided to implement the change.

Evidence supporting the narrative may 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.
Faculty should consider using the Faculty Formative Feedback to support their efforts to collect formative assessment data and reflect on this data. See https://www.csulb.edu/faculty-center/faculty-formative-feedback-project.

2.1.4 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

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

The CED considers student voice and perception one part of summative assessment. Therefore, student perception of teaching (SPOT) data needs to be included in faculty files related to summative assessment. While the CED acknowledges that there can be problematic dimensions with anonymous student response to instruction, such as low response rates, negative comments based on student and/or instructor identity-status, or evaluation based on the content

of the course rather than the quality of instruction, SPOT can be used for reflection. As such, candidates should leverage this data, qualitative (i.e., student comments) and/or quantitative (i.e. means) to provide opportunities for critical reflection on their teaching. The department will provide the faculty member with a SPOT table of quantitative data with all SPOT evaluations for the period under review. Faculty should consider this data and student comments and triangulating the information for reflection.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss effective instructional strategies for student learning. Evidence supporting the narrative could include, but is not limited to, student work samples (which may include multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), students emails, 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 of teaching (SPOT) data, and other supporting documentation. A SPOT table with all quantitative summary data for the period under review will be provided for each candidate by their department office. This must be included in the supplemental file materials but does not count toward the 6 pieces of evidence. Additional SPOT data (quantitative or qualitative) can be included in 6 pieces of evidence.

2.2 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.

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 University and CED missions 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. Engagement in RSCA is understood to be a cumulative process that spans an entire career as faculty members develop their scholarly agendas.

Faculty of all ranks are expected to publish peer-reviewed journal articles and other scholarly products that contribute to the knowledge base in their field to meet college expectations for RSCA. The CED highly values engagement in research that leads to peer-reviewed publications

that support the CED vision and commitment statement. In addition, we value a record of scholarly activities that is varied and includes multiple types of scholarly and creative activities. This includes RSCA that, for example, reflects a traditional research paradigm, grant development, professional conference presentations, as well as emerging research paradigms.

The CED wants to humanize the RTP process and create a space in the college for faculty to do the work that is related to our vision and commitment and at the same time is what faculty members are passionate about. Part of humanizing the RTP process is to be transparent for both faculty going through RTP and reviewers who want to support their colleagues through this process. The following section was developed to increase transparency.

The CED highly values peer-reviewed journal articles. For that reason, faculty can meet expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor by publishing at least TWO peer-reviewed journal articles during the period under review or a justification of equivalent publications. The faculty needs to be single, lead, or second author of these articles. Another TWO peer-reviewed journal articles or a justification of equivalent publications during the period under review can meet the expectations for promotion to full professor. These also need to be single, lead, or second- authored. Publications may be published in traditional research journals and/or practitioner-oriented journals. Full text of these articles needs to be included in the supplemental file as evidence for RSCA.

Faculty may choose to make a strong case that another type of peer-reviewed publication is equivalent to a single-authored or lead author or second author peer-reviewed journal article.

Faculty must make additional RSCA contributions. For **tenure and promotion to associate professor**, faculty need at least TWO additional RSCA contributions for the period under review. For **promotion to full professor candidates** need at least TWO additional RSCA contributions for the period under review. The list below provides examples of additional RSCA contributions. This list is not considered exhaustive. The quality of the RSCA product and the venue in which it appears, or is presented, is an important part of the review. Candidates need to provide descriptions in their narrative and in the supplemental file, including details about the audience, venue, whether it was peer-reviewed or invited, and the impact of the scholarship. For example, for public scholarship publications, candidates should describe the venue (e.g., Edutopia, Inside Higher Ed, NEA Today), the audience (e.g., teachers, administrators, policy makers), and the type of distribution (e.g., social media, website, email list serve, used in district policy decision). Each of these additional RSCA contributions need to be included in the supplemental file. RSCA activities that include students and/or alumni are valued by the CED.

