**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH**
**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**
**DEPARTMENT OF CHICANO AND LATINO STUDIES**

# REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY

***EFFECTIVE FALL 2025***

This policy states the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies' expectations for candidates seeking reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The department recognizes that faculty must be evaluated in accordance with principles and requirements detailed in the University and College of Liberal Arts Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion policies. We will be guided by those principles and requirements and augment with the following department-specific provisions and expectations for faculty success. CHLS policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) defers to the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP policy with the following additional specifications.

## 1.0 DEPARTMENT PURPOSE, GOALS, AND EXPECTATIONS

**1.1** The Department's purpose is to improve the well-being of Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x communities and prepare students to lead efforts that contribute to a more racially and socially just society for all.

**1.1.1.** The Department fulfills its purpose by pursuing the three fundamental goals:

a. Generating knowledge that advances racial and social justice in the United States and Latin America, by
    i. investigating Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x experiences within the context of the United States and Latin American histories, societies, and cultures;
    ii. producing works that create visibility, construct inclusive imaginaries, challenge categories, and demonstrate 'being' in community; and
    iii. examining issues of ethnicity, 'race,' gender, class, and sexuality in Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x lived experiences in the United States and Latin American societies to foster validation.
b. Fostering student well-being and success through teaching that increases knowledge, instills values, and cultivates skills in reading, speaking, writing, technology, and critical thinking required to effectuate social change in multicultural settings and contemporary national and global economies; and

c. Engaging diverse Chicana/o/x, Latina/o/x, and other marginalized communities modeling collaborative service and high-impact practices with a mind towards the wellness of community, campus, department, and self.

**1.1.2** To achieve these goals, the Department expects its faculty to become teachers-public scholars. Teachers-public scholars effectively balance teaching, research, service, and community engagement, but also recognize that quality instruction is their priority.

### 1.2 File Requirements

**1.2.1** CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 1.2.1 through 1.2.2.

### 1.3 Values

The criteria according to which decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are made are among the clearest expressions of the Department's values. The criteria in this policy are consistent with the values articulated by the College of Liberal Arts and the University. CHLS policy defers to CLA RTP policy 1.3 through 1.3.5, with the following additional specifications.

The Department values a spectrum of RSCA activities (Discovery, Engagement and Application, Integration, Teaching and Learning) and encourages faculty to use their RSCA to advance the public good.

## 2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The College of Liberal Arts requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines for each area of evaluation below.

### 2.1 Instructional Activities

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.

### 2.1.1 Instructional Activities File

#### 2.1.1.1 Required Materials

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.1.1.

#### 2.1.1.2 Optional Materials

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.1.2, with the following additional specifications.

Peer observation of instruction is not optional. A teaching observation is mandatory in CHLS RTP Policy and will be referenced as Peer Observation of Learning (POL).

### 2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.2, with the following additional specification.

Because faculty teach many general education and elective courses, candidates are encouraged to describe how those courses introduce students to Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x Studies and to differentiate those courses from advanced courses for the major.

### 2.1.3 Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.

### 2.1.3.1 Continuous Professional Learning

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.1.

### 2.1.3.2 Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.2.

### 2.1.3.3 Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.3, with the following additional specifications.

Peer observations of learning (POL) must be included at least three times during the tenure process.

1. The first POL shall be conducted at the time of the candidate's first Periodic Mini Evaluation.
2. The second POL shall be conducted at the time of the candidate's Reappointment file.
3. The Department RTP committee will still submit comments on the candidate's instruction during other Periodic Mini Evaluations.
4. The third POL shall be conducted at the time of the candidate's Tenure file, or Early Tenure file if the candidate pursues Early Tenure.

Because the Department believes strongly in the importance of teaching to students' success as reflected in the Department's purpose, these POLs will provide a rating of superior, high quality, and needs improvement for each of the items in the following rubric.

1. Course Document(s) Review
    a. Alignment of Syllabus to SCO
    b. Alignment of course goals and student learning outcomes
    c. Appropriate assessments
    d. Variety and appropriateness of teaching methodologies
2. Classroom Observations
    a. Clarity of objectives for classroom session (per classroom observation and/or candidate / observer meeting(s))
    b. Communication with Students
    c. Effectiveness of teaching methodology (e.g. student interaction; checking for understanding)
    d. Effective use of classroom time
    e. Appropriateness of classroom content

The Department RTP Committee shall designate <u>at least two members</u> to conduct the POL on behalf of the committee.

