

Approved by Academic Affairs on August 29, 2025

California State University, Long Beach
College of Liberal Arts

**PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**

Revised January 28, 2025

Approved by CLA Faculty Council in Spring 2025

Approved by the Department via 5-Day Notice on February 3, 2025

The purpose of this policy is to describe the process and standards that shall be used to evaluate candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Psychology Department at California State University, Long Beach. The standards and expectations this policy outlines are intended to affirm and develop the principles expressed in the University and College RTP Policies. By setting clear standards, the Psychology Department expects that each candidate will realize the high promise that is characteristic of its faculty members.

It is expected that each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will have a unique profile regarding accomplishments in (a) Instructional Activities, (b) Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), and (c) Service. The standards in this document are intended to provide clear criteria for evaluation while maintaining some flexibility for candidates to meet them, provided that candidates clearly describe how their work fulfills those criteria. This document is not intended to provide a simple checklist for success. Rather, candidates are expected to describe and demonstrate excellence relative to the stated criteria. Psychology Department RTP committee members are expected to use their best professional judgment in applying the criteria and evaluating all candidates consistently.

I. RESPONSIBILITIES

The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP Policy provides additional specificity for evaluating faculty members in the College. This Psychology Department RTP Policy provides further specificity as appropriate for our discipline's standards and expectations.

A. Candidate

The candidate is responsible for reviewing and addressing RTP policies and standards established in the University, College, and Department RTP Policies. The candidate is also primarily responsible for collecting, presenting, and describing the evidence of accomplishments. Candidates should take special care to prepare a succinct and clear Narrative that presents the best case for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Further context and description may be provided in the Professional Data Sheet (PDS). It is recommended that candidates also review the RTP committee evaluation form to ensure they address all relevant areas that are to be evaluated. In addition, candidates should make every effort to participate in the mentoring process and seek guidance from a variety of sources, including the Department Chair, the Department RTP committee, the College Dean, and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs to fully understand the process and standards. Candidates are responsible for knowing the timelines for the annual period review, including submission of the optional professional development plan (PDP), periodic mini evaluation (a.k.a., mini review), reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This information can be found on the Faculty Affairs website.

B. Department Chair

The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring candidates receive effective mentoring and support in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University

community. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the RTP procedures established by the university (e.g., Office of Academic Affairs) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) regarding the evaluation of candidates are followed. The Department Chair is encouraged to submit either a letter of support during the open period or an independent evaluation of each candidate undergoing tenure and/or promotion except where prohibited by the College or University RTP documents. The Department Chair is responsible for reviewing RTP policies with candidates during their first three years and before being evaluated for tenure and promotion.

C. Department RTP Committee

The Department RTP committee has primary responsibility for evaluating the candidates' materials and makes the initial recommendation to the College and University regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department RTP committee shall consider both expectations and other highly valued activities specified in this document by the candidate when deriving a recommendation. The candidate is responsible for adequately describing their activities and accomplishments so that the RTP committee can accurately evaluate their materials.

1. *Formation of Department RTP Committees.* Typically, two committees composed of five voting members will be formed, which may have overlapping members.
 - a. The committee considering actions of (a) reappointment of an Assistant Professor or (b) tenure and/or promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty with the rank of at least Associate Professor who are themselves not being evaluated in the RTP process that year.
 - b. The committee considering actions of promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor. If obtaining a five-member committee of Psychology Department faculty members is not possible, the committee shall consist of at least three members. In all cases, the committee is responsible for forming a majority decision.
2. *Eligibility.* All eligible faculty members, as described above, in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in the Academic Senate Policy are candidates for RTP committees with the option that a faculty member who serves one year at the Departmental RTP committee level may choose not to be listed on the ballot for the same level at which they served for the following year. Faculty who served on the College RTP committee may choose to opt out of being listed on any Departmental RTP committee the following year. Faculty members on sabbatical during the time of review may choose not to serve but should normally be listed on the ballot the following year. As stated in the University RTP document, faculty members participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are eligible for service on the department RTP committee if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary 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.
3. *Election Procedure.* The election of each RTP committee shall be by a majority vote of eligible faculty members as determined by the CBA. The election procedure will be as follows: On all ballots, all nominees shall be listed in random order. There will be two parts on all ballots. In the first part, voters will vote for all those nominees that they consider acceptable for membership on the committee. In the second part, eligible faculty members will vote for up to five that they would most prefer. If five or more nominees receive a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, the five receiving the greatest number of votes in the second part of the ballot shall be elected. If a vacancy occurs prior to the commencement of the RTP process, the person receiving the next highest number of votes (in addition to at least 50% acceptance) shall serve as a replacement. If less than five nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, then the

