CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

EFFECTIVE FALL 2025

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) is a teaching-intensive, research-driven university that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global perspectives. The Department of Economics Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy for CSULB establishes the criteria by which the work of tenure-track and tenured faculty shall be evaluated within this context. The department expects all tenure-track and tenured faculty to demonstrate a sustained, high-quality record in: (1) instructional activities; (2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and (3) service contributions.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

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

1.1.1 The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the college.

1.1.2 Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and department RTP policies.

1.1.3 The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed work for specified periods of review.

1.1.4 Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As such, all statements made by candidates and all materials put forth for consideration in RTP matters must abide by the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this principle. Such issues shall be referred to Faculty Affairs.

1.1.5 Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner organized according to the policy requirements and instructions.

1.1.6 Candidates' narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as detailed on the Professional Data Sheet (PDS).

1.1.7 The Department Chair will assign all new faculty members a Faculty Mentor in the first semester of appointment. The Faculty Mentor will provide, in a timely fashion, examples of appropriate documentation for future review. The Department will elect an RTP Committee as indicated in the bylaws.

1.1.8 Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on criteria and procedures delineated in university, college, or department RTP policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on unprofessional sources such as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., social media, websites, etc.), petitions and anonymous letters, nor shall the evaluation consider materials not included in the official RTP file.

1.1.9 As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other materials obtained during open period are to be considered as part of the evaluation of a candidate.

1.1.10 Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more areas of evaluation. Multifaceted activities may be broken into components and discussed where appropriate. Components discussed or listed under one area of evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.

1.2 File Requirements

1.2.1 All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:

A. Professional Data Sheet labeled according to university requirements and with the following CLA specifications:

1. Instructional Activities:
    a. By semester, list formal academic advising activities and associated duties, if applicable.
    b. By semester, list activities for which units are assigned (e.g., assigned time or other), such as involvement in student mentoring, supervision of student research, projects, and/or fieldwork, if applicable.
    c. By semester, include instructional activities outside of the classroom. Such activities include but are not limited to: (1) supervision of student independent research projects; (2) supervision of student research assistants; (3) chairing or serving on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees; and (4) supervision of student teachers, if applicable.

2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA):
For all RSCA that does not appear under Works in Progress, candidate must:

    a. Label according to CLA definitions for publication status and peer review.
    b. Place all previously claimed work under the double line.
    c. List RSCA-related external grants;
    d. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication listed with the following:
        i. Description of publication venue (e.g., journal, media, volume, event, performance, etc.) vis-à-vis the discipline and/or subfield;
        ii. Rationale for publication venue choice;
        iii. Explanation of candidate's contribution to co- and multi-authored RSCA.

3. Service activities, including term of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.

B. Narrative addressing the three areas of evaluation (instructional activities, RSCA, and service). This three-part narrative shall be submitted via the Candidate Statement Form which allows up to 3,000 words.

C. Workload Assignment Form.*

D. Academic Advisor Report† (as appropriate).

E. All peer-reviewed publications for the period of review, including (for each):

1. Proof of peer review for peer-reviewed publications, including documentation provided by the publisher or editor, or as appropriate to the discipline or type of RSCA
2. Proof of publication status for all RSCA submitted with the RTP file, including in press, forthcoming, accepted, or under contract with a complete manuscript, as appropriate to the discipline or type of RSCA.

F. Student course evaluation summaries for each section of courses taught for which formal student course evaluations were required during the period of review.

G. One representative syllabus for each course taught during the period of review.

H. Course materials providing evidence of teaching effectiveness, as described in Section 2.1.3.

I. All prior RTP reviews, periodic evaluations, and evidence of mentoring (i.e., mini-review evaluations or other) over the full review period, including the candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any. For promotion to rank of Professor, the report for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall be included.

J. Index of all material prepared by the candidate except the index of open-period materials, which shall be prepared by the department RTP committee chair or designee.

1.2.2 With the exception of optional written student evaluations, as per Section 2.1.1.2.b, any materials in excess of those enumerated in Section 1.2.1 A-J, will not be considered for review by the committees.

1.3 Values

The criteria according to which decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are made are based on the CLA's values, which are stated in the CLA RTP policy.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

---

* Denotes official form available from the College of Liberal Arts.

† Academic Advisor form available from the College of Liberal Arts and only required of faculty who receive unit compensation for advising activities.

