CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

College RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below)	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature	Date
	Ashley Carter	5/30/2025
April 25, 2025	Ashley Carter	

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below)	College Dean Name & Signature *Curtis Bennett*	Date
05/30/2025	Curtis Bennett	5/30/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below)	AVPFA Name & Signature	Date
2/11/25	*Patricia Perez*	6/3/25

Provost Signature	Date
signature	06/04/2025

CNSM Revised RTP Policy to align with CSULB PS 23-24.
FINAL Revision Approved by the CNSM College Council: May 9, 2025
Vote for Ratification by CNSM T/TT Faculty: May 2, 2025, through May 8, 2025

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. Readers should still consult the university RTP policy (PS 23-24). 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 matters.

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

1.1. College Mission and Vision

The College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics is a center of scientific learning in Long Beach offering excellent educational opportunities. Our student-centered instructional and research environment fosters equity, diversity, and access; mentors students for lifelong success by elevating character, skills, and mindset; creates scientific knowledge through research; and promotes science and mathematics in our community.
The College's vision is to educate the next diverse generation of scientists and mathematicians, as well as a science-literate citizenry, through inclusive teaching and research programs within the departments of Biological Sciences; Chemistry and Biochemistry; Earth Science; Mathematics and Statistics; Physics and Astronomy; Science Education; and the Environmental Science and Policy program.

1.2. Principles

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's mission. A college policy establishing standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing flexibility to recognize the unique

35 contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual disciplines. This policy
36 strives to balance clarity and flexibility by establishing roles and college-wide expectations
37 and giving directions to department RTP policies. In particular, department policies must
38 be consistent with this policy, meaning that department policies must observe
39 inclusions/exclusions and minima/maxima articulated in this policy, but they may match
40 or exceed within the boundaries established by this policy. Departments must create
41 specific guidelines for how faculty can fulfill the University's academic mission, while
42 abiding by these principles.

43

44 1.2.1. CNSM faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and
45 the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and
46 instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and
47 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. All CNSM
48 faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three areas.

49

50 1.2.2. RTP reviews must be clear, fair, transparent, and unbiased at all levels. The RTP
51 process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet
52 department, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.

53

54 1.2.3. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards
55 consistent with the department and college RTP policies for reappointment, tenure, or
56 promotion.
57 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three
58 areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate demonstrating a
59 sustained record of quality performance over the period of review. Reappointment
60 decisions are based on evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing
61 a record of evidence that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.

62

1.3. Values

63

64

65 The criteria according to which decisions regarding RTP are made are among the clearest
66 expressions of the university community's values. The criteria in this policy are based on,
67 and department RTP policies should embody, the following values:

68

69 1.3.1. CNSM values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. This policy and all
70 department RTP policies should reflect these values.

71 CNSM recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities
72 within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all department RTP policies should be
73 structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.
74
75 1.3.2. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive,
76 inclusive, collegial environment benefiting the CSULB community. This policy should be
77 interpreted as valuing these actions. All department RTP policies should implement
78 mechanisms to recognize these contributions, and guide candidates on necessary levels
79 of evidence to document these activities.
80
81 1.3.3. Shared governance is vital to CSULB's mission. Good academic citizenship requires
82 all faculty, especially those with tenure, to contribute to shared governance at more than
83 one level. This policy and all department RTP policies should acknowledge and reward
84 service in shared governance.
85
86 1.3.4. All faculty must contribute to CSULB's mission in all three areas: instruction, RSCA,
87 and service. However, since faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting
88 CSULB's mission, this policy should be construed as allowing for adjustments in the
89 weights assigned to instruction, RSCA, and service based upon faculty strengths as well as
90 department, college, and university needs.
91

2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

93
94 Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of excellence
95 in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative
96 activities; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the
97 profession, and for providing accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and
98 promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP policies. The departmental
99 standards must match or exceed the college standards.
100
101 Candidates for tenure and promotion recommendations are rated as excellent,
102 competent, or deficient in each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department
103 must provide specific standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent, competent, and
104 deficient in each area of evaluation for tenure and promotion. While written feedback
105 during the reappointment review at the college level is required, the use of the specific
106 terms excellent, competent, or deficient is discouraged.
107