committee will comprise of the three receiving the greatest number of votes in the second part of the ballot. If less than three nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, then the Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate(s), shall identify qualified faculty members from outside the department to stand for election to the Psychology RTP committee(s). Once the outside candidates have been identified, the normal election procedure shall occur.

Any exceptions to the eligibility and election procedures must be brought to the Advisory Committee by the Department Chair and passed with a majority vote.

D. Department Faculty

All Department tenured and probationary faculty members are encouraged to provide effective support and mentoring to candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University community. Candidates are encouraged to request multiple examples of Professional Data Sheets and Narratives from faculty members who have recently completed the same action (candidates can consult with the Department Chair for a list of faculty).

II. VALUES

Psychology upholds the values expressed in section 1.3 of the CLA RTP Policy (see sections 1.3.1-1.3.5). Candidates should ensure that their Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service reflect these values. It is the candidate's responsibility to articulate in their narrative and/or PDS how these values are reflected in their activities. Notably, as stated in the CLA Policy, our Department recognizes that cultural and identity taxation have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. Candidates who experience such inequities in any area of evaluation due to cultural and identity taxation should feel free to discuss this in the narrative and/or PDS.

III. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Faculty members are expected to provide effective instruction in their discipline. Consistent with the University and College RTP Policies, the Psychology Department recognizes that effective instruction occurs both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting as specified below and in the CLA RTP Policy.

A. File Requirements

Below is the list of required and optional materials specified in section 2.1.1 of the CLA RTP Policy to demonstrate effective teaching as defined in section 2.1.3 of the CLA RTP Policy.

1. *Required Materials*

- a. A teaching narrative written on the fillable form.
- b. Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal student course evaluations were required during the period of review.
- c. Grade distributions relative to course level.
- d. One (1) representative course syllabus for each course taught during the period of review.
- e. If applicable, an academic advisor report. Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal student academic advising shall report on their activities per a consistent procedure approved by the Dean or designee.
- f. Evidence of effective teaching in support of 1) Continuous Professional Learning, 2) thoughtful Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction, and 3) the use of instructional practices Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals. Suggestions for supporting evidence are outlined in section 2.1.3 of the CLA RTP Policy. This evidence should be included in the candidate's Professional Data Sheet and listed in their index.

2. *Optional Materials*

- 147 a. Teaching observation. Candidates may submit a formal teaching evaluation
148 conducted by a trained observer or request a peer observation to the Department
149 Chair. In the latter case, the Department Chair will designate a tenured faculty
150 member in the department who is familiar with the content of the course to be
151 observed as a peer observer. A written observation report by a trained or peer
152 observer must be included.
- 153 b. Written remarks on student course evaluations. If candidates opt to include
154 remarks from a course, all remarks (whether positive or negative) from written
155 evaluations for that course must be included.

156 B. Instructional Activities and Evidence

157 Candidates are expected to describe their instructional activities and evidence of (1) Continuous
158 Professional Learning, (2) Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction, and (3) Fostering Student
159 Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals in the PDS and/or narrative as appropriate to
160 make the best case for instructional effectiveness. Expectations and Additional Highly Valued
161 Activities for each of the above categories are specified below.