1. Although the preference is for both designated members to conduct the POL, the POL can be conducted by one person when faced with capacity issues (e.g., conflicting class schedules, time constraints, etc.).
2. If the POL is conducted by only one person, the Department shall note it was due to capacity issues.

## 2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2, with the following additional specification.

For the Department, the quality of a faculty member's RSCA is the most important criterion for evaluating scholarly accomplishments. Quality refers to the degree to which a RSCA contributes to the discipline, community base of knowledge, and/or social impact and use. Contributions in these areas will further enhance achievement of the Department's purpose and goals. This is judged by evaluating a candidate's commitment and achievements to RSCA that advance the state of theoretical and/or applied knowledge in their field(s) and/or the social impact of their work (e.g., scholarship of engagement).

As the discipline of Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x Studies is an interdisciplinary field, "discipline" is defined as the candidates' field of expertise and methodologies that are applied within Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x Studies' theoretical and/or applied contexts.

Candidates are responsible for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. This section outlines the criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidate's responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

### 2.2.1 RSCA File

#### 2.2.1.1 Required Materials

Candidate's files **must** include:

a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.

b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative activities <u>for the review period only</u>. RSCA claimed in prior actions cannot be included. Examples of published peer-reviewed research include but are not limited to books, articles, films, art, photos and video of creative practice and projects, and other media, policy or program development, legislation, new statewide curriculum, patent applications, training videos, and digital creations or tools. Such materials shall be included in the file with links for digital products made included in the PDS or made available in the appropriate format.

Furthermore, candidates have the option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per The following guidelines:

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

c. For candidates who author externally funded RSCA grants and choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, the file must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2) length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award; (5) brief description of candidate's role in authorship and implementation.

d. Proof of publication status as defined in Section 2.2.5 for all in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.

e. Proof of peer review as defined in Section 2.2.3.

### 2.2.1.2 Optional Materials

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.1.2.

### 2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.1.3.

### 2.2.2 RSCA Narrative

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.2.

### 2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.3.

### 2.2.3.1 Definition

Peer review may be defined as 1. a process by which qualified experts in the discipline evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities; 2. a mutually constructive process established in the reciprocal relationship between a researcher and the communities with which they are engaged (e.g., organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry).

The candidate is responsible for documenting the peer review process.

Forms of peer review may include but are not limited to:

a. The process of selection of work for dissemination within academic publishing venues. This form of peer review is appropriate for the scholarship of discovery. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, journal impact factors, journal acceptance rates, citation indices, or research productivity indices.
b. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the publishing venues of non-academic sectors. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of integration, teaching and learning, and application and practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, editor or curator letters of acceptance, breadth of distribution or audience reception, and/or acceptance rates.
c. Documentation of the quantity, strength, and impact of work on stakeholders (e.g., enactment of related legislation, adoption of innovations, and/or widespread changes in professional practice, etc.). This form of peer review would be appropriate for the scholarship of engagement, integration, application and practice, and teaching and learning. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, internal reviews, adoption of product by external groups, or community reports.
d. The process of evaluation of external RSCA grant proposals by granting agencies or organizations. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery, engagement, teaching and learning, integration, and application and creative practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, internal reviews, competitiveness of the grant process, or organizational reports.
e. A process leading to creative performances, exhibitions of work, or academic presentations in public venues in which peers independently evaluated the work. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery, engagement, teaching and learning,

integration, and application and creative practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, editor, organizer, or curator letters of individual invitation and/or acceptance, the prestige of the venue, published reviews, breadth of distribution or audience reception, or acceptance rates.

f. Testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adoptions from peers, professionals, community stakeholders, etc. that affirm the quality of the work; such materials would be from the period of review and may be distinct from those submitted during the open period. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of engagement, teaching and learning, integration, and application and practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, the extent to which others or the field have been influenced by the RSCA (e.g. changes in perspective in the field, widespread sharing of RSCA materials, positive end-user assessment, subsequent offers of consulting work, citation of adoption of RSCA work by a community, generation of gifts to endow a program, affirmation of improved economic, social or environmental conditions of a community, region, agency, industry or other sector).

g. Awards, honors, or other public recognition of the work by peers, professionals, community stakeholders, etc. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery, engagement, teaching and learning, integration, and application and practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, organizational sponsors or letters of award.