108 A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as
109 deficient (does not meet requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be
110 recommended for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a
111 rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the
112 area of research, scholarly and creative activities. In order to receive a positive
113 recommendation for promotion to professor, candidates must receive at least one rating
114 of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.
115
116 The classification of candidate activities in the three areas of evaluation should follow the
117 descriptions below. In certain circumstances, a set of candidate activities may be
118 reasonably described as falling within more than one category, across multiple categories,
119 or otherwise not clearly falling into just one category. In such cases, the activities should
120 be placed into a single category of the candidate's choice. This is to avoid the appearance
121 of attempting to receive more credit than a single activity would typically allow (i.e.,
122 "double-dipping"), and the candidate should provide justification for the category the
123 activity is placed in. RTP committees should provide flexibility for candidates to make
124 reasonable decisions about the classification of their activities insofar as they do not
125 obviously contradict the classifications described below.
126

127 ## 2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities
128
129 Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers of our diverse student body at
130 CSULB and provide evidence of this effectiveness in their files. Instruction is defined by the
131 university as any action designed to engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to
132 their success, regardless of whether it is part of formal coursework.
133
134 Instruction and instructionally related activities therefore include teaching and fostering
135 learning inside and outside the traditional classroom (classroom, laboratory, and field) and
136 can include, but are not limited to, activities such as: curriculum and course development,
137 academic and departmental advising, supervision of student research projects and
138 fieldwork, chairing thesis committees, student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and
139 project supervision.
140
141 CNSM recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and
142 available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CNSM also
143 recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning
144 opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.
145

146 In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe
147 how their instructional activities were influenced by this.

148

149 The candidate's narrative should include sufficient information to allow the RTP
150 Committee to appropriately assess the four main aspects of instruction described in the
151 remainder of this section and facilitate the evaluation of activities described in section 2.2.

152

153 Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB
154 compensation for any of the instructional activities described in their narratives. This
155 disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will
156 be excluded from credit toward instructional activities.

157

158 ### 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

159

160 Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject
161 matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty
162 members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and describe
163 ways in which they assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning. This
164 may include the adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom
165 and non-classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be
166 consistent with course/curriculum goals, clearly convey expected student learning
167 outcomes and goals, and should be designed to be student-centered.

168

169 #### 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and methods

170

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

173

174 The scholarly content of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses
175 taught in the discipline. Course materials and teaching methods should reflect currency in
176 the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be of value in facilitating learning. If the course
177 serves as a prerequisite for later courses, it should be well-aligned with the expected
178 academic background for those courses. Course materials should clearly convey to the
179 students the learning goals for the course, and the relationship of the course to the major
180 and to the broader discipline.

181

182 Course policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to students. The results
183 of grading practices (i.e., GPAs and DFW rates) should be reasonable.

184 If the candidate teaches courses which have high DFW rates (>20%), it is recommended
185 that they address these rates and describe their efforts to reduce these rates in their
186 narrative. A variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., nature of
187 course material, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence
188 DFW rates and the RTP Committee should consider these rates in that light.
189
190 The most recent syllabus from each different course taught during the period under review
191 must be included.
192
193 Additional teaching materials (e.g., additional syllabi showing evidence of course changes,
194 samples of student work with instructor feedback, example assignments, etc.), or other
195 materials (e.g., a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative
196 description, observations by trained observers, etc.) may also be provided to add context
197 or serve as examples discussed in the narrative document.
198
199 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher
200
201 Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also with
202 pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals.
203 Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development
204 activities associated with educating a diverse student population.
205
206 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in both
207 maintaining the currency of the material in their courses, and in enhancing their teaching
208 approaches used in the classroom or during other instructionally related activities.
209
210 The candidate should demonstrate thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward a
211 continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This should be described by the
212 candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant evidence. This may include
213 activities such as: classroom visitations, consultations on course improvement,
214 involvement in pedagogical professional development programs, participation in teaching
215 seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities
216 that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness. Ideally, the narrative will
217 include multiple examples of how participation in such activities led to specific changes in
218 instruction.
219
220 2.1.2. Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) scores
221

222 Course SPOT summary pages must be included for all courses evaluated during the period
223 under review, but SPOT data for independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or
224 698) or department seminar/colloquium courses should not be included.
225 Candidates are expected to address aspects of their SPOT score summaries in their
226 narrative, especially with regard to changes over time or differences between courses.
227 Candidates should describe actions taken to improve student perceptions. Importantly,
228 these evaluations alone do not provide complete or sufficient evidence of teaching
229 effectiveness. It has been established that a variety of factors outside of the candidate's
230 direct control (e.g., gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time,
231 actions by course-associated TAs) can influence SPOT scores and the RTP Committee
232 should consider these scores in that light. Nevertheless, some attention to SPOT score
233 evaluations should be present in the candidate's narrative.
234
235 Note: in this document, "SPOT scores" refers to the values from the official teaching
236 evaluation mechanism used by students. If this mechanism changes name in the future,
237 the use of "SPOT" is intended to encompass those new evaluations as well (i.e., without
238 requiring formal amendment of this document).
239