162 1. *Continuous Professional Learning*

- 163 a. Expectations: Candidates are expected to participate in 1) one-half, full, or multi-
164 day professional development activity (e.g., workshops, attendance at professional
165 conferences, multiple peer observations of instruction); or 2) two shorter
166 professional development activities (e.g., one-hour workshops, discussions of
167 instruction with peers) each academic year. This evidence of participation is
168 described in section 2.1.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy.
- 169 b. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities: The Department also recognizes
170 the following activities as evidence of supporting Continuous Professional
171 Learning:
- 172 • Reading scholarly articles and books on pedagogy
 - 173 • Attending Psychology Department colloquia
 - 174 • Development of pedagogical and mentoring practices that are reflective of
175 the needs of the students

176 2. *Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction*

- 177 a. Expectations: Candidates are expected to reflect on the outcomes and feedback
178 of their classroom instruction each semester and make appropriate adjustments.
179 Examples of evidence of reflection are described below (candidates should also
180 refer to section 2.1.2.2 of the CLA RTP Policy for additional guidance).
- 181 • Candidates can describe the changes in instructional materials (e.g., class
182 handouts, lecture notes/slides, descriptions of class activities, and web
183 page printouts).
 - 184 • Candidates may use individual SPOT items as evidence of their
185 instructional practices and deliberate efforts to improve student learning.
 - 186 • Candidates may discuss in their narrative and/or PDS the use of mid-
187 semester evaluations as evidence of adaptation of instructional practices
188 and responsiveness to student feedback.
- 189 b. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities: The Department also recognizes
190 reflection on and adaptation of additional instructional activities, including but not
191 limited to:
- 192 • Master's thesis supervision practices
 - 193 • Honor's thesis supervision practices
 - 194 • Practices of individual student supervision for independent study, research,

- internship, or student teaching
- Student mentoring and advising practices

3. *Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals*

- a. Expectations: Candidates are expected to demonstrate their efforts to foster student learning and their achievement of course goals during the period of review. As stated in section 2.1.3.3 of the CLA RTP Policy, course syllabi, quantitative course evaluation summaries, and grade distributions are required as supporting evidence. In addition, evidence supporting the narrative could include the following:

- Student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback)
- Formative or summative assessments (e.g., discussion assignments, labs, quizzes, papers or project assignments, and comprehensive final assignments or exams)
- A short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description
- Qualitative student perception data
- Classroom observation reports submitted by trained or peer observers
- Support letters submitted during the open period.

If the SPOT quantitative course evaluation response rate is lower than departmental norms, candidates should address plans to increase future response rates. Candidates may request average departmental response rates from the Department Chair.

In addition, candidates may take into consideration the following factors to make the best case for their file. The Department does not make any *a priori* judgments about the value of each of these factors.

- Level of courses taught (i.e., 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600)
- Size of classes taught
- Intensity of writing in courses
- Number of new preparations during the period of review
- Number of different courses taught during the period of review
- Trends over time
- Day/time of class taught
- Cultural and identity taxation.

- b. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities: The Department also values the candidate's efforts to foster student learning in other instructional activities, including but not limited to:

- Chairing master's thesis committees
- Supervising honors thesis students
- Supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study, research, internship, and student teaching
- Instructionally related mentoring and advising of students
- Curriculum and course development, including designing study abroad experiences

C. Additional Evaluation Criteria

In addition to the three areas described above in section III.B., the Psychology Department also values the following instructional activities:

1. Presentations of teaching techniques at academic or professional venues
2. Teaching or mentoring awards
3. Innovations in teaching (e.g., service learning, team learning, and novel use of technology)
4. Creation or substantial revision of standard course outlines
5. Creation of new courses or other substantial curriculum development
6. Exceptional degree of student mentoring
7. Student accomplishments (e.g., awards, presentations, and graduate school admissions) directly related to work supervised
8. Cultural and identity taxation, as detailed in sections 2.1 and 2.1.2 of the CLA RTP Policy

IV. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)

Faculty members are expected to remain engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the Psychology discipline over time. The Psychology Department recognizes and values the different forms of RSCA outlined in the University and CLA RTP Policies (*Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application or Engagement, and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*). All faculty members are expected to produce scholarly achievements that contribute to the Psychology discipline's knowledge base, are disseminated to appropriate audiences, and receive favorable reviews from professional peers before dissemination.