Examples of Additional RSCA Contributions

Publications
- Book editor of peer-reviewed book (evidence: table of contents, sample chapter written by candidate)

- Peer-reviewed authored and/or co-authored books (evidence: table of contents, sample chapter written by candidate)
- Peer-reviewed book chapters (evidence: full text)
- Peer-reviewed conference proceedings and papers (evidence: full text)
- Peer-reviewed co-authored journal articles (evidence: full text)
- Public scholarship, policy briefs (evidence: full text)
- Book chapters (non-peer reviewed) (evidence: full text)
- Book reviews (evidence: full text)
- Invited papers and articles (evidence: full text)
- Technical reports (evidence: full text)

Presentations
- Keynote presentations at professional organizations (evidence: conference program)
- Peer-reviewed conference presentations (evidence: conference program)
- Invited conference presentations (evidence: conference program)

Editorial RSCA
- Editor of peer-reviewed journal (evidence: letter from publisher/website)
- Book series editor (evidence: letter from publisher)
- Editorial Board Member (evidence: letter from editor, website)
- Journal reviewer (evidence: letter from editor)
- Conference presentation proposal reviewer (evidence: letter from conference or program chair)

Grants
- External grants funded (evidence: letter from granting agency)
- Fellowships awarded (evidence: letter from granting agency)
- Grant administration (evidence: description of your role as PI of Co-PI)
- Grant writing and/or participation (evidence: email confirming grant was submitted)
- Internal grants funded (evidence: email confirmation)

Other
- Mentorship of students engaged in RSCA (e.g, joint publications, thesis advising, dissertation chair, research assistants; evidence: letters, publications, emails)

In the narrative, the faculty member should describe their scholarly agenda, the nature of their scholarly work, and its impact on the field. The narrative should discuss both the quantity and quality of the candidate's accomplishments. It should discuss how the candidate's accomplishments demonstrate intellectual and professional growth over time, and how their scholarly and creative achievements have been disseminated to appropriate audiences, including professional, practitioner, and public audiences. The narrative should describe the scope of the RSCA audience (international, national, state, or local) and the nature of the collaboration and contribution of the faculty member for co-authored work. The narrative should also address how the RSCA contributes to the vision and commitments of the CED.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss their scholarly vision or program--the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work, aims or expected outcomes of their work, and how these align with the CED vision and commitment statement. 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 (6 maximum for RSCA area). 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. For candidates who author external RSCA grants (funded or unfunded) and choose to highlight them in the narrative or place details in Professional Data Sheet (PDS), the file must include: 1) summary or description of the project; 2) length of grant period; 3) granting agency; 4) amount of award; and 5) brief description of candidates' role in authorship and implementation.

Candidates may include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates decide to withhold these materials, such items must be listed under Works in Progress on the Professional Data Sheet (PDS). RSCA products submitted for the period of review for tenure and promotion to associate professor cannot also be used in subsequent review periods.

Reviewers should take a humanizing lens when reviewing candidate files. Reviewers should take a holistic approach to reviewing elements of RSCA. Reviewers should consider the PDS, narrative, and supplemental evidence in the review. Reviewers should recognize that CED faculty produce a variety of RSCA products that are published in a variety of venues, including peer-reviewed articles in both traditional research journals and practitioner-oriented journals.

2.3 Service

Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, 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.

Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member. Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take various 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 committees, subcommittees, and task forces (elected, ad hoc, appointed); CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to affinity groups; service to CFA; service to program (e.g., admissions).
- Community Service: Board memberships; partnering agencies and/or public schools.
- Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications (this can be either service or RSCA but not both); leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.

CED understands the important role of campus service and faculty governance in our college. All CED faculty are expected to engage in campus service. Assistant professors going up for tenure or promotion to associate professors must provide service to a minimum of two campus service activity types (see above) per year for the period under review (not including the first year as tenure track faculty), with a focus on program/department and college level service. Associate professors going up for promotion to full professor must provide service to a minimum of three campus service activity types (see above) per year with a service focus at all levels (program/department, college and university), including serving in a leadership capacity (chair, vice chair, etc.) for one term. This policy acknowledges that the actual number of committees a faculty member might serve on during a period under review is related to the terms of the committee service.

Faculty service to the community and/or profession should connect to candidates' academic expertise and professional goals. The CED values faculty contributions that support of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, both on campus and off campus, as well as in support of racial and social justice, including, for instance, the broader elimination of anti-Blackness.

The narrative should highlight 6 key service activities and include supporting documentation in the supplemental materials. For these 6 key service activities, faculty should provide a detailed description of the nature of the service, its significance, and how it fulfills the college vision and commitments. All other documentation of service should be included in the PDS. In the PDS, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity. Workload for administrative duties not covered by assigned time should be recorded in PDS as well.

For all service activities, the candidate should discuss in the narrative or denote in the PDS the service objectives or actions (e.g., what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (e.g., officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and then describe outcomes or impact of the work. When considering student mentoring or advising as service, candidates could describe 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 professionally 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 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.

