

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**

In alignment with the *College of Health and Human Services (CHHS)*, the Department of Health Science (hereafter HSC) *and its faculty are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore, HSC promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, HSC establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Evaluation of faculty members at all levels of review shall take into consideration the diversity of expertise within HSC and recognize this diversity as a source of strength that enables the department to grow in stature.*

In this HSC RTP Policy, portions of the CHHS RTP Policy (which may come directly from the University RTP Policy) that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted. All CHHS RTP Policy insertions in the HSC RTP Policy are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the CHHS and HSC policies. Portions of the CHHS RTP Policy not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the original CHHS Policy.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1. Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally engaged public university committed to providing highly valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.

The mission of the Health Science Department and its undergraduate and graduate programs is to aid and encourage students' development into competent professionals and life-long learners who are responsible for community health/public health disciplines, including health education and related areas. The program fosters the development of health professionals who are person-centered and sensitive to the diverse qualities and the changing face of the health care delivery system of our society. Upon graduation, our students are able to facilitate the physical, psychological, and social well-being of people individually and collectively in a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic metropolitan context.

Within this mission, the HSC department's goals are to: (1) Contribute to the development of a competent student body and faculty (2) Develop strong teaching and research or scholarship programs (3) Maintain linkages with health care professionals, academic personnel, and the community at large.

1.2. Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service is essential to accomplishing the articulated missions and visions of the university, college, and HSC.

1.2.1. *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to HSC, the college, university, community, and the profession.*

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

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

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

1.2.5. *All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, HSC, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior. These standards are articulated in Academic Senate policy.*

1.3. CHHS Values

1.3.1. *The criteria in this policy are intended to embody the following values of the college:*

Integrity

Students, faculty, and staff in the College of Health and Human Services act with integrity. We adhere to policy, accept responsibility for actions, and promote inclusion, communication, respect for others and divergent views, honesty, and fairness.

Growth Mindset

Students, faculty, and staff in the College of Health and Human Services believe that individual and collective talents can be developed through hard work, persistence, good strategies, and input from others.

Collaboration

The College of Health and Human Services supports interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty, students, and our community to stimulate and foster excellence in education and research innovation, responsiveness to pressing health and human services problems, and the growth of existing partnerships and the development of new ones.

Innovation

The College of Health and Human Services conducts research to advance the education of our students and the multiple academic disciplines that comprise the college. We aim to increase understanding, discover scientific breakthroughs, and enhance the communities we serve.

DEIA Statement

In addition, the CHHS celebrates the diversity of students, faculty, and staff. This policy is intended to embody the college's commitment to amplifying diverse voices in our classrooms, research endeavors, and administrative decisions. As a college, the CHHS believes in equal access and opportunity for all, and works tirelessly to eliminate barriers that hinder success, whether those barriers are related to race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, or any other aspect of identity. The college is therefore committed to providing an inclusive environment where everyone feels a sense of belonging, where everyone's perspectives are valued, and where we can all thrive academically, personally, and professionally.

1.3.2 Alignment with University Values

HSC values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. CSULB recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. CHHS and HSC RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

1.4 Governing Documents

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

1.4.2. *This HSC RTP Policy elaborates on standards specific to the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education and related areas in all areas of evaluation. The discipline-specific standards guide faculty members and the HSC RTP committee in expectations that align with or go beyond the university-level or college-level standards.*

1.4.3. *Collectively, the RTP policies of the university, college, and HSC shall be used to assess candidates' performance through the stages of their academic progress.*

1.5. Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and HSC RTP policies. In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.5.1. The candidate is responsible for submitting an RTP file according to the timeline required by Faculty Affairs. A complete RTP file should include all elements required per the HSC RTP policy as delineated in sections 2.0 (e.g. required documentation for each area of evaluation) and 3.0 (e.g., required files). The file must be submitted in the most current format required by Faculty Affairs (e.g., electronic submission in Interfolio).

1.5.2. The HSC RTP Committee must objectively evaluate the candidate's file according to the standards set forth in this RTP Policy based on the required and supplemental documentation provided in the candidate's file (section 2.0). The HSC RTP Committee must assess the candidate's qualifications for advancement based on demonstration of meeting or exceeding standards across all three areas of evaluation.