Candidates are expected to describe their RSCA activities and evidence of scholarly impact on the discipline in the PDS and/or narrative as appropriate to make the best case of RSCA productivity (candidates should refer to section 2.2.2 of the CLA RTP Policy for additional guidance). Because the field of Psychology is multi-disciplinary, the RTP committee is encouraged to pay careful attention to the unique value of each candidate's accomplishments. Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities are specified below.

A. Expectations

Within the discipline of Psychology, the *standard* and *expectation* of evidence of RSCA need to be peer-reviewed in the forms listed as follows (adapted from section 2.2.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy).

1. *Peer-reviewed Publications in Academic Venues* (e.g., journal articles and authored books) that fall within the different forms of RSCA (*Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application or Engagement, and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*)
 - a. Candidates need to demonstrate evidence of the quality of their peer-reviewed publications. Evidence of quality for journal articles is indicated by the significance of the work, journal impact factors, journal acceptance/rejection rates, citation indices, and/or research productivity indices (e.g., h-index). Evidence of quality for authored books is indicated by the status of the publisher, adoptions, sales and/or other indicators of impact (e.g., awards).
 - b. Candidates need to address their role in each scholarly work. Evidence of role is indicated by the candidate's responsibility in designing, planning, conducting, analyzing, implementing, and/or writing the scholarly work.
 - c. The following evaluative factors *shall not be considered* when evaluating the quality of peer-reviewed publications in academic venues.
 - Involvement of former academic advisor(s)
 - The institution at which the research was conducted

- Order of authorship. Note: The magnitude of the candidate's contribution (as described in PDS) is to be evaluated rather than the mere order of authorship

2. *Funded Peer-reviewed Major External Grants or Cooperative Agreements* (comparable to an NIH R03 grant or other external grants with substantial research components)

- a. Candidates need to demonstrate evidence of quality. Evidence of quality is indicated by a summary or description of the funded project, length of grant period, granting agency (e.g., Federal, State, private foundation, etc.), amount of award, and type of grant contract (e.g., primary award, subcontract). Additional evidence of quality may include grant reviews and/or the competitiveness of the grant process.
- b. Candidates need to address the level of their contribution. A brief description of the candidate's responsibility in authorship and implementation and the candidate's role on each grant (e.g., principal investigator, co-investigator, or key personnel) indicates the contribution level. Additional factors may include the percent effort the candidate is listed on the grant (e.g., calendar months).

Candidates need a minimum of four RSCA accomplishments from the above list (sections IV.A.1 and IV.A.2) or justified equivalencies. At least three of the required RSCA accomplishments must be peer-reviewed publications in academic venues (i.e., only one of the 4 required RSCA accomplishments can be a funded peer-reviewed major external grant or cooperative agreement).

Candidates submitting materials for RTP have the option to include *accepted* or *in-press* RSCA products for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates decide to withhold these materials, such items must be listed under Works in Progress on the PDS. In cases of promotion to full professor, candidates may only include publications and all accepted or in-press RSCA products that had not been previously claimed in a prior successful action.

B. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities.

1. Other peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters, proceedings, abstracts, etc.)
2. Non-peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters, book reviews, editorials, etc.)
3. Edited books
4. Conference presentations (both oral and poster presentations)
5. Invited presentations
6. Manuscripts and/or external grant proposals currently in the peer review process
7. Submitted major external grant proposals
8. Unfunded major external grant proposals
9. Minor external research grants
10. Internal grants awarded
11. Technical reports/Program evaluation reports
12. Policy/Amicus briefs
13. Scholarship-related awards
14. Scholarship-related professional development (e.g., participation in grant-writing workshops or scholarly writing institutes, etc.)

