Revised April 25, 2025

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES
DEPARTMENTAL REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES

DEPARTMENTAL REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY: STANDARDS FOR THE EXEMPLARY TEACHER-SCHOLAR

California State University, Long Beach ("CSULB") aspires to be a national exemplar in public higher education. Towards this end, CSULB takes pride in its faculty of teacher-scholars. The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies is committed to fostering the development of teacher-scholars so that they may, in turn, provide an instructional program of high quality that is responsive to the needs of its students, the community, and professionals in recreation, parks, and tourism management. Accordingly, this document sets forth expectations for faculty in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies within the teacher-scholar model, focusing on excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. In doing so, it is intended to: (1) guide new faculty in their quest for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the framework of being a true teacher-scholar; (2) guide development of tenured faculty as teacher-scholars; (3) guide the Departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (RTP) in evaluating candidates for mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review; and (4) help create an environment that supports faculty working to achieve the missions of the department, college, and university. These evaluative policies and procedures are intended to take into consideration the diversity of expertise within a department that is interdisciplinary and, when possible, transdisciplinary, thereby enabling the department to grow in strength and stature.

To provide candidates with a single, comprehensive document that sets forth the RTP requirements of the university, the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) and our own academic unit, the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies has elected to integrate its disciplinary standards within the framework of the RTP policies of both the university and the college. Thus, language used in the RTP policies of the university and the college that is critical for clarity and emphasis has been inserted throughout this document. All University and CHHS RTP Policy insertions in this document are presented in italics to differentiate clearly between the language of the university and college policies, as distinguished from the language that is unique to the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. Portions of the university and/or college RTP policies that have not been included in this document are referenced by the section number used in the original university and/or college policies.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 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. In service to the university's mission, the

CHHS seeks to be nationally and internationally recognized as an innovator and leader in community connections, the discovery of knowledge, and for educating diverse students in the health and human services professions.

The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies fosters engagement, participation, and leadership among professionals in recreation, parks, and tourism management. The Department strives to engage students in learning and in serving their community through the interdisciplinary and comparative study of the need for, delivery of, and both individual and community impacts of recreation, parks, and tourism programs. Our curricular offerings provide both theoretical and experiential learning that links multidisciplinary social-scientific theories and methods addressing program design, delivery, and assessment. The Department promotes life-long learning among students as they develop into professionals in recreation, parks, and tourism prepared to ethically lead public and private agencies as they create community through people, parks, and programs.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 *RLS Faculty members dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the mission and vision of* the university, the CHHS, and the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. *Faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the* Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, the CHHS, the *university*, the *community, and the profession.*

1.2.2 *Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.*

1.2.3 *RLS Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.*

1.2.4 *This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; academic unit and college needs; and university mission.*

1.2.5 *All* RLS faculty members *expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual,* the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, *the college,*

and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior.

1.2.6 All RLS faculty members are expected to be familiar with the provisions of this policy and comport their professional development in accordance with its letter and spirit. While the provisions of this policy set forth in great detail the Department's RTP requirements, candidates are encouraged to consult the appendices for shorter, user- friendly guides to assembling the materials they must submit for mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, and promotion evaluations. It should be noted, however, that the appendices appear only for the sake of convenience. Nothing in the appendices shall be construed at superseding the contents or requirements of the body of this RTP Policy.

1.3 Governing Documents

1.3.1 Adoption

The Department adopts this policy pursuant to the mandates of the Section 3.5 of both the *university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) and the CHHS RTP Policy (24-25), and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university RTP policy*, or the CHHS RTP policy, *the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.3.2 Specific Role of this Departmental Policy

This departmental-level policy serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the policies and procedures set forth in these other RTP policies specified in Section 1.3.1 in a manner that provides concrete guidance to faculty in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies within the department's discipline-specific framework.

1.4 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and department RTP policies. The only evidence that may be considered for review is that which is included in the candidate's RTP file.

1.4.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Start Process

In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.4.2 Completeness of Candidate's File

Candidates must furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation (e.g., for teaching: student evaluations for all courses for which SPOT was administered, course syllabi, sample(s) of course content, sample(s) of student work with feedback, peer evaluations, and grade distributions; etc.; for RSCA, copies of manuscripts under review and/or presented at conferences; preprints or reprints of articles; letters accepting manuscripts for publication; for service, letters documenting the candidate's service which assess the quality of the service contributions) in the most current format required by Faculty Affairs.

1.4.3 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which Department RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating the evidence to support its recommendations.

1.5 Standards

Recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or directors of academic units (if submitted) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit. Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation must also be guided by the following expectations that apply to all Department faculty members at all ranks:

1.5.1 Staying Current

Faculty members must keep abreast of scholarly and applied discourse applicable to the faculty member's areas of teaching and research interest(s) through appropriate means and demonstrate their application of this knowledge.

1.5.2 Involvement in the Profession

Faculty members are encouraged to attend and participate in the annual meetings of professional organizations such as the Leisure Research Symposium, the National Parks and Recreation Association Congress, the World Leisure Congress, the Travel and Tourism Research Association Congress, the Association for Experiential Education, the American Therapeutic Recreation Association, the American Camping Association, the North American Association for Environmental Education, American Sociological Association, the American Psychological Association, and other similar international, national and/or regional organizations (such as the California Parks and Recreation Society).