240 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**
241
242 Assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be based on a careful reading of the
243 candidate's narrative, evaluation of appropriate materials in the candidate's RTP file, peer
244 observations of teaching, and on student course evaluation forms for all courses evaluated
245 since the last promotion or since appointment. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness
246 should be based on the quality of teaching performance across all courses assigned to the
247 candidate, with particular attention paid to progress and improvement.
248
249 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for appropriate discussion of the four main
250 parts of section 2.1 of this document: (i) instructional philosophy and practice, (ii)
251 pedagogical approach and methods, (iii) ongoing professional development as a teacher,
252 and (iv) student perception of teaching (SPOT) scores.
253
254 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly
255 content of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses
256 taught by tenured/probationary faculty members. Typically, this involves the use of
257 average GPAs or DFW rates, but recognition should be made that some aspects of courses
258 outside of the instructor's control may influence these. Such factors may include, but are
259 not limited to, the difficulty or desirability of the material (e.g., pre-requisites for other

260 majors), class meeting times (e.g., early mornings or Fridays), class size (e.g., large lecture
261 vs small discussion), or semester (e.g., spring GPAs are lower campus-wide than fall
262 GPAs).

264 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness,
265 including a critical analysis of all student input included in the file or submitted during the
266 open period. This analysis must include the candidate's student course evaluation data.
267 Following university policy however, student course evaluation data should not be used as
268 the primary component of the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

270 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and content
271 should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating the
272 learning process. When appropriate, choices of materials that recognize the diverse nature
273 of our student body and their lived experiences should be valued.

275 2.2.5. As part of the review process, class visits shall be made by at least two members of
276 the department RTP committee and to multiple class meetings. Ideally, these class visits
277 will be conducted during the semester in which the review takes place. If the candidate is
278 not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made subsequent to the
279 last RTP action during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses
280 during the review period may be used. At least two observations must be performed during
281 the review period, however a maximum of two observations from prior years may be used.
282 It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in
283 advance if this situation is likely to arise.

285 2.2.5.1. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, there will be a minimum of four
286 reviews of class visits. The expectation is that these four reviews would be as follows, one
287 from the review two years previous to the semester of review, one from the previous year,
288 and two (to multiple classes) from the semester of review, each conducted by the RTP
289 committee of the corresponding year. The candidate may opt out of having reviews from
290 either (or both) of the two previous years, in which case the RTP committee will conduct
291 sufficient visits during the semester of review to bring the total to four visits.

293 If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made
294 during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the
295 review period may be used. At least two observations must be performed during the review
296 period, however a maximum of two observations from prior years may be used. It is the

297   responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in
298   advance if this situation is likely to arise.
299
300   2.2.5.2. For promotion to Professor, as part of the review process, class visits shall be
301   made by at least two members of the department RTP committee and to multiple class
302   meetings. Ideally, these class visits will be conducted during the semester in which the
303   review takes place. If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of
304   review, then visits made subsequent to the last RTP action during the previous three years
305   or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be used. It is the
306   responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in
307   advance if this situation is likely to arise.
308
309   2.2.5.3. For peer visits, the candidate should be informed that the visits normally occur
310   during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of a possible visit at least five
311   days prior to the start of the classroom visit period, which will normally occur over a two-
312   to-three-week period. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being
313   evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es) regarding the classes to be visited
314   and the scheduling of such visits. Class visits should include the entire scheduled time
315   period. Exceptions may be made with written approval of the dean and the candidate.
316
317   The candidate may submit course syllabi, provide Canvas access, or otherwise notify the
318   RTP committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee to
319   choose the most appropriate days for visits. Candidates are encouraged to arrange
320   meetings with the members of the RTP Committee who will visit their class to discuss their
321   course design in order to place the material and activities intended for the reviewed class
322   meetings into context.
323
324   The committee members' evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should address
325   factors such as instructional clarity, communication with the students, student
326   engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery of
327   subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and electronic
328   media or demonstrations. If the candidate provides syllabi or other course materials, these
329   should be reviewed to provide context for classroom activities. Reports based on class
330   visits must be included in the candidate's RTP file and shared with the candidate. The
331   signed reports must include times and dates of the visits.
332
333   Departments are encouraged to develop rubrics and standardized forms to facilitate
334   consistency and utility of evaluations.