1.6. Standards

Recommendations from the HSC RTP Committee, and the HSC chair (if submitted), shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established HSC standards, not just merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within HSC. Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. HSC-specific standards are set forth in section 2.0 within each area of evaluation.

1.7. Profiles of Academic Ranks

RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by HSC. The university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The HSC RTP policy applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria which are delineated in in section 2.0 within each area of evaluation.

1.8. Narrative

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

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

In addition to following the minimum standards of the university and the college, HSC has further defined *the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in health science, public health, community health, health education and related areas, consistent with the mission and needs of both the university and the college. RTP standards and criteria in section 2.0 and its subsections articulate HSC's discipline-specific expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The HSC standards and criteria adopted match or exceed all college-level standards and are consistent with college and university RTP policies.*

Candidates must be evaluated for advancement based upon the quality of their performance of the three areas of evaluation. Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 elaborate on what should be considered when evaluating candidates. Elements of certain activities may fall into multiple areas of evaluation; if activities meet criteria set forth below (based on evidence provided), candidates shall be given credit in multiple areas of evaluation. The activities and examples delineated below are illustrative and are not all inclusive. Further, the items listed are not granted equal weight as, logically, certain items qualitatively have differing value to and impact on the contributions to one's discipline. To allow for thorough evaluation, candidates must provide evidence as noted below with descriptions of activities in the narrative, being sure to address any anomalies or other issues to clarify activities and achievements. Candidates are encouraged to submit additional documentation to supplement the required documentation to demonstrate exceptional quality in each area of evaluation. Within the narrative and/or PDS, *faculty members must disclose and describe any activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional salary*. Candidates whose contributions and activities exceed minimum standards will be commended for supporting the excellence of CSULB programs and achieving the missions of the department, college and university. Given the university's inclusive excellence priorities, diversity-related activities are highly valued. Diversity-related activities are defined as those that aim to improve the well-being and/or achievements of diverse and/or underserved groups (defined by the university, based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, and/or age). When candidates clearly illustrate that their instructional, RSCA and service activities significantly surpass minimum standards, the review committee will highlight meritorious efforts by faculty that far exceeded minimum standards.

2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Faculty members in CHHS are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Candidate's instruction and instructionally related activities will be evaluated in the following sub-areas: 1) Continuous Professional Learning; 2) Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment; 3) Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment; 4) Student learning outcomes; 5) Syllabi; 6) Grade Distributions; 7) Student Response to Instruction; 8) Peer Evaluations; and 9) Other Evidence (if applicable). Candidates may also provide other evidence of effectiveness in instruction and instructionally related activities. Each of these sub-areas *should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials* as described below.

Instructionally related activities recognized by HSC include, but are not limited to:

- *Curriculum and course development; academic and HSC advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical, research, community, and center settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and related activities involving student learning and student engagement, such as internship preceptorship.*
- *Mentoring students; taking students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.*
- *Active involvement in instructionally related activities outside the classroom in such areas as academic advising, field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, thesis or project supervision, and student recruitment and/or retention efforts. Career advising and mentorship (including writing letters of*

recommendation for training programs and advanced degrees) are additional instructionally related activities relevant to HSC faculty members.

- Committee work that is necessary for instructional program success (such as creating and grading program assessments) and continuous improvement, such as identifying program needs, planning and implementing responsive action, and development of new programming and course or curricular revision.
- As the preceding do not provide an exhaustive list, HSC considers activities that meet the following criteria as those that should be given credit under instructional activities:
 - Presentations, panels and/or workshops that provide instruction or training to students, staff and/or faculty (e.g., poster development workshop; responsible conduct of research (RCR) training; career trajectory panel discussion; objective assessment methods); activities delivered to students are given more weight.
 - Structured activities in which faculty members provide student learning opportunities that include development of a syllabus that delineates learning objectives, activities and timeline (e.g., student club advising, supervising directed research projects)
- Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the field, collaborative instructional activities are viewed favorably.
- Instructional activities that support inclusivity and diversity-focused learning are given more weight.