1.5.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing

Faculty members must actively pursue a research and publishing agenda relevant to one or more of the following types of data-based scholarship, all of which are

highly valued regardless of reliance on quantitative, qualitative, or other discipline-appropriate methodologies (such as legal analysis, policy analysis, or case studies):

A. Scholarship of Discovery – the traditional research model in which new content knowledge is acquired and disseminated;

B. Scholarship of Integration – the creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and making connections across disciplines or sub-disciplines;

C. Scholarship of Application – the bridging of the gap between theory and practice through both research and action in ways that promote positive social change and/or promote policy-oriented problem solving; and

D. Scholarship of Pedagogy – the discovery of the ways our students learn and the identification and assessment of methods used to foster learning.

1.5.4 High-Quality Instruction

Faculty members must involve students in active learning through excellence not only in their "in-classroom" teaching, but also in their mentoring of students in the following ways:

A. by their own examples of service to the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies; the College of Health and Human Services; the university; professional organizations; and in the community at large;

B. through collaborative research that engages students in the processes of critical inquiry and discovery;

C. through engaging students in service learning projects;

D. through unique disciplinary interactions with students through directed readings and independent research projects;

E. through the ongoing process of socializing students into a culture of intellectual discovery and professional communication via both group and one-on-one interactions in classes, at conferences, in co-curricular activities (especially through the Department's Student Recreation Society), and through advising/mentoring; and

F. through assigning meaningful work in the discipline, and by interacting with students both in and out of class in a manner that fosters the development of broadly-applicable intellectual habits necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship.

1.5.5 Meaningful, Collegial Service

Faculty members are expected to serve the Recreation and Leisure Studies Department, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession as a meaningfully contributing citizen.

A. CSULB depends on faculty contributions to ensure that it achieves its educational mission through effective and efficient operations. The university's commitment to participatory governance and the needs of academic programs and units necessitate a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all faculty members in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in professional organizations.

B. Faculty service contributions are expected to increase concomitantly with the institution's commitment to the individual. This means that faculty members are expected to accept more significant service responsibilities over time during the probationary period, and then even more at each higher rank.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies is comprised of a community of teacher-scholars and learners who are dedicated to free inquiry and open exchange. In accordance with the CSULB mission, the Department's faculty is dedicated "to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity, and service for the people of California and the world." *Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank.* The Department's expectations for achieving CSULB's Mission and the standards contained in Sections 1.5.0 through 1.5.5 vary by rank. The specific criteria applicable to each academic rank are integrated throughout Section 2.0 of this Policy and its subsections.

1.7 Candidate's Narrative

In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As Section 2.0 the university and CHHS RTP policies both make clear, *academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university, the college, and the particular academic unit*. The subsections of Section 2.0 in this policy were crafted in fulfillment of that obligation. Accordingly, the provisions in Section 2.0 and its subsections articulate the standards for faculty accomplishments and the criteria for evaluation of those accomplishments in *three areas of evaluation: 1)*

instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

While all of expectations set forth above in Sections 1.5.0 through 1.55 are highly valued, above all, Recreation and Leisure Studies faculty members are expected to serve the missions of the department, college, and university through high-quality teaching that successfully integrates both discipline-specific and broad learning goals and objectives. The goal of higher education is to help develop educated, ethical, and productive citizens, as well as capable professionals in a variety of recreation, parks, and tourism careers. In a rapidly changing world, a university education must provide students with more than the knowledge needed for success in a specific profession. It also must provide them with skills and attitudes that facilitate adaptation and constructive response to societal needs and changes. Accordingly, faculty at all ranks should aspire to be teachers of the first order.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student differences.

To help evaluate candidate's instructional philosophy and practice/teaching effectiveness, candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit six types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: student evaluations; peer evaluations; course syllabi; examples of instructional materials and methods; examples of student work with the instructor's feedback; and grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy. Additionally, candidates may (but are not required to) submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher (e.g., taking part in faculty development initiatives at the college or university level). Lastly, candidates shall clearly articulate all instructional activities that are compensated by assigned time or additional compensation.

A. Indicia of High-Quality Teaching – Although high quality teaching is to be assessed holistically, *hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and practice* include, *but are not limited to*:

1) subject mastery, currency, and ongoing growth in one's discipline;

2) teaching skills that arouse student interest, curiosity, motivation and participation;

3) rigor and transparency in evaluating student work;

4) timeliness and professionalism in meeting classes and evaluating student work;

5) thoughtful mentorship and advising that contribute to students' cultural, social, and intellectual lives;

6) the creation and/or revision of courses and curricula in ways that foster a vibrant, intellectual community that is built around a shared commitment to scholarly inquiry;

B. Indicia of Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher – *Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness* can be evidenced by teaching innovations based upon, but is not limited to:

1) Purposeful experimentation with one's own pedagogy leading to improvements in ways to foster engaging educational environments that are characterized by academic freedom, creative expressions, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and community engagement;

2) Deliberate efforts to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to:

a. *Regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course developmen*t; or

b. A sustained record of involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for Faculty Development; or

c. A sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or professional organizations; or

3) Significant contribution to the Department's curricular assessment efforts.

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning that should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials, including, but are not limited to:

A. *Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey to students*—in measurable, behavioral terms—*expected student learning outcomes.*

B. Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices, standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic responsibilities and/or individual personal growth).

C. Careful preparation and clear organization of lessons and pedagogical materials that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

A. Required Documentation – In order to allow for complete consideration of student evaluations, candidates must submit copies of student evaluations – both quantitative and qualitative – in accordance with the following requirements:

1) Although candidates for mini-review and/or initial reappointment are required to submit copies of all student evaluations for all courses for which SPOT was administered.