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

2.1 Instructional Activities

Effective instructional activities within the College of Liberal Arts encompass a wide range of tasks and responsibilities. The University RTP Policy (Section 2.1) defines instruction as "any action designed to engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to their success, regardless of whether it is part of formal coursework." Within CLA, instructional activities include but are not limited to classroom instruction; chairing thesis committees; supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study, research, internship, honors, student teaching; instructionally related mentoring and advising students; curriculum and course development, including designing study abroad experiences. Departments may define additional activities—such as serving on thesis or comprehensive exam committees—as instructional activities. CLA requires faculty to identify any instructional activities for which they received assigned time by including a Workload Assignment Form and, if applicable, an Academic Advisor Report in their file.

2.1.1 Instructional Activities File

2.1.1.1 Required Materials

To demonstrate effective teaching as defined in CLA Policy section 2.1.3, candidates **must** submit:

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. A Workload Assignment Form and an Academic Advisor Report, if applicable. 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 continuous professional learning, thoughtful reflection on and adaptation of instruction, and the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals. Suggestions for supporting evidence are outlined in Section 2.1.3. This evidence should be included in candidate's Professional Data Sheet and listed in their index.

2.1.1.2 Optional Materials

To demonstrate effective teaching as defined in CLA Policy Section 2.1.3, candidates may also submit:

a. Peer observation of instruction. Candidates may request a peer observation.

b. Written remarks on student course evaluations. Candidates must include all remarks (whether positive or negative) from written evaluations if they opt to include remarks.

2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice

CLA faculty members are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. The candidate's narrative of instructional philosophy and practice provides the context necessary for understanding and interpreting the candidate's instructional goals, materials, and accomplishments.

The ability to teach, mentor and serve our diverse students is highly valued by the university, college and department. Candidates should pay special attention to the relationship between cultural and identity taxation and teaching, if applicable. Candidates who experience cultural and identity taxation may choose to describe this in their narratives, detailing how their positionality might impact their teaching assignment, methodologies, and student perceptions of instruction. Candidates may wish to describe in their narratives how their own unique circumstances intersected with the needs of the campus community during the period under review, clarifying how this may have affected their teaching performance. Committees, chairs, and the Dean shall consider cultural and identity factors in evaluating candidate files.

2.1.3 Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching

The University RTP Policy grounds effective teaching in three principles: 1) continuous professional learning; 2) thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction; and 3) the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals. This section outlines the definition of effective teaching, the required contents of candidate narratives, supporting evidence, and, as relevant, evaluation criteria for committees, chairs, and the Dean.

2.1.3.1 Continuous Professional Learning

Candidates must show efforts to improve their teaching. In demonstrating continuous professional learning (University RTP Policy Section 2.1.1), candidates should explain how they have remained up to date with course content, pedagogical methods, and best practices for educating a diverse student population. Their narrative should discuss how they have engaged in professional pedagogical development activities during the period of review to ensure their instructional activities reflect current best practices. They may also discuss the relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to instruction.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to participation in professional development activities (both on- and off-campus), attendance at professional conferences, and observations or discussions of instruction by peers. Candidates should document supporting evidence in their PDS and list evidence in their index. Department evaluation shall consider evidence demonstrating application of professional development activities and the implementation of pedagogical training into course materials during the period under review.

2.1.3.2 Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction

Candidates must show reflection on and adaptation of instruction. In demonstrating reflection on and adaptation of instruction (University RTP Policy Section 2.1.2), candidates should discuss modifications to their teaching during the period under review. Their narrative should explain how they have examined their instructional practices and made deliberate efforts to improve student learning. This might include specifying one or more instructional goals or practices the candidate decided to change, followed by a discussion of the evidence that indicated the need for a change, and concluding with an explanation of the effort undertaken to make the change.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to instructional materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes. Instructional materials include but are not limited to class handouts, lecture notes/slides, descriptions of class activities, and web page printouts. Candidates should document supporting evidence in their PDS and list evidence in their index. The evaluation shall consider evidence regarding changes to course syllabi, instructional goals or practices, assignments, or other materials that show modifications to instruction over time based on reflection.