CSULB recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CSULB also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:

- *continuous professional learning,*
- *thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction (formative assessment), and*
- *the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals (summative assessment).*

HSC requires *multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and does not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms as evidence.*

2.1.1. Continuous Professional Learning *Effective instructors remain up-to-date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.*

Continuous professional learning is required of all HSC faculty members. Candidates should describe thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. These activities promote ongoing lifelong learning and model this value for students. These actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Regular interactions with colleagues regarding various pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development.
- Involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center; teaching-development seminars or conferences sponsored by HSC, college, university or relevant

professional organizations; and formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.

- Professional development activities that support teaching effectiveness such as learning techniques for new teaching modalities (e.g., online and hybrid instruction), how to improve teaching and mentoring of diverse students, learning new technology or software, integrating AI, etc.

Within their narratives, candidates must discuss what they have invested in their own learning and growth as instructors.

Required Documentation

(1) Evidence of participation in professional learning activities to improve instruction (examples of activities completed to enhance teaching effectiveness).

- Provide proof of completion/number of sessions (multisession) and state the number of activities in the narrative. Note that each session counts as 1 activity even when there is a multi-session/module.
- It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide sufficient documentation to serve as evidence of completion/engagement in activities. For example, if a faculty member views an online training, evidence of how they applied their learning to their course materials may serve as evidence of watching the training.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

(1) Candidates engaged in appropriate and relevant activities to improve teaching effectiveness

(2) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:

- Candidates being evaluated for reappointment must have engaged in at least two activities per year since their initial appointment.
- Candidates being evaluated for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must have engaged in an average of at least two activities per year since their initial appointment.
- Candidates being evaluated for promotion to Full Professor must have engaged in an average of at least one activity for every year since their last promotion.

(3) Professional learning activities that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

2.1.2. Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective instruction requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning. Effective teaching is thoughtful teaching. Deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and change their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate the need to do so.

CHHS and HSC value culturally responsive teaching and encourage faculty to undertake instructional adaptation to advance culturally relevant pedagogical strategies that focus on student-centered practices of setting high expectations, honoring different

communication styles and practicing critical consciousness that values student agency and input.

Formative assessment leading to instructional adaptation is required of all HSC faculty members. Candidates should describe thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce changes in instructional practices. These actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Developing innovative approaches to teaching; fostering increased student learning in the classroom; and participating in the evaluation of instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.
- Course revisions to support and/or enhance student learning, including strategies to support diverse students and integrate diversity issues into course content.

Within their narratives, candidates must discuss their formative assessment practices, including: (1) discussion of one or more course goals, aims, or practices the candidate decided to change, (2) the evidence alerting the candidate something needed to change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided the course(s) would change.

Required Documentation

- (1) Examples of formative assessments with discussion of how instructor used the assessment to identify the need for change (e.g., data/results, notes/observations based on student response to activity).
- (2) Examples of changes to instructional practices resulting from formative assessment
- (3) Examples of course revision resulting from formative assessment (e.g., multiple syllabi for the same course showing revisions), if applicable
- (4) Reflection on the curricular changes and their intended impact on student learning.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) Candidates implemented appropriate and relevant formative assessment related to instructional practices
- (2) Candidates revised instructional practices and/or curricular revision appropriate for the formative assessment results
- (3) Candidates included a meaningful reflection of the curricular changes in the narrative
- (4) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:
 - Candidates being evaluated for reappointment must have engaged in formative assessment in each different course taught during the review period.
 - Candidates being evaluated for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must have engaged in an average of at least two formative assessment activities per year since their initial appointment.
 - Candidates being evaluated for promotion to Full Professor must have engaged in an average of at least one formative assessment activity for every year since their last promotion.
- (4) Instructional improvement activities that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

2.1.3. Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

Effective instruction engages and helps students learn the desired course outcomes. Instructional methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