2) In the years following initial reappointment, candidates for mini-review, any subsequent reappointment, tenure, or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are required to submit copies of all student evaluations for all courses for which SPOT was administered.

3) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are required to submit copies of all student evaluations for all courses for which SPOT was administered.

B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – *Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.*

1) *While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the Department and/or the CHHS for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative* (e.g., when teaching a new course for the first time, especially if offered at the graduate-level; when teaching under-enrolled courses which could result in skewed evaluations), *overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages.*

2) *Student ratings of instruction are "consistently favorable" when* both of following criteria are met:

a) the mean for students' responses to questions on standardized teaching evaluation forms are no lower than one standard deviation below the departmental mean; and

b) student evaluations submitted by candidates provide evidence of the following trends:

(1) For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching *must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.*

(2) *Student evaluations of teaching submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.*

(3) *Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.*

C. Caveat on the Use of Student Ratings – *Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. For this reason, candidates must present other information, such as their syllabi, grade distributions,* sample course content, sample of student work with instructor feedback, *and peer evaluations of instruction*. These additional materials serve to help the Department RTP Committee contextualize student ratings.

2.1.4 Peer-Evaluation

A. Required Documentation – Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit at least two (2) peer evaluations conducted within the three years prior to the application. To show growth in response to feedback from peers, candidates are encouraged to seek a second peer evaluation from the same tenured colleague in a subsequent semester.

B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – Peer evaluations must be based on personal observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. Peer evaluations must document whether: instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; and overall effectiveness of ways in which information is communicated to students in the classroom. Peer evaluators should also evaluate and comment upon the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials. To assist tenured colleagues in conducting these types of evaluations, peer evaluators must use the form contained in Appendix A.

2.1.5 Syllabi

At minimum, all course syllabi comply with the requirements of CSULB's official syllabi policy. Pursuant to that policy, all syllabi must set forth course meetings times and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information; required books and other resources; an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy; an explanation of how the instructor will apply the University's course withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or schedule. Excellent syllabi, however, also contain other types of information, such as:

A. the measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;

B. clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;

C. instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and

D. readings and assignments that are up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, assigned readings from primary sources that enhance the interdisciplinarity and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.

The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence this Policy is designed to facilitate.

Samples of course content should be provided by the candidate as evidence of how the instructor addresses the course content described in the syllabi. Samples of course content can include, but are not limited to:

A. Power Point lectures

B. Classroom instructional activities

C. Outlines of discussion questions to be addressed in a facilitated class discussion

2.1.6 Grade Distributions and Feedback on Student's Work

Although there is no such thing as an "ideal" grade distribution, grade distributions can help to contextualize a candidate's student evaluations and assist in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The RTP Committee should evaluate a candidate's grade distributions within the context of how the candidate himself or herself commented upon them. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be expected in larger undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques might justify a grading distribution of all "A"s and "B"s in small, upper-level or graduate seminars. Thus, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor's teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices.

2.1.7 Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above in Section 2.1.1(A) and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher as set forth in Section 2.1.1(B). If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee shall review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Research and scholarly/creative activities (RSCA) represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and beneficial components of the professorial role for several reasons. First, advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one's knowledge has the potential for improving the quality education by keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline. Second, RSCA bring prestige and visibility to the University and the Department. The most respected and successful universities support and encourage the acquisition of knowledge. This increases not only the likelihood that the Department will attract high quality students and faculty, but also the likelihood of obtaining grants, equipment, and other financial support from the community, industry, and government agencies. Third, RSCA enhance teaching effectiveness and enrich the education of students. Fourth, RSCA, especially when funded, bring equipment, technology, and professional development opportunities to the Department and its students. This, in turn, increases the likelihood that students will be well-trained and competitive when seeking employment. Fifth, professional survival requires that members generate a large

portion of the knowledge upon which their profession is based. Scholarly activities enable professions to shape their own destiny, rather than allowing others to dominate the course of events. For these reasons, *faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers.* Accordingly, faculty members in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research which demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of recreation, leisure, tourism, and/or related fields. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

2.2.1 Variability within Recreation and Leisure Studies

A. Variability in the Nature of Relevant RSCA – Recreation, leisure, and tourism are interdisciplinary fields. Scholarship includes basic, applied, and pedagogical research, as well as outreach initiatives. Qualified faculty members may be trained in recreation or therapeutic recreation, tourism or tourism management, park or natural resource management, sports management, the social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, political science, and anthropology), and/or in interdisciplinary programs (e.g., experiential education, gerontology, child development). These varied disciplines use a diverse array of research methodologies that are all equally valued. Thus, any application of standards needs to respect individual differences in scholarly programs and goals.

B. Variations Due to Intense Service Roles – There may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in teaching or service, such as serving as the department chair, graduate advisor, or in a position of leadership with college-wide and/or university-wide significance. In such cases the reduction in scholarship should not be counted against the candidate, but there should be evidence that the candidate's scholarly activity has been maintained to some degree and has promise for full resumption when the other activities return to normal levels.

2.2.2 Standards for the Production of Scholarly Research and Creative Activities

A. Standards – The following provide the foundation for delineating our discipline-specific standards for teacher-scholar excellence and, therefore, shall be used for evaluating candidates' RSCA:

1) high-quality work as judged by one's peers;

2) scope of recognition for RSCA contributions at the international, national, regional, or local level;

3) sustained effort, involvement, and record of RSCA accomplishment; and

4) the impact of one's research and scholarly activities.