2.1.3.3 Fostering student learning and the achievement of course goals

Candidates must show how they have engaged and helped students achieve course outcomes. In demonstrating instructional practices that foster learning and achievement of course goals (University RTP Policy Section 2.1.3), candidates should explain how they have supported student learning, achieved course outcomes, and accommodated student differences. Their narratives should discuss their philosophy and how it aligns with their instructional strategies. Their narratives should also address, as appropriate, student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level as well as grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

Evidence supporting the narrative must include course syllabi, quantitative course evaluation summaries, and grade distributions. For courses taught more than once during the period of review, only one representative syllabus shall be submitted. Candidates may include additional syllabi as needed to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation. Evidence supporting the narrative could include 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, or comprehensive final assignments or exams), a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, qualitative student perception data, observations by trained or peer observers, or support letters submitted during open period. Candidates should document supporting evidence in their PDS and list evidence in their index.

In line with the University RTP Policy, the CLA requires RTP committees to consider multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness as it relates to fostering student learning, achieving course goals, and accommodating student differences. In considering course syllabi, the evaluation shall additionally consider evidence such as syllabi content relative to course level and catalog description as well as currency in the discipline and consistency with current Academic Senate syllabus policies.

Course evaluation summaries provide one among several ways to measure instructional effectiveness and should be supplemented with other instructional materials. Although course evaluation summaries must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations are required during the period of review, committees, chairs, and the Dean shall evaluate quantitative student perceptions of teaching (i.e., SPOT forms) relative to context, including:

a. Class characteristics
    1. Course level
    2. Course type and mode (e.g., required, elective, writing intensive, online synchronous/asynchronous/hybrid/face-to-face, for majors only or GE, etc.)
    3. Number of enrolled students (vs. number of SPOT responses)
    4. Whether this was a new course preparation
    5. Course meeting time

b. Candidate's teaching assignment
    1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of evaluation
    2. Total number of different course preparations during the period of review
    3. Alignment of Standard Course Outline (SCO) with the candidate’s area of expertise/training

c. Candidate's experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness

d. Trends over time, keeping in mind that it is impossible to remove or account for all bias in student evaluations

Grade distributions must be included, as they provide a measure for contextualizing assessment of student learning and student course evaluations. As grade distributions necessarily differ from one group of students to another, the evaluation will consider overall trends in grade distributions relative to the contextual factors listed for course evaluations.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The Department of Economics requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The department recognizes and appreciates the diversity of methods, epistemologies, and perspectives represented within the department. The department understands that faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways, including but not limited to original research, making connections between and across disciplines, bridging theory and practice, communicating knowledge effectively to students and peers, or reciprocal partnerships with broader communities. The Department of Economics values scholarship as a continuum of diverse forms which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities. RSCA involves the dissemination of products and findings. The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable RSCA is not restricted to professional audiences,

English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. All RSCA, however, must be peer reviewed by other experts, practitioners, partners, or reciprocal collaborators. Standards for peer review are determined by the type of scholarship being undertaken (the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application or engagement, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning; definitions are in Section 2.2 of University RTP Policy). The department does not limit candidates to an exclusive list of research, scholarly, and creative activities; contributions may be in one area or across multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship.

Scholarly contributions to any area(s) are valued equally by the Department of Economics.

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 for the review period only. RSCA claimed in prior actions cannot be included. Examples of published peer-reviewed research include but are not limited to books, articles, films, 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 must 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

The inclusion of non-peer-reviewed publications is optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as negative for any candidate.

2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials

Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g., works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures). Listing such items on the PDS is sufficient.

2.2.2 RSCA Narrative

The RSCA narrative should be written for a nonspecialist audience and should provide context for the candidate's RSCA overall; candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment. Candidates are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. For the period of review, the narrative must address:

a. The scholarly vision or program of the candidate's RSCA, including the questions, issues, or problems addressed by their work, as well as the aims or expected outcomes.
b. The trajectory and development of the RSCA and its quality, significance, and impact, especially in regard to the type of activity (scholarship of discovery, integration, application, engagement, and/or teaching and learning as per University RTP Policy Section 2.2), and the communities and constituencies involved.
c. The quality, significance, and impact of non-peer-reviewed products, if included in the candidate's RTP file.
d. Any RSCA for which the candidate received reassigned time or additional compensation.

2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition

In the Department of Economics, a candidate's RSCA and its impact can take many forms. Peer review is the primary requirement for the majority of a candidate's research, scholarly, and creative activities. Peer review should be executed by expert scholars, practitioners, partners, or reciprocal collaborators in the field, depending upon the type of scholarship undertaken (the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, the scholarship of application and practice, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning); see Section 2.2 in College and University RTP policies. It is the candidate's responsibility to clarify how their work meets the standards for peer review, to explain the appropriateness of the kind of peer review for the type of RSCA, and to make the case for the impact of their work.