All HSC faculty members must implement instructional practices that promote student learning and their understanding of course learning expectations. The candidate must illustrate effectiveness of instructional practices and course materials in conveying learning goals and student outcomes. Candidates must describe in their narrative how their instructional activities ensure student awareness of and their ability to meet curricular goals. Use of appropriate assessment methods is needed to observe and evaluate student learning. To this end, faculty members must develop assessment tools for courses that provide evidence of student learning based on course learning objectives. Assessments should clearly convey expectations and/or criteria for success. These practices may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Syllabi/learning contracts clearly noting learning expectations, grading information and how grading is tied to assessments
- Course assignments, exams and other assessments identifying goals and relation to course/program learning outcomes/objectives
- Assignment/assessment guidelines that detail what the assessment intends to measure
- Methods used to provide iterative feedback on assignments/assessments
- Varied instructional practices and assessments to address different learning styles

In addition, candidates may describe and provide evidence of student learning in other forms, such as, but not limited to:

- Reports of student performance on assignments, exams and other assessments
- Student participation in course discussion boards
- De-identified samples of student work
- Informal evaluations conducted by the instructor
- Student comments and feedback on learning through informal communications

Required Documentation

- (1) Course materials, such as syllabi, that clearly convey to students, in behavioral terms, the learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education.
 - (2) Syllabi, or some form of contract (e.g. document outlining objectives, expectations and timeline) for non-traditional courses or instructional activities in which the faculty member supervises students (such as thesis, independent and directed studies) should include:
 - The measurable learning outcomes of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
 - Clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
 - How assessments align with learning objectives; and
 - Instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught
- Syllabi/contracts may be enhanced by identifying purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic responsibilities, and/or individual personal growth)

- (3) Course materials, such as assignment guidelines with rubrics (or other clear indicator of grading standards), clearly conveying to students, the relationship of the activity to the course, major and/or to general education goals.
- (4) Evidence of up-to-date instructional methods and materials that are appropriate to the courses taught and foster student learning, such as application of innovative best practices including technological teaching methods related to virtual instruction, development of novel assignments that integrate learning across courses, flipped lectures, use of discussion boards, etc.
- (5) Candidates should provide evidence of any assessment methods described in the narrative, (i.e., samples of assignments/assessments used in courses taught during the review period, such as exams and assignment guidelines with rubrics).
- (6) *Other evidence could include student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers (vs. peer observations), qualitative or quantitative student feedback.*

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) Candidates implemented appropriate strategies that ensured student awareness of learning expectations and relevant activities.
- (2) Student performance indicators are clearly linked to learning objectives of instructional activities.
 - (4) Assessments convey clear metrics for evaluation.
- (5) Candidates implemented appropriate assessment methods to accommodate student differences.

2.1.4. Student Learning Outcomes Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. *Instructional practices and course materials must clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. Where candidates have made improvements to outcomes, goals, and/or assessments, these should be discussed in the narrative by the candidate with corresponding evidence.* Candidates may also describe any other evidence of student learning.

Faculty members must prepare lessons and course materials that lead to students achieving intended learning outcomes for a course or other instructionally related activity. To this end, candidates are required to provide scores from items relevant to student learning on SPOT evaluations.

- Student perceptions of whether concepts presented and assignments supported their learning are reported on SPOT evaluations and should be included in the candidate's file for evaluation of student learning outcomes.

Required Documentation

- (1) A summary table displaying SPOT evaluation scores for all courses taught within the review period with columns showing HSC and college averages should be included in the narrative.
 - For each course, median scores for the item, "Concepts were presented in a manner that helped me learn." should be displayed.

- For each course, median scores for the item, “Assignments contributed to my learning.” should be displayed.
- (2) Discussion in the narrative of any improvements made or other evidence of student learning with relevant documentation.
 - (3) Samples of assignments/assessments used in courses taught during the review period, such as exams and assignment guidelines with rubrics.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) For SPOT evaluation scores related to student learning outcomes, expectations differ depending on candidate’s rank as follows:
 - Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in median scores across time or median scores equal to or above 5 in over half of classes evaluated since initial appointment.
 - Student evaluations submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must provide evidence of a sustained level of median scores above 5 for at least two-thirds of courses evaluated since initial appointment.
 - Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has median scores above 5 for at least 75% of courses evaluated since last promotion.
- (3) Assessments used in courses can provide evidence of student learning.