B. Types of RSCA – All faculty members in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies are *required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative,* theoretical, and/or other discipline-appropriate scholarly research (such as policy analysis, legal analysis, or case study), *as well as other scholarly and creative activities* consistent with the provisions of this Policy. Copies of all such scholarly work published or presented must be submitted so that the Department RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.

1) Suggested Types of RSCA

(a) *Publication of scholarly research in peer reviewed journals is suggested of all candidates* at all levels of review. Specific publication requirements are set forth below, but not limited to in subsections C(2), D(1), and D(2).

(1) "Research" involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as policy analysis or legal analysis) that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment. This type of data-based research is a highly valued type of scholarly activity for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies.

(2) Under appropriate circumstances, such as publication of articles or original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully advance leisure theory, theoretically-based scholarly writing may also constitute "research," depending on the candidate's area of expertise, even if it does not include the quantitative or qualitative examination of empirical data. Articles published in journals like *Leisure Sciences*, for example, would satisfy the departmental requirement for scholarly research. Under no circumstances, however, shall this provision be interpreted as allowing literature reviews, book reviews, scholarly article reviews, or encyclopedia entries to satisfy the departmental requirement for "scholarly research."

(b). C*onference proceedings and presentations strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank*. Conference proceedings and presentations do not, however, substitute for the requirement that candidates publish scholarly research in peer reviewed journals as set forth in specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

2) RSCA Strengthening a Candidate's file

a) *Although other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, article* reviews, encyclopedia entries, *etc.) are valued* (and therefore are detailed below in subsection D) *these types of scholarly and creative activities are insufficient to meet the department or CHHS RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate.* In other words, these other forms of scholarly activity strengthen the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications as recommended in subsections 2.2.2 B(1), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

b) *Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.* These forms of scholarly activity strengthen the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications as recommended in subsections 2.2.2 B(1), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

c) Candidates may also strengthen their required program of RSCA by writing or editing books. Books strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications as recommended in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

C. Evolution of RSCA – Although scholarly activities take many forms, faculty members must develop a scholarly research agenda and a record of scholarly publication that flows from the pursuit of that research agenda.

1) Scholarly Research Agenda – Teacher-scholars in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies are expected to establish and maintain an ongoing program of scholarship that is marked by continued scholarly research activity and dissemination. Teacher-scholars may concentrate on one type of research specified in Section 1.5.3, or may distribute their scholarship across the different types. Rates of dissemination may vary with specific scholarly goals.

An important element of all RTP reviews is the teacher-scholar's explanation of the continuity and evolution of their scholarly agenda, including future plans and goals. While the primary focus is clearly on accomplished contributions during the probationary years, it is important to respect and support the continued vibrancy of scholarly activity after the award of tenure and promotion. While the focus of scholarly activity can be expected to change with the evolution of an academic career, continuity, reflection, and growth are expected to persist. We recognize that sometimes staying involved and remaining vibrant means taking risks to change focus, adopt a new methodological approach, or develop a new application. As a community of vibrant teacher-scholars, we are committed to recognizing, valuing, and supporting each others' unique paths of professional growth. Towards these ends:

a) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to define and pursue a scholarly research agenda.

b) Reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require evidence that the candidate's scholarly research has been productive as evidenced by publications in suitable, scholarly venues (see subsection 2 below). Moreover, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be able to demonstrate how their research agenda is both continuing and evolving.

c) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained pattern of achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly record.

2) Scholarly Publications – The quality of work is defined by its significance in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to validate the work's significance. Normally, this means that the finished works will be published and/or presented in a venue consistent with accepted disciplinary standards (discussed in more detail below in subsection D of Section 2.2.2). This level of accomplishment is suggested and is the most important evidence for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion within the RSCA area.

a) RTP Committee members evaluating mini-reviews must be mindful of the fact that in the early probationary years, faculty are likely to begin establishing a research agenda. Thus, in the first year or two, new faculty might be more likely to publish book reviews, invited essays, monographs, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing article in peer-reviewed journals. New faculty, however, are expected to be working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed publications for editorial consideration in their first two years. New faculty members who are starting their careers immediately upon completion of their doctorate

are especially encouraged to try transforming their dissertations into at least one or two peer-reviewed journal articles. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

b) By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment in the third probationary year, it is expected that the candidate will have at least two peer-reviewed publications either in-print or formally accepted for publication consistent with accepted disciplinary standards (discussed in more detail below in subsection D of Section 2.2.2). Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

c) After initial reappointment in the latter half of the probationary period (years four through six), faculty should be publishing regularly in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least four scholarly articles in refereed venues (an average of roughly one publication per year). Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Thus, for example, a dozen publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing three or four articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

d) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have produced, on average, at least one scholarly publication in a refereed journal each year since the last promotion. As with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, however, quality is more important than quantity. Thus, multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner are not likely to result in a favorable recommendation for promotion. Conversely, three or four publications in high-quality journals, or a book or two with a well-respected scholarly press or leading commercial publishing house may warrant granting promotion to the

rank of Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

3) Significance of Scholarly Engagement of Students and/or Community – In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to our role in serving the communities in which we work and live through collection and analysis of data from these communities. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends shall be considered evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement.