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 constitutive 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, etc.). It is the responsibility of the candidate to document the process of peer review.

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, 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 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 practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, editor, organizer, or curator letters of 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 another 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

The term peer review encompasses the terms "juried" and "refereed," which may be used for all RSCA evaluated by qualified experts in specific disciplines. For each RSCA item on the Professional Data Sheet, candidates are required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using consistent labels of "Peer Reviewed," "Refereed," or "Juried" as appropriate to the field and type of scholarship undertaken.

2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status

RSCA not yet in print or otherwise in the public domain must be labeled on the Professional Data Sheet according to the following definitions of publication status:

a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable. Both refer to an accepted work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-publication state.
b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has agreed to publish without major changes.
c. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft. Candidates have the option to include works under contract with complete manuscript draft as RSCA if they deem it beneficial to their current RTP action; see Section 2.2.1.1.
d. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be published.
e. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.
f. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.
g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.

2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status

For in press, forthcoming, accepted and under contract with a complete manuscript RSCA submitted with the RTP file (e.g., Section 2.2.4.a-c), candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation (e.g., work in progress /ongoing work as per Section 2.2.4.d-g) does not require such documentation.

2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest

2.2.6.1 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 2.2.6.1 a, c or d.
c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.
d. Letters, testimonials, evaluations, public recognition, etc. from community stakeholders or participatory agencies, communications between the community and researcher, and other similar evidence of peer review.

2.2.6.2 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.

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

High-quality, sustained service contributions to their department, college and the University as well as to the profession and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts. It is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation. Service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators. Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty member.

This section delineates service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.

As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. The Department of Economics recognizes that the quality and degree of a candidate's service may be impacted by disproportionate expectations placed upon them for this work. Specifically, the labor undertaken to support diversity initiatives is often provided by, or extracted from, marginalized and/or minoritized faculty as a direct result of their identities. Cultural and identity taxation is defined in Section 1.3.1.

The sections below provide guidelines to candidates on how to discuss service impacted by issues of cultural and identity taxation in their files, and to RTP committees on how to evaluate files impacted by such issues.

2.3.1 Service File

Candidates **must** submit:

a. Narrative written on the fillable form. The narrative shall address the significance and impact of service identified on the PDS. Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.
b. Professional Data Sheet. As per university guidelines, the PDS must address dates of service, offices held, objectives of activity, degree of participation, concrete contributions, and responsibilities. In the case of student mentoring or advising, the PDS should include the nature and extent of the work, and the number of students impacted.

In their service file, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or actions (for instance, what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and describe outcomes or impact of the work. If the candidate chooses to discuss student mentoring or advising as service, that could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g. number of students, extent of work) and impact of the candidate's work, highlighting student success. Candidates can describe off-campus or profession-linked work in terms of what the work is, how it utilizes the candidate's academic expertise, and how it impacts the profession or wider community. In general, candidates should discuss and (when possible) document the importance, scope, and length of their service accomplishments, noting the time, effort, and amount of work involved in the activities as well as (when possible) the overall impact of the service and the number individuals impacted.

Candidates who experience cultural and identity taxation may choose to describe this in their narratives, detailing how their service is in high demand due to their positionality, and how their service obligations may have exceeded typical expectations due to their marginalized and/or minoritized identities. While not easily quantifiable, the increased service workload undertaken by these faculty can be described in terms of the impact their work has had on their department, college, university, community and/or discipline. Faculty may wish to describe in their narratives

how their own unique circumstances intersected with the needs of the campus community during the period under review, clarifying how this may have affected their work performance in teaching, RSCA, and service activities.

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.

Review committees should recognize that faculty experience various forms of cultural and identity taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring, and other activities on and off campus that are essential to the mission of the university. The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is incumbent upon evaluating committees to contextualize this service, and to recognize service accomplishments that are tied to cultural and identity taxation.

2.3.2 Service Expectations

All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues. At all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates serve.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles. The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive.

Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to:

Campus Service: Service on department, university, CSU systemwide committees and taskforces, program development; sponsorship of student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and projects; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures; mentoring of fellow faculty members and staff; mentoring of students; service or leadership activities for university committees, service to CFA.