335

336 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the candidate in
337 supervisory courses. The narrative should describe the candidate's mentoring philosophy,
338 goals, and procedures they use to facilitate student success. The candidate is encouraged
339 to provide evidence in the narrative of student success outcomes arising from mentored
340 students. Outcomes such as acceptances into graduate and professional programs are
341 appropriately described in this section whereas outcomes such as student conference
342 presentations or publications are appropriately described in the RSCA section.

343

344 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student academic advising, they should provide
345 the RTP committee with evidence of this effort and should address in their narrative the
346 effectiveness of this advising in meeting student needs.

347

348 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities: The college recognizes that there are a variety of
349 activities that fulfill, complement, and complete a candidate's file with regards to
350 instructionally related activities. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is
351 neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college
352 RTP committee in this category:

353   (a). Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching.
354   (b). Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides.
355   (c). Substantial participation in the supervision and mentoring of student
356   researchers, thesis research supervision, and the preparation of students for the
357   presentation of such research.
358   (d). Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories.
359   (e). Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the candidate's
360   assigned workload, and academic mentoring of students.
361   (f). Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students.
362   (g). Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-
363   based materials.
364   (h). Participating in pedagogy, education, or cultural awareness professional
365   development activities designed to improve instruction.
366   (i). Attending, developing, and/or offering workshops, colloquia, and other forums
367   for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of novel teaching
368   methods to faculty colleagues.

369

370 2.2.9. All candidates must include the following in their RTP files:
371 (a). Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated during the period
372 under evaluation.

373 (b). The most recent syllabus from each different course taught during the period under
374 evaluation.
375 (c). Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and homework sets.
376
377 2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional relevant items for inclusion.
378
379 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline
380
381 Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the
382 discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate.
383

384 **2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**
385
386 2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA
387
388 CNSM Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of
389 substance in RSCA throughout their careers and produce quality RSCA achievements that
390 contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or
391 interdisciplinary studies.
392
393 CNSM recognizes and appreciates the diversity of methods, epistemologies, and
394 perspectives represented within the college and endorses an inclusive definition of
395 scholarship aligned with the university's policy which recognizes scholarship as a
396 continuum of diverse forms of knowledge and knowledge-making practices that can be
397 pursued in a multitude of ways. CNSM values the direct involvement of students in these
398 scholarly activities through research mentoring and advising activities, including those that
399 directly impact underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students in
400 science and mathematics.
401
402 In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe
403 how their RSCA activities were influenced by this.
404
405 Because academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA, the
406 CNSM RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees
407 engaged in evaluating scholarly work. Departments must develop their own discipline
408 specific definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA, including examples
409 of specific accomplishments. These definitions, standards, and criteria should value
410 scholarly contributions which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting

411 professional, local, state, national, and/or international communities. Department
412 standards may be higher than college-level standards. The department RTP policy shall list
413 non-exhaustive examples of specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for
414 tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate,
415 disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to
416 the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies.
417
418 Candidates for tenure must develop an independent research program at CSULB that
419 results in peer-reviewed publications in which the candidate is identified as a senior
420 investigator, consistent with the co-authorship practices of each discipline. Thus, a
421 candidate's research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of
422 the faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged, and departments must
423 define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement. The
424 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the
425 candidate's scholarly activity, and this narrative must identify the candidate's
426 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects, and the
427 involvement of students. Within their narratives candidates should also discuss (and
428 committees should consider) their scholarly vision or program--the questions, issues, or
429 problems guiding their work and aims or expected outcomes of their work. They should
430 discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities
431 are high quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. The narrative is not meant to be
432 merely a list of activities and candidates are not expected to discuss every
433 accomplishment. Candidates should discuss their plans for sustained RSCA. Candidates
434 are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents.
435 The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their fields.
436
437 In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. Valuable scholarly
438 and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only
439 contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms.
440
441 In addition, candidates must disclose any scholarly or creative activities for which they
442 received reassigned time, grant buyouts, or additional compensation. This disclosure is
443 intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded
444 from credit toward RSCA activities.
445