4) Sponsored Research – *Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank.* Securing such sponsored research opportunities, though, shall constitute a criterion that is given extremely positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.

   a) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the probationary period, merely applying for externally sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills. However, applying for sponsored research opportunities does not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

   b) During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related scholarly activities, allowances should be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly journal articles. Such allowances must recognize that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming and, therefore, publication of the results of such research may be delayed until after extensive data-collection and analysis processes.

D. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of Specific Forms of RSCA
The following tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality can be used to guide choices of scholarship dissemination outlets. The most important of these criteria are contained in subsections (1) and (2), as such publications are a requirement for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as stated above in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a) and C(2); all other forms for RSCA listed below strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

1) Authorship – Sole-authored and first-authored works, as well as works published with student collaborators, are evaluated most positively. For multiple-authored works, the amount or nature of author contributions must be specified. Absent unusual circumstances (such as using a unique methodology or participating in long-term grant research with other scholars, etc.), all RTP candidates who contribute to multiple-authored works are expected to balance such collaborative research projects with research and publication of their own, independent research.

2) Refereed Journal Articles – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of articles: peer-review; acceptance/rejection rates for the journal; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal; status of the journal within the subfield; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and/or citations to the article.

a) Venues – Refereed articles that are accepted and published in recreation, leisure, and tourism journals; journals from related social sciences and/or cognate disciplines; recreation-related professional journals and newsletters, relevant electronic media are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The degree of value, however, depends on the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published, the degree of the candidate's contribution to the publication, and the impact of the publication on the discipline, and must always be taken into account when assessing the significance of any publication

b) Exceptional Scholarship – Publishing exceptionally high-quality scholarship in top-tier journals constitutes the strongest evidence of scholarly achievement that contributes to the meaningful advancement of the discipline.

3) Books – The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.

(a) Both scholarly books and textbooks are valued for RTP purposes.

(b) Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.

4) Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.

5) Invited Publications and/or Presentations – The stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.

6) Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – A peer review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local). Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Although conference presentations represent a form of scholarly activity, conference presentations and published proceedings do not supplant the requirement that candidates produce peer-reviewed publications in discipline-appropriate venues.

7) Editorial Roles – Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer on journal submissions; membership on a grant-review panel; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications. Such roles augment faculty members' required program of RSCA, but are insufficient to meet the Department RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.

8) Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports; and the frequency and range of clients for consulting activities.

9) Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of activities supported by internal grants, reassigned time, sabbaticals, and other forms of support for scholarly research funded by CSULB. Such activities augment faculty members' required program of RSCA, but are insufficient to meet the Department RSCA standards required for

favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.

10) Professional Honors, Awards, and Other Forms of Recognition – Recognition of RSCA through fellowship status in a professional organization, including consideration of the scope of the organization; awards, prizes, and other forms of recognition, including consideration of the scope of the organization presenting the award.

E. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of the Impact of RSCA

1) Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary journals. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).

2) Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses). Publications and presentations that include student co-authors are highly valued.

3) Community Impact – We recognize that RSCA impacts a variety of communities, including but not limited to professional and public (e.g. local, state, national, and international).

The impact of scholarship on students and the community is more difficult to demonstrate tangibly than the impact on the discipline. Nevertheless, these are highly-valued areas of impact. There are no clearly-established criteria for scholarly contributions in these areas. Documentation of this type of impact is thus particularly important. Indicators may include student co-authorship on presentations/publications, undergraduate research mentee pursuit of graduate training, scholarship used to provide community testimony on use of technical reports or consultation to address issues of public policy, expert review or letters about the quality and impact of applied research, and external evaluation of engaged scholarship.

F. Weighting of the Body of Work – The applicant's entire body of scholarly work provides evidence for the pattern of continuing and evolving scholarship in

support of mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, and initial promotion, but only works finished since appointment at CSULB and within years of service credit granted at the time of appointment are evaluated for mini-reviews, reappointment, and tenure.

2.3 Service

Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments

All faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance through service to their academic units, the college, and the university. The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience. Additionally, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are required to have made quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection. Lastly, regardless of rank, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity within their narratives.

A. Service within the University

1) *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in university or college service; however, they are expected to perform quality service* within the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. In evaluating the quality of Departmental Service, initiatives that improve the Department's alignment with the mission of the college and university will be most highly valued. Examples of Departmental service include, but not limited to the following:

(a) attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;

(b) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department;

(c) participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees, (especially by chairing a department committee such as the Awards, Scholarship, and Banquet Committee, or the Assessment Committee);

(d) attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the department, the college, the university, and professional organizations; and

(e) advising student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;

2) *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to* both the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies (as discussed above) and to service contributions to the effective operation and growth of *the CHHS*, such as serving on college-wide committees and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the college. University-level service is desirable, but not required.

3) *For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to* demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent *service and leadership at* the department*, college, and university levels.* In doing so, they must contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution, including, but not limited to:

(a) chairing the department[1], serving as the Graduate Advisor or directing the Department's certificate or distance-learning degree programs, etc.;

(b) holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;

(d) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university, college, or department;

B. Service to the Community and/or the Profession – *All faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession.*

1) Community Service – *If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member* such that he or she applies academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional, national, or international problems.

(a) For reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, such community service may include:

(1) *consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations*.

[1] This provision shall not be construed as inviting or authorizing a review of the candidate's performance as department chair. Rather, RTP committee members must be mindful of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of a department chair may impact a candidate's ability to engage in a full range of instructionally-related activities and/or RSCA.