2.1.5. Syllabi *Course syllabi shall be included in the candidate’s RTP file and align with HSC requirements (aligning with requirements of CHHS and HSC standard course outlines [SCOs]). Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period shall be included in the candidate’s file.*

Required Documentation

- (1) A complete list of teaching responsibilities for the review period in the PDS.
- (2) Syllabi for every course taught during the review period (if multiple sections of the same course are taught and the syllabus does not differ across sections, only one syllabus needs to be submitted for the course, and this must be clarified in the narrative). This may include some form of contract (such as a document outlining objectives, expectations and timeline) for non-traditional courses or instructional activities in which the faculty member receives instructional credit (e.g., supervising student theses, independent or directed studies).
- (3) Narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to syllabi.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) At minimum, all course syllabi must comply with the requirements of the current CHHS SCO to ensure alignment with current campus policies, such as accessibility standards. The absence of required SCO content in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may

fail to meet the standards of excellence that this RTP Policy is designed to facilitate.

- (2) Syllabi may be further enhanced when they contain other types of information, such as:
 - The measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
 - Clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
 - Instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and
 - Readings and assignments that are up to date (dates for readings should generally be within the past 5-10 years with exceptions for seminal papers; assignments should align with current behaviors and practices within the field), be appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of HSC, assigned readings from primary sources that support inclusivity and diversity, enhance the interdisciplinary and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.
- (3) If improvements have been made to syllabi, candidates must clearly describe such in the narrative and provide supporting evidence.

2.1.6. Grade Distributions *Grade distributions of courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file along with narrative discussion of grading in accordance with HSC expectations. Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness and, as such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.*

Faculty members must deliver instruction using effective strategies that promote student learning, which may be reflected by students' grades. To this end, candidates are required to provide grade distributions for all courses taught during the evaluation period as one metric of student learning. Additionally, candidates must explain how their instructional strategies impact the grades students earn in their courses.

- The distribution of students' grades can help to contextualize students' perceptions of teaching and assist in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
- Grade distributions must be understood within the context of an instructor's teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be expected in larger undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques might justify a grading distribution of all A's and B's in small, upper-level or graduate seminars.

Required Documentation

- (1) All candidates must submit the grade distributions for all the courses taught during the review period.
 - Overall course GPAs should be presented in a table in the narrative with columns showing the relevant HSC and college averages for course level (i.e., lower division, upper division, graduate) that aligns with the courses taught; in addition, the candidate may choose to provide frequencies of the distribution of GPAs.
- (2) Narrative must describe how the grade distributions provide evidence of student learning, explaining what the ideal distribution is for each of their courses. For example, a class with all grades being "A" requires an explanation of how/why

such distribution versus a balanced grade distribution indicates learning and is not an indicator of grade inflation.

- (3) Narrative must clarify how the candidate's teaching practices are related to the grade distributions.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) Grade distributions are appropriate for the course content and instructional modalities and practices.
- (2) Teaching practices have a clear relation to the grade distributions.

2.1.7. Student Response to Instruction *Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness, and utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to instruction. Nevertheless, student course evaluations shall be used by the HSC and College RTP committees to evaluate student response to instruction, among other evidence. Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with academic unit expectations. All student course evaluations during the review period must be included in the candidate's file. Candidates should demonstrate in their narrative deliberate efforts to improve instruction based on student course evaluations.*

SPOT evaluations enable student feedback to be evaluated based on university-defined metrics. Written comments on SPOT forms may provide further details and context for quantitative ratings. *Candidates must submit student evaluations in accordance with the requirements of this HSC RTP Policy.*

Required Documentation

- (1) All candidates, regardless of rank, must submit the evaluation summary sheets for all the courses in which university administered SPOT evaluations were given:
 - candidates for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must submit student evaluations of all sections of all courses taught since their initial appointment; and
 - candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must submit student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since their last promotion review.
- (2) If any written comments from SPOT evaluations are submitted along with the summary sheets, the candidate must submit ALL of the written comments for that course.
- (3) A summary table displaying SPOT evaluation scores for all courses taught within the review period with columns showing HSC and college averages should be included in the narrative.
 - For each course, median scores for the item, "The instructor was effective at teaching the subject matter in this course" should be displayed.
 - For each course, overall averages for all SPOT items should also be displayed
- (4) While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the academic units and/or the college. Appropriate reasons for

these results must be explained in the candidate's narrative (e.g., change in administration methods to online SPOTs, first time teaching a course).