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. CED values these contributions and understands that this contribution might be best shared in the narrative and not have supplemental evidence. In the supplemental file, 6 pieces of evidence for the area of service may include letters from the committee chair, agendas, minutes that reflect where the candidate made a substantive contribution (e.g., a product/policy created by the committee to which they contributed). These should be referred to in the narrative.

Reviewers should take a humanizing lens when reviewing candidate files. Reviewers should take a holistic approach to reviewing elements of Service and consider individual faculty capacity as only 1/5 of our workload is for service. Reviewers should consider the demands of service work including cultural and identity taxation, rank, and expertise. Reviewers should consider that assistant professors should be protected from large amounts of service and that faculty service contributions impact both teaching and RSCA and vice versa.

3.0 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 faculty affairs (as an appropriate administrator), and the president (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair and other RTP advisory resources such as those provided by the university, department RTP workshops, and department colleagues, particularly regarding the RTP process and

procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. It is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional training and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA).

The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence of their accomplishments. Please see section 4.0 for a full explanation of the required documentation.

The candidate shall submit a narrative, not to exceed 15 pages, 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) instructional activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation (a maximum of 6 pieces of evidence per area of evaluation) and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including the candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

CED departments must follow the CED RTP Policy.

3.3 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 and describing the candidate's performance by applying the CED RTP policy to the department review process. The committee is also responsible for ensuring that all required documentation for the review is present in the file.

The committee members will then evaluate the performance in each area as having "met expectations" or "not met expectations". Candidates must meet expectations in all three areas of review (instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service) to be granted reappointment, tenure, and /or promotion. Candidates seeking early promotion and/or early tenure will be evaluated as having: Exceeded expectations, Met expectations; or Not Met Expectations.

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.

3.4 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 department chair (and/or dean) shall meet with the department RTP committee members prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the college and university processes and procedures. Department chairs are given the option to 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.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The CED RTP policy specifies the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with the university RTP policy. The CED RTP policy ensures consistency of standards across the college. The CED 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. The College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the college.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The CED RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations, if any. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the college and university RTP policies. The CED RTP committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the college RTP documents. The committee members will evaluate the performance as having met expectations or not met expectations. Candidates seeking early promotion and/or early tenure will be evaluated as having: Exceeded expectations, Met expectations; or Not Met Expectations.

The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean. A candidate must minimally meet expectations in each area of review to be granted reappointment, tenure, and /or promotion.

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.

3.7 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 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.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees.

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

3.9 President

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

4.0 REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION
Materials should be organized according to the appropriate review categories. Candidates should be judicious in their selection of evidence and choose the best evidence and representative examples to make their case. For each of the three categories, 1) instructional activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the college, at the university, in the community, and in the profession, please provide up to 6 pieces of evidence. These pieces of evidence should be discussed and referred to in the narrative.

4.1.1 RTP Status Sheet: provided and uploaded by the college.

4.1.2 Curriculum Vitae or Professional Data Sheet (PDS): The PDS serves as the curriculum vitae for RTP purposes in the CED; it should be a complete listing of accomplishments and may incorporate bullets or charts. Entries in the PDS should be dated and listed in reverse

chronological or chronological order consistently throughout the documents. To allow the candidate's recent record to be reviewed in the context of his/her full career, all achievements should be listed, with a double bar separating work to be evaluated under the current period of review from earlier (previously reviewed) work. The University requires that each category A-E as listed below begin on a separate page and be presented chronologically or in reverse chronology. Be consistent in the ordering throughout the document. Current requirements are listed below; please check the Faculty Affairs website for the most current information.

A. Academic Preparation and Honors
1. Degree, institution, year, major, other education
2. List academic awards and honors

B. Instructional Activities

1. Current teaching and/or administrative assignment.
2. Field of special competence (include areas of special content or pedagogical knowledge bearing on teaching effectiveness)
3. Teaching assignment (include list of all courses taught by semester)
4. Participation in student activities (list activities such as advisement, sponsorship, etc. other than routine advisement during office hours or registration periods)

C. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (List all relevant accomplishments as outlined in the CED RTP policy.)

D. Campus, Community, and Professional Service Activities (list all relevant accomplishments and provide dates. See section 2.3 for details required.

E. Other contributions that reflect credit in terms of your professional standing and recognition which have a bearing upon your University teaching, research, scholarly, and creative activities, or university or community service.