(2) helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise; and/or

(3) acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.

(b) For promotion to the rank of full Professor, such community service is expected to include a record of meaningful service in the community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international problems), such as:

(1) taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;

(2) holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to the candidate's professional expertise;

(3) consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;

(4) serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or

(5) engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to recreation professions; serving as a media consultant (by giving interviews or otherwise) for recreation-related events or news stories; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with recreation-related missions; writing recreation-relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.

2) Professional Service – *Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected offices* in a recreation, leisure, and/or tourism related professional organization. Such professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for national or international associations.

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments and Participation

The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in section 2.3.1. Accordingly, the RTP Committee must not merely summarize the breadth and/or quantity of a candidate's service contributions, but rather must evaluate the depth, *quality, and significance of service activities*. In doing so, the Committee should consider:

A. *the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, the college,* and/or to the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies;

B. the significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the university, college, and/or department, including participation on committees and/or with student organizations;

C. the *depth and quality* of activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional, and prospective students;

D. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;

E. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers their services; and

F. most importantly, the *degree of leadership* exhibited by the candidate. In evaluating this criterion, the RTP Committee must be mindful of the fact that leadership is not exclusively defined by one's position in a hierarchical structure, but rather is something that can be demonstrated at all levels by influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the group in which they serve. Effective leaders create results, attain goals, realize vision, and guide others by modeling more quickly and at a higher level of quality than do ineffective leaders.

2.4 Evaluation of Service

2.4.1 Candidate's Responsibility

The candidate must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative criteria in their narrative.

A. Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance.

B. Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.

C. Insofar as the University and CHHS recognize that cultural and identity taxation have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas, service done on behalf of students or on behalf of the department, college and university that might otherwise go unrecognized or disproportionately fall on faculty should be considered in the evaluation process. While all tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in shared governance and maintain active engagement.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the academic unit, Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies *RTP committee, the chair of the* Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies*, 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 RTP committee of the academic unit, the chair or director of the academic unit, 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, shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

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

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college- level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies. The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies RTP Committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for evaluating the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.

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

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

All RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.

3.3.1 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee level of peer review.

3.3.2 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.

(b) After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election.

3.3.3 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy.

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 chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university processes and procedures.

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

3.5 College RTP Policy

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

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

3.6 College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP

committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee must take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

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

3.6.1 Duties

The college RTP committee shall conduct evaluations of all candidates' files and shall include a recommendation to the college Dean.

3.6.2 Membership

The college RTP committee shall consist of eight (8) tenured, full-time faculty members. A minimum of five (5) faculty members must hold the rank of Full Professor. Up to three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members may serve at the rank of Associate Professor. Only tenured Full Professors may evaluate and vote on applications for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

3.6.3 Election, Service, Appointment, and Terms

(a) Annually, each department shall be invited to nominate from its membership one professor and an associate professor to the dean of the College during their first/second department meeting. Members of the college committee shall be elected by secret ballot of the college faculty;

(b) There shall not be more than one member from any one academic unit; an exception may occur and a second member from the same department can be elected only after all academic units are represented from the eligibility pool;

(c) Elected members shall serve staggered, two-year terms;

(d) Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e., more than four consecutive years). After serving four consecutive years in any capacity (e.g., alternate), an individual is ineligible to serve the following year in any capacity.

(e) A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee of peer review.

(f) A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee (one-year term at a time) if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President. However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of whom, are FERP participants.

3.6.4 Vacancies

In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the college RTP committee, either a meeting of the college faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the office of the Dean of the college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).

3.6.5 Chair

A chair shall be elected from among the members of the college RTP committee.

3.6.6 Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files

(a) The college RTP committee shall evaluate all candidates' files in accordance with standards established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university.

(b) The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the academic unit's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.

(c) The college committee shall prepare and forward an independent, written evaluation to the college Dean concerning each RTP candidate. The evaluation must conclude with a personnel action recommendation in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.

3.6.7 Recommendations

(a) For all candidates seeking reappointment or tenure, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit as part of its evaluation of the candidate and recommend whether reappointment or tenure should be granted or denied.

(b) For all candidates seeking promotion, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit and make a positive or negative recommendation with respect to the proposed action.

(c) The college RTP committee shall forward to the Dean the entire candidate file, including its own evaluations and recommendations and those from the academic unit.

(d) The college committee shall inform all candidates of the committee's recommendation in writing.

2.1 Dean of the College

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

The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

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

2.2 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 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the timeline designated by the University Policy (see sections 4.0-4.3 of Policy Statement 23-24).

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the reappointment and promotion criteria designated by the University Policy (see sections 5.0-5.5.2 of Policy Statement 23-24). In particular, this policy aligns with the University Policy on early tenure and/or early promotion, as noted below:

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

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 department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways. The candidate's record must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

Furthermore, candidates must include documentation to demonstrate they have not just exceeded requirements in all three areas, but achieved markedly exceptional results relative to the requirements. Candidates need to be outstanding or extraordinary in all three areas of evaluation (teaching, RSCA, and service) in order to be considered for early tenure. RSCA productivity alone, without exceptional teaching and service does not quality a candidate for early tenure.

In concurrence with University RTP policy, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to engage in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

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 in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways.