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs. Overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistent with or more favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages. A faculty member's median scores on the teaching effectiveness item, in particular, are expected to compare favorably to the averages for HSC and the college. All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

(1) RTP committee must take into account any unusual circumstances that may have impacted SPOT evaluations in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness

(2) High-quality teaching is defined as:

- A median score of 5 or higher on the item "The instructor was effective at teaching the subject matter in this course" on each course SPOT; and
- An average score on overall averages of all SPOT items within one standard deviation of both the HSC and college averages (separate comparisons should be made for the department and college scores).

(3) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:

- Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
- Student evaluations submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
- Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence, defined as:
 - For at least 90% of all courses taught since the last review, mean ratings for the item "The instructor was effective at teaching the subject matter in this course" on each course SPOT are above the HSC mean and any course with a mean below the department mean must have a median of 6; AND
 - An overall average score combining the mean for all SPOT items is at or above the overall HSC average.

2.1.8. Peer Evaluations *Peer evaluations of the candidate's instruction are important sources of evidence that must be included in the candidate's RTP file, and candidates should reflect on and incorporate peer feedback, including providing evidence of instructional improvements where appropriate. The quantity of peer evaluations, as well as the rank of evaluators for HSC faculty members is specified below and must be followed accordingly. CHHS and HSC value growth mindset for faculty in terms of continuous quality improvement for teaching. Evaluators are encouraged to use evaluative statements in their assessment of classroom performance and activities.*

Positive teaching evaluations as assessed by peers who visit the classroom to observe teaching style, breadth, depth, and overall effectiveness are required. Such evaluations of classroom performance may be conducted by peers from HSC, the

HSC RTP Committee, the chair of HSC and/or faculty members from other academic units with relevant expertise who are approved by the HSC RTP Policy or Committee (e.g., statistics or research methods instructors from other departments). Peer evaluations must be based on observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. Peer evaluations must document whether: instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; content is up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and overall effectiveness of ways in which information is communicated to students in the classroom. Peer evaluators should also evaluate the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials.

Peer evaluations are not limited to HSC courses taught by the candidate. Candidates may request peer evaluation of courses taught for training programs (e.g., summer training program, learning community), guest lectures given in HSC courses or courses in other departments where the candidate presented content relevant to HSC.

Ideally, a candidate will ask for peer evaluations for each course topic they teach (including for different modalities, if relevant), and such evaluations will be conducted by different colleagues who have the experience and expertise to provide critical review of their teaching effectiveness. This may include non-tenured faculty members as well as lecturers who have been teaching a course longer than the candidate has or other peers with expertise (which must be substantiated) in the course content (including colleagues with fewer years in the department or university). Moreover, to show growth in response to feedback from peers, candidates are encouraged to seek a second peer evaluation from the same colleague in a subsequent semester. Whenever possible, candidates are encouraged to seek peer evaluations from tenured/tenure track faculty to prevent uncompensated service burden on lecturer faculty.