#### 2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.3.2.

### 2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.4.

### 2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.5.

### 2.2.6 Number and Type of Publications

The expectation for the number and type of publications for promotion and tenure includes one (a, b, or c) or a combination (a, b, and c) of the following (or their Justified equivalencies):

a. Target of 3-4 peer-reviewed products. These include peer-reviewed products such as journal articles and competitive major external grants received; peer-reviewed creative works; and other peer-reviewed publication types such as critical literature reviews that establish the state of knowledge in a field, historiographical essays, or publications in edited volumes or anthologies, and products from scholarship of engagement.

b. Target of 2-3 edited or co-edited books from a peer-reviewed press and/or edited or co-edited special-issue from peer-reviewed journals. If edited or co-edited, the candidate must document significant authorship or contribution to the publication.

c. A target of a 1 single-authored book or 1 co-authored book from a peer-edited press. If co-authored, the candidate must document significant authorship or contribution to the publication.

### 2.2.7 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest

### 2.2.7.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process

Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such proof must be provided in English. Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to the following, any of which forms of proof are equally valid

a. A statement of the venue's editorial policy.
b. Copies of reader reports. Candidates who submit these for evidence of peer review should be aware that any materials submitted in RTP files can be used by evaluators to assess their work in any capacity. Candidates who are concerned that critiques in their readers' reports may reflect negatively on their overall RSCA are encouraged to submit alternate proof of peer review, such as Section 2.2.7.1 a, c or d.
c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.
d. Letters, testimonials, evaluations, public recognition from community stakeholders or participatory agencies, media outlets, communications between the community and researcher, and other similar evidence of peer review.

### 2.2.7.2 Ethical Concerns

Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative. Ethical concerns include but are not limited to conflicts of interest, monetary payment to secure publication, and duplicate publication. In accordance with CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.6.2, CHLS emphasizes the following:

a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include but are not limited to having collaborated on the RSCA works being evaluated.
b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure publication (e.g., for-profit presses and predatory presses) shall be considered a priori an ethical concern, regardless of selection process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images, open access, or subvention).
c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in their narratives. Examples include but are not limited to the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprints must be labeled as such.

## 2.3 Service

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.

### 2.3.1 Service File

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.1, with the following additional specification.

Examples of work associated with cultural and identity taxation include, but are not limited to advising student organizations, serving on campus committees, serving on thesis or comprehensive exam committees, advocating for or counseling marginalized and/or minoritized students (e.g., students of color, queer students, students with disabilities, etc.), defending scholarship on marginalized and/or minoritized communities, meeting with marginalized and/or minoritized students, commenting on drafts of papers, writing letters of recommendation, sharing career and academic opportunities, giving public lectures on diversity, and mentoring junior colleagues.

### 2.3.2 Service Expectations

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.2.

#### 2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.2.1.

### 2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.3.

## 3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process and emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.

### 3.1 Candidate

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.1 through 3.1.3.

### 3.2 Joint Appointments

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.2.

### 3.3 Department RTP Policy

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.3.

### 3.4 Department RTP Committee

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.4 through 3.4.2 and 3.4.4 through 3.4.5, with the following additional specification regarding 3.4.3.

RTP committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a higher rank/classification than the candidate.

### 3.5 Mentoring

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.5.

### 3.6 Department Chair Evaluations

CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.6.

## 4.0 APPROVAL AND AMENDMENTS TO THE CHLS RTP POLICY

**Approval**

This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies and approval by the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.

**Amendments**

Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by at least three tenured and probationary Department faculty. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Chair of the Department shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the tenured and probationary faculty members and place the proposed amendments on the agenda of the next scheduled Department meeting. Once agendized and discussed in a Department meeting, the proposed amendment (as proposed or amended) will be voted on within 30 days of a regular or special Department meeting.

**Voting on Amendments**

Voting on amendments shall be prior to the close of the preceding academic year of adoption.

**Majority Needed to Adopt**

To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured and probationary faculty members and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.

**Voting Rights**

All tenured and probationary Department faculty members – including those on leave, sabbatical, and FERP—are eligible to vote.

Adopted by the Faculty of the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies on February 17, 2025.

Ratified by CLA Faculty Council on [ADD].

Approved: _____(Dean, CLA) _____(Provost)
Effective: Fall 2025

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

# Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of Chicano and Latino Studies

| Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below): | Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature: | Date: |
|---|---|---|
| 03/28/2025 | CHRIS KARADJOV | 9/8/2025 |

| Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below): | College Dean Name & Signature: | Date |
|---|---|---|
| 9/8/2025 | Dan O'Connor | |

| Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below): | Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs Name & Signature: | Date: |
|---|---|---|
| 11/17/2025 | Patricia Perez | |

| Provost Signature: | Date: |
|---|---|
| | 11/18/25 |