The following factors will be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate's additional highly valued activities. Candidates must address the following factors for each highly valued activity as appropriate.

1. The magnitude of the candidate's contribution to each scholarly work
2. Status of outlet (i.e., provide one indicator of status, such as rejection rates, impact factor, prestige of publisher, type of conference presentation, etc.)

3. For external and/or internal grants (submitted and/or unfunded):
 - a. Title and summary of the project
 - b. Length of the grant period
 - c. Granting agency (e.g., Federal, State, private foundation, CSULB, etc.)
 - d. Amount of award
 - e. Type of grant contract (e.g., primary award, subcontract)

C. Additional Evaluation Criteria

The Department RTP committee will evaluate the quality of both individual scholarly accomplishments and the overall body of work in determining whether to recommend a positive or negative RTP action. The following factors may be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate's overall RSCA accomplishments:

1. Scope of research (e.g., amount of time and effort required)
2. Programmatic nature of research
3. Impact of RSCA to the field
4. Level of involvement of student co-authors, if any
5. Cultural and identity taxation, as detailed in section 1.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy

V. SERVICE

The Psychology Department recognizes that meaningful service by a faculty member varies by rank and can be manifested in a variety of ways. All faculty members are expected to actively engage in service activities and describe their contributions and responsibilities in the PDS and/or narrative as appropriate to make the best case for their service contributions and types of activities. See section 2.3.1.a and 2.3.1.b of the CLA RTP Policy for details. Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities are specified below. Candidates should also refer to section 2.3.2.1 of the CLA RTP Policy for minimum expectations by rank.

A. Expectations

Candidates are expected to actively engage in service as evidenced by:

1. Participation in faculty governance and/or advising student organizations
2. Participation in one of the following
 - a. academic and/or professional service (e.g., ad hoc reviews, editorial board participation, professional association governance, and external evaluations)
 - b. community service (RSCA-related or instruction-related)

Candidates going up for promotion to Professor are expected to have a record of leadership (see section VII.D).

B. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities

1. Committee leadership
2. University citizenship (e.g., participating in Department, College, or University-sponsored events, judging student research competitions)
3. Service-related awards
4. Writing a substantial number of letters of recommendation for students, defined as 50 or more letters per year or letters for 10 or more students per year
5. Performing peer observations of teaching of others
6. Serving as an external reviewer for tenure and promotion of candidates at other institutions

C. Additional Evaluation Criteria

The following factors may be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate's contributions.

1. Nature of the service assignment
 - a. Frequency of activity
 - b. Number of different activities

- c. Length of service
- d. Personal contributions

- 2. Organizational level of service (Department, College, University, Professional, or Community)
- 3. Selection procedure (voluntary, assigned, elected)
- 4. Additional support for service role/activity (reassigned time or compensation)
- 5. Cultural and identity taxation, as detailed in section 2.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy

VI. MULTI-FACETED ACTIVITIES

Candidates for RTP actions in the Psychology Department frequently complete important activities that combine aspects of Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service. Candidates shall not repetitively list such activities in different sections of their materials. Instead, different components of a particular activity should be separated and listed in different sections as applicable. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department Chair or members of the RTP committee in such cases and then use their judgment to make the most persuasive case for their application.

VII. EXPECTATIONS BY RANK

A. Expectations for all Ranks

The Expectations specified in sections III, IV, and V are used for decisions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In recognition of the divergent academic profiles among excellent faculty members, candidates for tenure and/or promotion to any rank are further expected to provide evidence of engagement in at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities in at least one area of evaluation (Instructional Activities, RSCA, or Service). These Additional Highly Valued Activities cannot substitute for Expectations but can provide evidence that the candidate maintains a productive instructional, scholarly, or service profile. Specific factors that provide context for the evaluation of Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities are listed in sections III, IV, and V.