Furthermore, candidates must include documentation to demonstrate they have not just exceeded requirements in all three areas, but achieved markedly exceptional results relative to the requirements. Candidates need to be outstanding or extraordinary in all three areas of evaluation (teaching, RSCA, and service) in order to be considered for early promotion. RSCA productivity alone, without outstanding teaching and service, does not qualify a candidate for early promotion. Moreover, for promotion to Full Professor under the differential track model, departments must identify within their RTP policy what exemplifies markedly exceptional results in a given track.

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

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

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the steps in the RTP process designated by the University Policy (see sections 6.0-6.10 of Policy Statement 23-24).

6.1 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).

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

6.3 Departments must post outside the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. Departments must also disseminate this list to department faculty unit employees, staff, and students electronically. The announcements shall invite statements about qualifications and work of the candidate and its impact. These submissions may be electronic but cannot be anonymous.

6.4 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.

6.5 Candidates prepare materials for review and submit them via the 1187 university-approved process by the deadline.

6.6 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.

6.7 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.

6.8 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.

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

6.10 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.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the additional processes designated by the University Policy (see sections 7.0-7.6 of Policy Statement 23-24).

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

7.2 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.

7.3 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.

7.4 At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of 1222 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.

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

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

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the changes and amendments procedures designated by the University Policy (see sections 8.0 of Policy Statement 23-24).

Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur because of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs, and 1237 these changes should be communicated in a timely manner.

Effective: DATE

APPENDIX A: PEER-EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES

EVALUATION REPORT FROM
PEER-OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

INSTRUCTOR'S RANK _____

COURSE OBSERVED _____

OBSERVATION DATE _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS PRESENT _____

TIMEBASE Part-Time Full-Time # of WTUs: 3

A. Summary of Key Teaching Performance Indicators

The class session began with an overview of the lesson's objectives and then proceeded to meet those objectives through the delivery of instruction.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The lesson was well-organized.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The methods used to deliver the lesson during the observed class session were appropriate for meeting the learning objectives.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor was well-prepared for class.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor integrated content from sufficiently varied sources to add both breadth and depth to the lesson.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

Information communicated by the instructor was accurate and up-to-date (i.e., the instructor's subject mastery and currency were evident).				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor was effective in presenting subject content and materials in the class session.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor was enthusiastic and/or was able to arouse student interest, curiosity, motivation, and/or participation.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor fostered an effective educational environment that facilitated creative expression, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and/or student engagement.				
☐ Excellent	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

B. Course Syllabus Construction

1. Consistent with CSULB policy, the syllabus adequately sets forth:		
course meeting times and location	☐ Yes	☐ No
the instructor's office location and office hours	☐ Yes	☐ No
the instructor's contact information	☐ Yes	☐ No
required books and resources	☐ Yes	☐ No
an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy	☐ Yes	☐ No
an explanation of how the instructor will enforce the university's withdrawal policy	☐ Yes	☐ No
course requirements that form the basis of the assessment of student performance	☐ Yes	☐ No
a statement on academic integrity	☐ Yes	☐ No
a course outline or schedule	☐ Yes	☐ No

2. Syllabus evaluation criteria:

The learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education are clearly conveyed to students in behavioral terms.			
Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Not at all

Grading practices, standards, and criteria are clearly articulated.			
Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Not at all

Instructional methods used in the course are explained and are appropriate to the course taught.			
Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Not at all

Course assignments are explained and are appropriate to/for the course taught.			
Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Not at all

Course content appears to be up-to-date, appropriate to the course topic, and enhancing of student learning.			
Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Not at all

The course appears to integrate materials that are interdisciplinary and/or comparative.				
Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Not at all	Not applicable

C. Qualitative Feedback on Teaching

1. *Describe the lesson taught, including the subject, objectives, and methods used.*

2. *Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, currency, breadth, and depth.*

3. *How well organized and clear was the presentation?*

4. *How effective were the methods of instruction used for this presentation?*

5. *Describe the level of student interest and participation.*

6. *What were the instructor's major strengths? Weaknesses?*

7. *What specific and constructive recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's teaching in this class?*

D. Overall Rating of Teaching

On the basis of the evidence provided in Sections A, B, and C, I rate the instructor's overall teaching as:

☐ Excellent	☐ Proficient	☐ Satisfactory	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unsatisfactory

SIGNATURE OF PEER-EVALUATOR:

NAME OF PEER EVALUATOR	TITLE OF PEER EVALUATOR	DATE

SIGNATURE OF EMPLOYEE	
I have read the above evaluation. My signature indicates neither agreement nor disagreement with it.	
EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE	DATE

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR MINI-EVALUATIONS

Mini-Evaluations of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies RTP Committee, the Department Chair (optional), and the College Dean. The standard form for evaluation must be used.[1] Pursuant to that form, a candidate's activities are to be evaluated under the categories of: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. The dossier, however, for a mini-evaluation is not supposed to be a full RTP evaluation file. Accordingly, candidates for mini-reviews are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini-evaluation or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).[2]

To assist the Department RTP Committee in conducting a mini-evaluation of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit an updated Professional Data Sheet (PDS) and curriculum vitae which addresses: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. These updates are to be supported with the following documentation:

1. Narrative – The narrative for a mini-review should be in the form of a short letter (*two to three pages*) that reflects on a candidate's accomplishments in all three areas either since initial appointment (for new probation faculty), since the last mini-review (for candidates in their second or fifth years), or since formal reappointment (for candidates in their fourth year).