4.1.3 The Narrative: The narrative should describe the candidate's priorities and areas of professional emphasis, including their teaching philosophy and scholarly agenda. Other elements of the narrative have been described throughout this policy. The narrative shall include a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instructional activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the University, community, and profession as well as the linkages between these areas as was discussed earlier. The candidate should clearly reference and explain materials presented in supplemental files that support elements of the narrative. Candidates should explain how they have addressed areas of improvement (if any) from prior reviews. The narrative should be no ***more than 15 double-spaced pages***, 12-point font

with 1-inch margins.

4.1.4 Index of Supplemental Material: Candidates should include up to 6 supplemental documents per area of review (total of 18). These documents should be described in the narrative.

4.1.5 SPOT Data Table: Table provided by the department

4.1.6 Prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations.

4.1.7 Open Period Material Index and Materials. These are provided by the department and uploaded by the department.

4.1.8 All reviews: department committee, college committee, dean, and provost (if applicable).

4.1.9 Candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any, and adjusted recommendations.

Required documents at a glance

Materials	Overall Information to include	Instructional Activities	RSCA	Service
PDS/CV	Title, education, etc	Courses taught, Program Coordination, Curriculum development Program advising for students. See 2.1 for full description.	Peer reviewed articles, additional RSCA (i.e., grants, book chapters) See 2.2 for full description.	Service activities their role, contribution. See 2.3 for full description.
Narrative	Identify your specific contributions in each of the three review areas and discuss any work across areas that complement each other.	Describe the 6 pieces of evidence you selected for documentation and how that contributes to your overall pedagogical approach. Address SPOT or other formative and summative	Describe at least 2 peer reviewed articles included in supplementary materials. Describe at least 2 additional RSCA activities included in supplemental materials and how they contribute to your research areas and agenda. You	Describe the 6 pieces of evidence included in supplementary documentation for campus service, community service and professional service. Description should include how the service

		assessment data and feedback. See 2.1 for full description.	may describe 2 other selected RSCA supplementary documents. See 2.2 for full description.	fulfills the college's vision and aspirations. See 2.2 for full description.
Supplemental Documentation	N/A	6 pieces of documentation that support the narrative. SPOT table does not count as one of 6 pieces of evidence.	6 pieces of documentation that support the narrative, must include evidence of two peer reviewed articles and two additional RSCA activities.	6 pieces of documentation that support the narrative.

5.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenure-track and tenured faculty undergo performance review and evaluation. Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated each year. New TT faculty may submit a PDP in lieu of a mini-review during their first 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 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.

5.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment
In the first of service new TT faculty may submit a PDP in lieu of a mini-review. In subsequent years of pre-tenured service, when actionable reviews are not conducted, 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.

5.2 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 6.5.

5.3 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 6.5.2.

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.

6.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

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

6.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria outlined by the college in this document, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality and meeting expectations in all three areas of evaluation. Reappointment is critical as it indicates the potential long-term commitment to the candidate by the university and the college.

The CED requires that tenure-track faculty must show the reasonable likelihood that they will be able to meet the requirements for tenure. Candidates should note that reappointment does not guarantee a favorable recommendation for tenure. In all cases where the recommendations have been unanimously positive, the dean has the authority to grant reappointment for one, two, or three-year periods, or to recommend not granting reappointment, with the final decision made by the provost.

The minimum expectation for reappointment in CED in the area of Instructional Activities: The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CED diverse students and to the CSULB and CED vision. The candidate should demonstrate effective teaching through multiple means as laid out in this policy. Candidates may wish to include in the narrative 2 or 3 areas of strength and 2 or 3 areas for growth during the period under review. The minimum expectation for reappointment in CED in the area of RSCA: The candidate is expected to show progress in their program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The minimum

expectation for reappointment in CED in the area of Service: The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the program and/or department level and consistent with the service expectations outlined in this policy.

6.2 Awarding of Tenure

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

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high-quality 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 valued contributions in all areas and potential for ongoing professional growth that reflects the college vision and mission. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

6.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

Minimum expectations for promotion to associate professor in CED in the area of Instructional activities: An associate professor is expected to teach effectively and foster quality learning experiences that are responsive to the learning needs of CED's diverse students and to the CSULB and CED vision. The candidate should demonstrate effective teaching through multiple means as laid out in this policy.

Minimum expectations for promotion to associate professor in CED in the area of RSCA: 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, a minimum of TWO peer-reviewed manuscripts published in reputable journals which contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study, or a justification of equivalent publications. Additionally, faculty need at least TWO additional RSCA contributions (see section 2.2 for list of suggestions).