446 **2.3.2. Evaluation for RSCA**
447

448   2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA element
449   to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The candidate's
450   narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The evaluators will
451   assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific RSCA criteria
452   established in the departmental RTP policy. The narrative is intended to serve as a
453   coherent guide to evaluators in understanding the candidate's intellectual and
454   professional achievements in this category, the nature of student involvement in the
455   candidate's RSCA, the candidate's plans for continuing RSCA into the future, and how the
456   candidate places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the
457   department, college, and university RTP policies.
458
459   2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted, examples of the
460   candidate's best work along with an explanation of why these materials should be
461   regarded as significant contributions. Evaluation criteria at the departmental level should
462   recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only
463   within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and
464   values of the College, including the importance of involving students in RSCA. For jointly
465   authored activities, departmental RTP policies must specify how the candidate should
466   identify the specific extent of their participation.
467
468   2.3.2.3. The College follows the University RTP policy which lists the following forms of
469   RSCA, with examples. The College policy acknowledges that different disciplines weight
470   types of contributions differently. Departmental policies may further specify other forms of
471   RSCA.
472
473   In all cases, the CNSM policy highlights the importance of activities that include
474   successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship of publications
475   and student presentations at scientific meetings. Candidates may list mentorship of
476   research students as an accomplishment in their narratives.
477
478   The University RTP policy states:
479   RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms.
480   Examples below should not be construed as exhaustive or recommended:
481   Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship,
482   and creative activities.
483   - Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed
484   publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues,
485   or patents.

486 Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing
487 knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated
488 use of knowledge.
489   - Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published
490   literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.
491 Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary
492 expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of
493 Engagement includes a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations
494 with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/or peer-
495 reviewed, and has evidence of impact.
496   - Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports,
497   program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA.
498   - The College also includes collaborations with private industry or government
499   agencies, as well as patents and technology transfer stemming from RSCA.
500 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge
501 through systematic study.
502   - Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational
503   research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new
504   instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.
505
506 2.3.2.4. Grant and Funding Applications: Applications for internal and external funding may
507 be used as evidence of RSCA by the candidate. These may include applications for
508 research support, education grants, infrastructural grants (e.g. NSF MRI), or grants to
509 support students.
510
511 2.3.2.5. Guidelines for departmental criteria. The department RTP policy shall list non-
512 exhaustive examples of specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for tenure
513 and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate, disseminated to
514 appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to the disciplines
515 or to interdisciplinary studies. Departments and colleges should not limit candidates to an
516 exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments.
517 Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to
518 which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. Faculty
519 members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in
520 RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA
521 achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the
522 discipline or interdisciplinary studies and demonstrate ongoing progress.
523

2.4. Service

Academic service plays a vital role in the functioning of the university and should not be minimized or considered less important than teaching and RSCA by both candidates and evaluators.

Academic service consists of activities (other than teaching and RSCA) that strengthen shared governance processes and contribute to the mission of the university, benefiting students, faculty, department, college, university, discipline/profession and/or community. Faculty members are expected to maintain active engagement in service throughout their careers. Note that 3 WTU of our 15 WTU load is designated for service.

Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB compensation for any of the service activities described in their narratives. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward service activities.

2.4.1. Service Expectations

The college acknowledges that departments may have varying expectations regarding service. However, following reappointment, candidates are expected to broaden their involvement beyond their department, and candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect of service.

The candidate's narrative should address the scope and purpose, extent and level of their participation, the outcomes, and the contributions of the service activities to the missions of the university, the college, or the department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise, as applicable.

The college acknowledges that some academic service activities may not be covered under traditional committee-based roles. We also recognize that the service activities undertaken to support diversity initiatives are often provided by marginalized or minoritized faculty as a direct result of their identities (i.e., cultural/identity taxation). This policy defines cultural/identity taxation as the suggested or unstated expectation that faculty from marginalized or minoritized backgrounds or identities should provide representation on committees or service activities related to the groups and communities to which they belong. Marginalized or minoritized backgrounds or identities include, but are not limited to: ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, gender, ability, etc.

562

563 Candidates are encouraged to include these contributions in their narrative where
564 appropriate, emphasizing how they support our diverse student population, including
565 underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students. Department and College
566 RTP committees should recognize and take such activities into account as part of the
567 service workload, and acknowledge the difficulty in documenting this kind of service.