Required Documentation

- (1) When candidates have taught using modalities other than in-person [1) synchronous online, 2) asynchronous online, or 3) other online modality (i.e., mixed online, hyflex)] three or more times, they must provide at least one peer evaluation of a course in that other modality.
- (2) Expectations differ depending on candidate's rank as follows:
 - Candidates for reappointment must provide at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since initial appointment.
 - Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must provide at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since reappointment, in addition to three from the period between initial appointment and reappointment.
 - Candidates for promotion to Full Professor must submit at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion.
- (2) Candidates must request that peer evaluators use the standard Peer Evaluation of Teaching form (appropriate for the modality of teaching); these completed forms must be included in the candidate's file.
- (3) Candidates must describe in their narrative *how changes were implemented as a result of these evaluations*.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) Candidates for reappointment must provide of either continued improvement (item on peer evaluation form for “overall teaching effectiveness” increases across time) in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching (item on peer evaluation form for “overall teaching effectiveness” is at least proficient on over half of classes evaluated since initial appointment).
- (2) Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the Associate Professor must provide evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching (item on peer evaluation form for “overall teaching effectiveness” is Excellent on over half of classes evaluated since reappointment).
- (3) Candidates for promotion to Full Professor must submit at least three peer evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence (item on peer evaluation form for “overall teaching effectiveness” is Excellent and qualitative feedback on forms is overall positive on over 75% of classes evaluated since the last promotion).

2.1.9. Other Evidence Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to describe in their narrative and submit related documentation or any additional information that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above. Examples include recognition of or awards for instructional effectiveness, student statements of teaching effectiveness (e.g., e-mails or cards from students expressing appreciation). If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee must review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness.

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

In accordance with University policy, CHHS and HSC faculty engage in a variety of valuable scholarly and creative activities. HSC definitions, standards, and criteria for RSCA value scholarly contributions which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to: books, journal articles that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly book chapters (whether or not reviewed by professional peers), scholarly presentations, accepted research abstracts, software and electronically published documents, submitted and awarded grants or contracts, and invited lectures. While some activities are required others enhance the candidate’s portfolio, as described below.

2.2.1. Variability Across Disciplines *Evaluation criteria should recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and values discussed in section 1, including the importance of involving students in RSCA.*

The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable

contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Consistent with University expectations of all faculty members, RTP candidates within HSC and the CHHS must demonstrate achievements in the area of research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in the CHHS RTP Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in this HSC RTP policy. RSCA standards are specified in the following subsections. Accordingly, HSC faculty members must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of health science, public health, community health, health education, and related fields.

2.2.2. Research *RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Examples below should not be construed as exhaustive or recommended:*

- *Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.*
- *Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.*
- *Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.*
- *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.*

Academic units should not limit candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments, but may develop equivalencies for RSCA activities in accordance with disciplinary norms and expectations. Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills based on requirements delineated the department.

Peer-reviewed articles are the primary RSCA activity used in evaluation of dissemination expectations. Publications based on original research, brief reports and literature reviews are counted towards dissemination expectations. The following are equivalencies for one peer-reviewed publication within HSC:

- An extensive commentary, with documented justification of how the effort to prepare and publish the product is equivalent to a full-length peer-reviewed publication.

- Policy briefs, technical reports, white papers, evidence-based intervention/program development (including health education curriculum) may count as one peer-reviewed article (must provide appropriate evidence to corroborate time commitment is equivalent to that of development and submission of a research article), evidence of peer review should be provided when relevant.
- Two peer-reviewed oral presentations at premier conferences in which the candidate is lead author. Premier refers to the professional meeting that is considered a prestigious, top-tier, leading, flagship or main venue for a particular research area, sub-field or discipline.
- Three peer-reviewed poster presentations at premier conferences in which the candidate is lead author.
- Four peer-reviewed poster presentations at premier conferences in which a student is lead author.
- Three peer-reviewed oral presentations at premier conferences in which a student is lead author.
- Completion and submission of a grant proposal to a federal funding agency (e.g., NIH, USDA, HRSA, CDC), foundation (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, California Wellness Foundation), and/or other external funding entity (that requires effort to develop and submit proposal equivalent to that of a NIH grant) whether funded or not. Development and submission of smaller grants are acceptable, however, the candidate must demonstrate how the sum of the efforts were equivalent to that of an NIH grant submission.
- Administering an external federally funded research project as principal investigator (PI), or co-PI or co-investigator if substantial contributions are equivalent to those of the PI. Candidate must provide appropriate evidence to corroborate equivalence of time commitment. Each year of administering the project may qualify as one peer-reviewed article.