   In terms of the content of the narrative, two or three paragraphs should be devoted to reflection on one's teaching. Two or three paragraphs should discuss the candidate's scholarly activities; in these paragraphs, in accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy (and its subsections), candidates must identify their program of scholarly research. It is important that specific goals and plans – both current and future – be clearly articulated and documented because mere claims of intent are insufficient. This should include not only a written plan of research activity, but also some indication of how data for empirically-based research may be derived or obtained. Finally, a paragraph or two should explain the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period.

2. Student Evaluations

---

1 http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/personnel/forms/documents/CHHS-RTPEVALFORM-revised9- 2004.doc.

2 New probationary faculty should therefore submit materials from the date of appointment. However, if service credit was given at the time of appointment, candidates should also include materials for the credited years.

a) New Probationary Faculty Prior to Initial Reappointment – In accordance with Section 2.1.3(A)(1) of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review are strongly encouraged to submit all student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, from all sections of all courses they have taught; however, candidates for mini-review are only required to submit all quantitative and qualitative copies of student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses taught each semester. In addition, candidates must submit a summary table of their student evaluations from all sections of all courses for which SPOT was administered since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses that are subsequently evaluated by students. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 1: Summary of Quantitative Anonymous Feedback on Teaching

Question	**Semester Year**		**Semester Year**		**Semester Year**		**Candidate Average**
Course Number	REC xxx	REC xxx	REC xxx	REC xxx	REC xxx	REC xxx	Compute Mean of the Means
1. The instructor provided clear and accurate information regarding course objectives, requirements, and grading procedures.							
2. The instructor's grading was consistent with stated criteria and procedures.							
3. The instructor provided assignments/activities that were useful for learning and understanding the subject.							
4. The instructor's expectations concerning work to be done in this course were reasonable.							
5. The instructor was well-prepared for class.							
6. The instructor was effective in presenting subject content and materials in the class.							
7. The instructor was available during posted office hours for conferences about the course.							

8. Overall, I rate this instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in this course as:	Instructor Mean							
	Department Mean							
	College Mean							

3. Peer-Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.4 of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review must submit peer evaluations of teaching that were conducted within the year prior to the application. Candidates should have at least one peer-evaluation each semester they teach from tenured faculty.3 Ideally, candidates should ask for a peer evaluation each semester that he/she teaches a course to show that growth, development, or consistency exists in the candidate's teaching.

4. Syllabi – In accordance with Section 2.1.5 of the Department RTP Policy, syllabi from all courses for which SPOT was administered in the relevant review period must be submitted. Only one syllabus per discrete course should be submitted, not multiple copies of syllabi used in different sections or semesters. An exception to this rule, however, is if the candidate has made substantial changes to a syllabus in response to suggestions from students or peers. In such an event, candidates should submit "before" and "after" copies as evidence of efforts to improve courses. Candidates should make sure that their syllabi conform to all university requirements.

5. Table of Grade Distributions – In accordance with Section 2.1.6 of the Department RTP Policy, candidates must submit their grade distributions *in summary tabular form* from all sections of all courses for which SPOT was administered since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses taught. The table should be presented using the format below (Table 2). Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness and, as such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.

6. Syllabi – In accordance with Section 2.1.5 of the Department RTP Policy, syllabi from all courses for which SPOT was administered in the relevant review period must be submitted. Only one syllabus per discrete course should be submitted, not multiple copies of syllabi used in different sections or semesters. An exception to this rule, however, is if the candidate has made substantial changes to a syllabus in response to suggestions from students or peers. In such an event, candidates should submit "before" and "after" copies as evidence of efforts to improve courses. Candidates should make sure that their syllabi conform to all university requirements.

7. Table of Grade Distributions – In accordance with Section 2.1.6 of the Department RTP Policy, candidates must submit their grade distributions *in summary tabular form* from all sections of all courses for which SPOT was administered since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses taught. The table should be presented using the format below (Table 2). Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness and, as such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.

Table 2: Summary of Grade Distributions

Term	Class	No. of Stdnts Enrolled	No. of Stdnts Respond	Lect Mean*	Lect SD	Dept Mean*	Dept SD	College Mean*	College SD*	Class GPA	Dept GPA

8. Scholarly Publications – In accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy and its subsections, candidates must document their scholarly publication record. During mini-evaluations, candidates should therefore including copies of papers presented at conferences; manuscripts under review; preprints of articles accepted for publication along with the letter of acceptance; reprints of articles that have been published; proposals for funded research; and letters documenting service as an editor or peer- reviewer. *Only those scholarly activities that have occurred since the last review need to be submitted.*

9. Documenting Service – Candidates during mini-reviews need not submit any documentation of service; simply listing such service on their updated curriculum vitae is sufficient. Candidates are well advised, however, to be careful to keep such documentation since it is required to be submitted as part of a candidate's RTP file for formal reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Such evaluations may be conducted by faculty members in the Department, qualified faculty members from other departments, or the Faculty Development Center. Experts in the relevant subfield may also provide additional evaluations of the content of a candidate's teaching.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2026**

Department of RLS

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below):	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature:	Date:
4/25/25	Nathan Gerard Nathan Gerard	10/13/2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below):	College Dean Name & Signature:	Date
10/13/2025	Grace Reynolds-Fisher Grace Reynolds-Fisher, DNP	10/13/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below):	Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs Name & Signature:	Date:
9/19/2025	Patricia Perez Patricia Perez	10/14/2025

Provost Signature:	Date:
	10/14/25

1250 BELLFLOWER BOULEVARD · LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90840 · 562 | 985 | 5212 · FAX 562 | 985| 1680