568

569 2.4.2. Criteria for Service

570

571 Faculty members must participate in faculty governance through active involvement in
572 committees and/or other service activities at the department and college levels to receive
573 a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor. A faculty
574 member being considered for promotion to full professor must demonstrate significant
575 service (e.g., taking leadership roles in committees or other service activities) at the
576 college, university, or CSU system level. Along with their contributions to shared
577 governance, a candidate's service to their profession and any additional service activities
578 (such as mentoring junior faculty, or mentoring students beyond teaching or RSCA) will
579 also be considered. The quality of service is the primary consideration, rather than mere
580 membership on a number of committees.

581

582 ### 2.4.3. Evaluation of Service

583

584 The emphasis in the evaluation of service shall be on: 1) the quality and significance of the
585 activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions of the
586 university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and level of the candidate's
587 involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service. Assessment of
588 the service to both the university and community shall be based on information described
589 in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence, which may include, but
590 shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the
591 contribution, or printed programs.

592

593 In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe
594 how their service obligations may have exceeded typical expectations due to their
595 marginalized and/or minoritized identities. While not easily quantifiable, the increased
596 service workload undertaken by these faculty can be described in terms of the impact their
597 work has had on their department, college, university, community and/or discipline.

598

599 RTP committees and evaluators should recognize that many faculty experience various
600 forms of cultural/identity taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring,
601 and other activities on and off campus that are essential to the mission of the university.
602 The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is the responsibility of committees
603 and evaluators to recognize this service.
604
605 2.4.4. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Service
606
607 The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as service.
608 Faculty are expected to engage in shared governance as well as other service activities that
609 contribute to the mission of the university. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative
610 and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the
611 college RTP committee in this category:
612 (a). Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department,
613 the college, or the university
614 (b). Leading or serving on department, college or university level committees including but
615 not limited to hiring committee, RTP committee, college council, RSCA review committee,
616 academic senate etc.
617 (c). Leading institutional programs
618 (d). Other service activities that contribute to the mission of the university
619 (e). Sponsoring student groups
620 (f). Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing)
621 (g). Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through
622 discipline-oriented activities such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media
623 interviews
624 (h). Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments, and
625 community service organizations
626 (i). Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships,
627 awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in the
628 discipline.
629 (j). Participation in activities promoting diversity, equity, inclusion and access (DEIA) (e.g.,
630 organizing DEIA workshops/trainings, serving as an advisor or sponsor for cultural or
631 affinity groups, collaborating on DEIA grants or funding proposals, engaging in community
632 outreach for underrepresented groups etc.)
633 (k). Participating in Department/College recruitment events (e.g. CNSM open house,
634 SOAR)
635 (l). Oversight of work study/department student workers.
636 (m) Serving on thesis committees as a non-chair member.

637

3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

639

Participants in the RTP process governed by this document include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, and the Dean. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the current 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, and the dean. In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1. Candidate

3.1.1. Candidates should consult the university RTP policy and mission statements of the college and university. A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional trainings and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

3.1.2. The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The

674 candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary
675 sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The
676 candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review
677 period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.
678
679 3.1.3. The CNSM candidate's narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20
680 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins). In addition to the material
681 above, the narrative shall include a discussion of how the candidate addressed any
682 substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.
683

684 **3.2. Department RTP Policy**

685
686 3.2.1. The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be
687 applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department
688 standards must match or may exceed the college-level standards. Department RTP
689 policies must be consistent with the CNSM and university RTP policies.
690
691 3.2.2. The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-
692 track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty
693 council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular
694 review by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.
695

696 **3.3. Department RTP Committee**

697
698 3.3.1. The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the
699 candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee
700 regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members
701 are responsible for evaluating the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the
702 department.
703
704 3.3.2. The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the
705 department's RTP committee. The CBA restricts membership on RTP committees to
706 tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the
707 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the
708 majority vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the department and
709 approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of
710 faculty participating in the FERP.

711 3.3.3. No single individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more
712 than one level of review. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend
713 RTP evaluation workshops, equity workshops, and be familiar with the latest policies and
714 evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.
715

716 ## 3.4. Department Chairs
717

718 3.4.1. The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college,
719 and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to
720 candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations.
721 The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking
722 with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional
723 mentoring. The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning
724 of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university
725 processes and procedures.
726

727 3.4.2. Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write independent evaluations of all
728 RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee.
729 However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than
730 the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate
731 on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of
732 any single candidate in more than one level of review.
733

734 ## 3.5. College RTP Committee
735

736 3.5.1. The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well
737 as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and
738 recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in
739 accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP
740 policies. The college RTP committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation
741 occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the
742 department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee must take into
743 serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. It is
744 strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops,
745 equity workshops, and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the
746 Department, College, and University levels.
747