Service to the Profession: Service to professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; external grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; mentoring, coaching and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.

Service to the Community: Consulting in public schools and other agencies relevant to academic expertise, serving in local government, and board membership in community organizations.

2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank

The department defers to CLA RTP policy on minimum service expectation by rank (see 2.3.2.1 in CLA RTP policy).

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service activities relative to department, College, and University RTP policies as well as the CBA. When evaluating candidate files that demonstrate patterns of cultural and identity taxation affecting workload, RTP committees must also account for those contributions when evaluating service.

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

Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.

3.1.1 It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Faculty Affairs.

3.1.2 It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required materials are included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.

3.1.3 As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of materials after the date of file completion must have the

approval of the college RTP committee, which is the peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.

3.2 Joint Appointments

The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the formation of an evaluation committee. This committee shall consist of members selected from among the peer review committees of the departments within which the candidate holds a joint appointment.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities for department RTP committees and stipulates that no one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review. It is expected that all evaluators attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

3.3.1 The Department RTP Committee Chair is responsible for protecting the confidentiality of RTP documents.

3.3.2 The Department RTP Committee Chair must inform all other committee members of the decisions of the Department Chair, CLA committee, Dean and Provost.

3.4 Department Chair Evaluations

In the Department of Economics, the Chair is not required to but may provide an independent evaluation of RTP candidates. That document usually will not exceed 500 words. However, in promotion considerations, the Chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review. In no case will the department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.5 College and University Review

The College RTP committee reviews materials submitted by candidates, departmental committees, and department chairs. Evaluation by the College committee must take into account the RTP policy of the candidate's department as well as the university and college RTP policies. It is expected that all evaluators attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels. The committee renders its own evaluation, which it forwards to the Dean.

The Dean is charged with mentoring department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process. The Dean also communicates standards and expectations and ensures the integrity of the RTP process across the college. The Dean writes an independent evaluation and recommendation for each candidate and forwards that evaluation to the Provost.

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 regarding RTP. 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 University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review requirements for tenured and probationary faculty. All tenure-track and tenured faculty undergo performance review and evaluation. Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years. The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit:

4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Reappointment

In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the College Dean. The periodic evaluation in the first year may just be reviewed by the department chair and the Dean. In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.

4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion. A tenure-track faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

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

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1) instructional activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any action.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-Track Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the college and the candidate's department, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the University's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in their program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high-quality work over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive in all three areas. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.

The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

The University RTP Policy states the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor, including the expectation that a candidate shall have a record of high-quality peer-reviewed work that has contributed to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition to the minimum standard stated in that

policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the candidate to make high-quality service contributions to the department and to either the College or the University.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

The University Policy states that standards for promotion to Full Professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to Associate Professor. In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities. The candidate also is expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership at the University; and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

As outlined by the University RTP Policy, early tenure and/or early promotion are awarded in exceptional circumstances in which a candidate demonstrates a superior record of accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation. That policy states that candidates for early tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the university policy on external evaluation.

5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts

In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a potential candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources and mentors, including the department chair, Dean, and, if possible, department RTP committee members.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the University RTP Policy. In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or department chair collects and prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file, and submits the materials via the university approved process.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The department defers to CLA RTP policy on additional processes (see 7.0 in CLA RTP policy).

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

8.1 Amendments may be proposed by the Department RTP Committee or by a petition signed by 20 percent of the tenured and probationary faculty of the Department.

8.2 The Chairperson shall call a meeting of the Faculty to discuss proposed amendments.

8.3 Voting shall be consistent with the By-Laws of the Department of Economics.

8.4 Amendments are ratified by a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured and probationary faculty and approvals required by the CLA Faculty Council, the CLA Dean, and the Provost.

8.5 If any provision of this Document is in conflict with either (a) RTP provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement or (b) the University Policy on RTP, the Faculty shall approve changes to bring the provision into conformity, thereby amending this Document.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of Economics

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below):	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature:	Date:
03/28/2025	Chris Karadjov Chris Karadjov	9/8/2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below):	College Dean Name & Signature:	Date
09/16/2025	Daniel O'Connor Daniel O'Connor	9/16/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below):	Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs Name & Signature:	Date:
08/01/2025	Patricia Perez Patricia Perez	9/16/2025

Provost Signature:	Date:
	09/16/25

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