Minimum expectations for promotion to associate professor in CED in the area of Service: The candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the department and college or the expanded community or profession. The service activities should reflect active participation, ongoing contributions, and initiative. The candidate is required to make high quality service contributions to the program, department, and to either the college, or the university, and profession or community (as appropriate), which includes service on at least 2 committees per academic year during the period under review (not including the first year as tenure-track faculty).

6.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Minimum criteria for promotion to professor in CED in the area of Instructional Activities:

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. The candidate should demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching and document this through various means as outlined in this policy.

Minimum criteria for promotion to professor in CED in the area of RSCA: Successful candidates will have a proven program of RSCA that demonstrates increased breadth and depth in their discipline and includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have produced high quality peer reviewed work, a minimum of TWO peer-reviewed manuscripts published for the period under review or a justification for equivalent publications. Faculty also need at minimum TWO additional RSCA contributions (see section 2.2 for list of suggestions).

Minimum criteria for promotion to professor in CED in the area of Service: a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the program, department, college, and university levels, and in the community and/or the profession. Promotion to full professor requires consistent involvement in leadership and innovation. It also requires a record of service to the department, college, university, and community. For promotion to the rank of full professor, successful candidates are expected to have a substantive service record including a minimum of serving on three committees per academic year for the period under review.

6.5 Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and the dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. 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.

6.5.1 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 this CED policies for Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must demonstrate a sustained record that inspires 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. To be recommended for early tenure, the candidate must receive an evaluation "exceed expectations" in all areas of review, relative to requirements for tenure on an accelerated timeline.

The CED believes that candidates who have met expectations on an accelerated timeline have exceeded expectations. For assistant professors, the standard timeline for review for tenure is when the candidate has begun the sixth year in the current rank.

6.5.2 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 established in this CED policy for Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas. 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. To be recommended for early tenure, the candidate must receive an evaluation "exceed expectations" in all areas of review, relative to requirements for tenure on an accelerated timeline.

The CED believes that candidates who have met expectations on an accelerated timeline have exceeded expectations. For assistant professors, the standard timeline for review for promotion is when the candidate has begun the sixth year in the current rank, while for associate professors, the standard timeline is when the candidate has begun the fifth year in the current rank.

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.

7.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

7.1 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).

7.2 The Office of Faculty Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.

7.3 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 Academic 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 the qualifications and work of the candidate and the impact of the work. These submissions may be electronic but cannot be anonymous.

7.4 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.

7.5 Candidates prepare materials for review and submit them via the university-approved process by the deadline.

7.6 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.

7.7 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.

7.8 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.

7.9 The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President (or designee) by the deadline.

7.10 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.

8.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

8.1 Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see the CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

8.2 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.

8.3 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.

8.4 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.

8.5 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

8.6 When ratings (e.g., met expectations or not met expectations) are used in evaluation reports, the definition and scales of rating must be provided to the candidate.

9.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

Changes to the CED RTP policy are subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and tenure-track college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost. The Faculty Council shall have the power to propose changes to this CED RTP policy by a two-thirds vote of its members. Amendments may also be proposed by a petition of not less than one-third of the voting tenured and probationary college faculty presented to the dean and to the chair of the Faculty Council. All proposed changes shall be distributed during the academic year to faculty at the College meeting called for discussion of such proposals.

Elections regarding proposed amendments shall be conducted via secret ballot. Ballots shall be distributed to all voting tenure-track and tenured college faculty at least 10 working days prior to the due date of those ballots. Ballots may be distributed to faculty having active on-campus appointments via their on-campus mailboxes. However, ballots for voting-eligible faculty who do not have such on-campus appointments during the term of the election (such as faculty on sabbatical) must be addressed and distributed according to the contact information on file at the Dean's Office.

To certify an election regarding a proposed amendment, at least two-thirds of the voting tenure-track and tenured college faculty must participate in the voting regarding that amendment. An amendment to this policy shall be adopted and become effective when it has satisfied all the following conditions: (a) has been voted on by two-thirds of the voting tenured and probationary college faculty in a certified election, (b) has received a simple majority vote of the voting faculty, (c) is approved by the dean, and (d) is approved by the provost.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

College RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

College of ___Education___

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below)	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature	Date
January 27th, 2025	Noah Asher Golden	May 5th, 2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below)	College Dean Name & Signature	Date
2/28/25	Anna M. Ortiz	5/6/25

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below)	AVPFA Name & Signature	Date
04/03/25	Patricia Pérez	05/07/25

Provost Signature	Date
	05/07/2025