748 3.5.2. The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to
749 the college dean.
750

3.6. Dean of the College

752

753 3.6.1. The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP
754 process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the
755 RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty
756 performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, facilitates
757 mechanisms for guiding/mentoring candidates in the RTP process, and ensures that all
758 evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university
759 policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.
760

761 3.6.2. The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior
762 evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the provost based upon the
763 three areas of evaluation listed earlier.
764

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

766

767 The college follows the university policy, which states:
768 All tenure-track and tenured faculty undergo performance review and evaluation. Tenure-
769 track faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not
770 being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo
771 periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years.
772

773 The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of assistant
774 professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of
775 appointment and service credit.
776

4.1. Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Reappointment

778

779 In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a
780 periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress
781 toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the
782 department chair, and the college dean. The periodic evaluation in the first year may just
783 be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean.
784

785 In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review.
786 Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.
787

788 **4.2. Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion**
789

790 In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous
791 service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as
792 appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the
793 annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for
794 promotion.
795

796 A tenure-track faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion
797 prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5.
798

799 **4.3. Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion**
800

801 An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth
802 year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full
803 professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 5.5.
804 A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year;
805 however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic
806 evaluation of tenured faculty.
807

808 4.3.1. The period of review for promotion to full professor is the period after the most recent review
809 for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Activities performed in the academic year prior
810 to the awarding of tenure or promotion, but not included in the file or amendments submitted for
811 tenure and promotion to associate professor, may be considered to fall within the period of review
812 for promotion to full professor. For faculty members who begin their employment with tenure and
813 appointment at the associate level, the period of review includes all time since being hired with
814 that status.
815

816 # 5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL
817 # CRITERIA
818

819 **5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**
820

821 5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon
822 criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment
823 must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.
824
825 5.1.2. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching
826 responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse body of students and to the
827 university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show ongoing progress in
828 their program of RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements.
829 The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the
830 departmental level consistent with departmental and college service expectations.
831

5.2. Awarding of Tenure

833
834 Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is
835 awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and distinguished professional
836 contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure recommendations are based
837 on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's overall record of
838 accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the continuation of this
839 record.
840

5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

842
843 5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor
844 normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty members who
845 have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction and instructionally
846 related activities, RSCA, and service. A candidate will not receive a positive
847 recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive
848 recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a
849 rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the
850 area of RSCA.
851
852 5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to be
853 effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in Section
854 2.2 of this policy.
855
856 5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that
857 the candidate will continue making distinguished contributions in RSCA. Activities used in
858 assessing excellence in research are listed in Section 2.3 of this policy. The department

859 RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for tenure and promotion to
860 associate professor along with the departmental standards for assessment of the quality
861 of the candidate's accomplishments. All levels of review will use these departmental
862 criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.
863
864 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the
865 university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in service
866 are listed in Section 2.4 of this policy.
867

5.4. Promotion to Professor

869
870 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for tenure
871 and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the departmental RTP
872 policy. A professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of effectiveness in
873 teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular development. The successful
874 candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to
875 the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of
876 study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-
877 reviewed work at the national or international level. In addition, a professor shall have
878 provided significant service and leadership on campus and service in the community or the
879 profession.
880
881 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if deficient in
882 any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a candidate must earn
883 at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.
884

5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion

886
887 5.5.1. A potential candidate should seek (and receive) initial guidance from the department
888 chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early
889 promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional
890 circumstances and for compelling reasons as in 5.5.2. A candidate for early tenure and
891 promotion must also be rated as excellent in all three categories, as stated in department
892 RTP policies.
893
894 The University Policy states: "a candidate [for early tenure or promotion] must achieve a
895 record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the