B. Reappointment of Assistant Professor

For reappointment of Assistant Professor, the Psychology Department accepts the standards articulated in the College and University RTP documents. Specifically, a candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure and promotion. Regarding service expectations of pre-tenure faculty, most service activities are expected to be at the department level, and the overall service load should be appropriate for a new faculty member who is acclimating to the university. Evidence for achievement of Additional Highly Valued Activities is not required.

C. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, sections III, IV and V specify the Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities. Additionally, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP policy specifies that in order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must make high-quality service contributions to the department and to either the college or the university.

D. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, sections III, IV and V specify the Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities. The Psychology Department notes that the University RTP document calls for higher performance standards than those used for decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In the area of Instructional Activities, candidates must sustain a high level of performance as specified in section III. The Psychology Department adopts the standards for RSCA and Service specified in the CLA RTP policy regarding promotion to Professor. The CLA RTP policy specifies that successful candidates for promotion to Professor will demonstrate high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or

interdisciplinary fields of study. Moreover, the candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed work at the national and/or international levels. The CLA RTP document specifies that a successful candidate for promotion to Professor will have a substantive record of service that includes: (a) service at the department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership in the university and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

VIII. EARLY TENURE AND/OR EARLY PROMOTION DECISIONS

For early tenure and/or early promotion, the Psychology Department acknowledges that the University RTP document calls for higher standards than those for decisions of tenure and/or promotion conducted following the standard time interval. In addition, for cases of early tenure, the record of distinction must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

Candidates within the Psychology Department seeking early tenure and/or early promotion are encouraged to initially seek guidance from the Dean, Department Chair, and Department RTP committee. With regard to the Psychology Department Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities outlined in sections III, IV, and V, candidates must provide compelling evidence of distinction in the areas of Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service that clearly exceeds, in substantial ways, the requirements for tenure and/or promotion to Associate or Full Professor. The criteria for each area are as follows:

A. Instructional Activities

Any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must have at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities in each of the three areas of instructional activities during the period of review: 1) Continuous Professional Learning, 2) Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction, and 3) Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals.

B. RSCA

Any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must achieve seven or more RSCA accomplishments listed under the expectations. Of the minimum seven accomplishments expected, at least six must be peer-reviewed publications in academic venues or justified equivalencies. In addition, candidates should also have at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities.

C. Service

Any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must demonstrate a substantial record of service engagement at the department, college/university, and professional levels. In addition, candidates should also have at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities. Candidates going up for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must also demonstrate leadership in the department and college/university, whereas candidates going up for early promotion to Professor must demonstrate leadership in the department, college/university, and profession/community.

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THIS POLICY

Amendments may be proposed by petition of at least three tenure-line faculty members of the Department. Proposals shall be presented to the Department Chair (presentation to any office staff shall constitute notification of and presentation to the Chair). Proposals shall be submitted to the faculty for discussion within three weeks, excluding holidays, following presentation to the Chair. Amendments may not be considered between the end of the Spring semester and the beginning of the subsequent Fall semester. Proposed amendments shall be distributed in writing to the tenure-line faculty members of the department at least five working days, excluding holidays, prior to a Departmental forum to discuss any proposed amendments. Amendments to this Policy shall become effective at the beginning of the next academic year if they receive a favorable secret ballot vote of two-thirds of tenure-line and probationary Psychology department faculty members and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of Psychology

Approved by the College Faculty
Council (Enter date below):

March 28, 2025

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Christopher Karadjov *Christopher Karadjov* 9/2/2025

Date:

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

09/02/2025

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Daniel O'Connor *Daniel O'Connor* 9/2/2025

Date:

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

08/29/2025

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Patricia Perez *Patricia Perez* 9/2/2025

Date:

Provost Signature:

[Signature]

Date:

09/02/25