896 requirements in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what
897 qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways."
898
899 The college interprets this as meaning achieving a rating of "excellent" in each of the three
900 categories and exceeding a rating of "excellent" in substantial ways in at least one of these
901 categories. It must also include at least one exceptional circumstance and compelling
902 reason as described in the next section.
903
904 5.5.2. Examples of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons: (the list below is
905 meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that
906 may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category):
907 (a). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality teaching.
908 (b). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality DEIA
909 activities.
910 (c). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality service.
911 (d). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality RSCA.
912 (e). Grant success well beyond what is typical in the discipline for rank.
913 (f). Extremely prominent publications in highly ranked journals.
914 (g). Chairing a significant college or university committee (e.g., College Council during a
915 year with significant work, Academic Senate, GEGC, CEPC, FPCC, etc.) or service in highly
916 unusual situations for rank (e.g. to University or Profession).
917 (h). Acquiring additional Student Mentorship/DEI grants that span more than one
918 department.
919 (i). Leading the creation of a significant new curricular or instructionally-related program
920 (beyond the creation of courses).
921
922 5.5.3. Exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons shall occur within the
923 evaluation period and while the candidate is a CSULB faculty member.
924
925 5.5.4. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. Tenured
926 associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-
927 tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without
928 also seeking early tenure.
929
930 5.5.4.1. In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the
931 external evaluation process according to the current Academic Senate policy on External
932 Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.
933

934 5.5.4.2. Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also
935 candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's
936 achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant
937 awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a
938 body of work sufficient for promotion but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained
939 record upon which tenure is based.
940

941 ## 6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS
942

943 The college follows the university policy, which states:
944

945 6.1. The Office of Faculty Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including
946 deadlines for the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period,
947 completion of all RTP reviews by all review levels, and final decision notification to the
948 candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be consistent with the
949 requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
950

951 6.2. The Office of Faculty Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review
952 and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.
953 6.3. Departments must post outside the department office a list of candidates being
954 considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for
955 the open period provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and consistent with the
956 requirements of the CBA. Departments must also disseminate this list to department
957 faculty unit employees, staff, and students electronically. The announcements shall invite
958 statements about qualification and work of the candidate and its impact. These
959 submissions may be electronic, but cannot be anonymous.
960

961 6.4. A copy of all statements submitted during the open period shall be provided to the
962 candidate by the department RTP committee chair or department chair. The department
963 RTP committee chair or department chair collects, prepares an index of the materials
964 submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file, and submits the
965 materials via the university approved process.
966

967 6.5. Candidates prepare materials for review and submit them via the university-approved
968 process by the deadline.
969

970 6.6. The department RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and, using the
971 standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next
972 level of review by the deadline.

973

974 6.7. The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP
975 committee, reviews the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written
976 evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

977

978 6.8. The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an
979 independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the
980 deadline.

981

982 6.9. The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written
983 review and recommendation to the President (or designee) by the deadline.

984

985 6.10. The President (or designee) reviews the candidate's materials and provides an
986 independent written review and recommendation. The President (or designee) makes final
987 decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The
988 President (or designee) notifies the candidate (and all levels of review) in writing of the final
989 decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline. The decision
990 letter shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be placed in
991 the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.

992

993 ## 7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

994

995 For additional processes, the college follows the university policy, which states:

996

997 7.1. Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice
998 from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to
999 candidates for early tenure.

1000

1001 7.2. If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation
1002 documents is discovered, the RTP file shall be returned to the level at which the requisite
1003 documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely
1004 manner.

1005

1006 7.3. Either the candidate or evaluators may ask to have new materials placed in the file
1007 after the deadline. Such additions shall be limited to items that became available after the

1008 file was submitted as verified by the College RTP Committee. Copies of the added material
1009 shall be provided to the faculty unit employee. When material has been added to the file in
1010 this manner, the file shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee (the Department
1011 RTP Committee) for review, evaluation, and comment before consideration at subsequent
1012 levels of review.

1013

1014 7.4. At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the evaluation and
1015 recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before
1016 it is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a
1017 rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days (as defined in the CBA)
1018 following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's
1019 rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP file as it advances and shall also be sent to
1020 any previous review levels.

1021

8. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

1022

1023

1024 All information in this policy applies to a faculty member appointed jointly to two or more
1025 departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for
1026 tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must be
1027 worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the departments
1028 and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the dean(s).

1029

9. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

1030

1031

1032 9.1. Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of changes to
1033 the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to
1034 accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to
1035 procedures do not require a vote by the faculty members.

1036

1037 9.2. The tenured/probationary faculty members of the college, voting by secret ballot (with
1038 pro and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy and
1039 evaluation criteria section of this policy.

1040

1041 9.3. Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

1042

1043 9.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the
1044 tenured/probationary faculty members or

1045

1046 9.3.2. By action of the CNSM Faculty Council.

1047

1048 9.4. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the
1049 faculty members called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and
1050 shall be distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty members at least five
1051 (5) instructional days before the public hearing.

1052

1053 9.5. Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a
1054 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members voting in a secret
1055 ballot conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public
1056 hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president or
1057 designee.