Importantly, candidates are required to have a required minimum number of peer-reviewed publications to satisfy dissemination expectations (i.e., there is cap on the number of equivalencies that may be substituted). See limits in the dissemination evaluation criteria below.

Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, clinical, and/or other research appropriate for the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education, and related areas. Candidates must detail their research activities and show how those activities qualify as RSCA. Research activities recognized by HSC include, but are not limited to:

- As used in this document, “research” involves bench, clinical, social, behavioral, policy, or applied community-based investigations that rely on or are derived from primary (whether observational or experimental) or secondary data collection, including qualitative research methods such as content analysis of relevant sources of information and data, interviews and focus groups.
- While securing funding is not required of candidates, faculty members are highly encouraged to seek support for RSCA through internal funding sources. These mechanisms are useful, particularly for early career faculty members, in garnering support to engage in RSCA to ensure they are on track for publication requirements.
- Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, HSC, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are

- encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank.
- In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, HSC values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to HSC's role in serving the communities in which we work and live. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends as well as student authored products shall be considered enhancing evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement. *It is the candidate's responsibility to identify research outcomes related to student research mentoring.*
 - As the preceding do not provide an exhaustive list, HSC also considers activities that meet the following criteria as those that should be given RSCA credit:
 - Research products resulting from student thesis projects, such as completed final theses published by the university library, submitted and accepted conference abstracts and presentations as well as publications based on the thesis project; instruction of research courses that directly result in research dissemination products.
 - Research mentorship to students in the department, to students working in CSULB research centers, and to students in formal research training programs that result in research products, as described above.
 - Inclusivity and diversity focused RSCA that support achieving health equity and eliminate health disparities are viewed favorably.

Within their narratives, candidates must discuss their scholarly vision or program—the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work and aims or expected outcomes of their work. They should discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities are high quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. The narrative is not meant to be merely a list of activities and candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment.

Candidates should refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their fields. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation. For collaborative works, the candidate must articulate their contributions and how they are distinguished from the efforts of others on the research team.

2.2.3. Dissemination of RSCA *In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. Publication of scholarly and creative works in peer reviewed scholarship is required of all candidates.*

Peer reviewed work. Refereed articles that are accepted and published in public health journals, journals from related disciplines, and relevant electronic media (such as online journals) are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The quality of work is defined by its significance in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to validate the work's significance. Normally, the finished works will be published and/or presented in a respected venue consistent with accepted disciplinary standards. RSCA activities are expected to have significant impact on students and community.

- *Publication of scholarly and creative works in peer reviewed journals is required of all candidates at all levels of review.*
- All RTP candidates are expected to present their research at academic conferences and professional meetings relevant to the fields of health science, public health, community health, health education or other related fields. Conference proceedings (e.g., abstracts, panel moderation, session chair, symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) and presentations strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure and promotion to any rank.

Required Documentation

- (1) Complete list of peer-reviewed work should be provided in the PDS. For multiple-authored papers where the candidate is not the first author, the amount or nature of author contributions should be specified in the PDS listing of publications. Student authors should be identified.
- (2) Copies of all such scholarly work must be submitted so that the RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.
- (3) Documentation of the impact of scholarship on students and/or the community should be provided. Indicators may include, but are not limited to:
 - Student impact: student co-authorship on presentations/publications, student awards for research presentations or papers, research mentee pursuit of graduate training (e.g., undergraduates applying for master's or doctoral programs, or master's students applying to doctoral programs),
 - Community impact: community partner co-authorship on presentations/publications, translation and dissemination of research to support community members' health and well-being, scholarship used to provide community testimony on use of technical reports or consultation to address issues of public policy, expert review or letters about the quality and impact of applied work, and external evaluation of engaged scholarship.

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee Evaluation of quality must consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, whether a research presentation is at a premier conference) and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work. All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards. Impact of RSCA should also be evaluated using guidelines below.

- (1) High-quality work as judged by one's peers should be based on assessment of the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published, and the degree of the candidate's contribution to the publication must always be considered when assessing the significance of any publication.
 - Authorship: First-authored and senior-authored (last author as principal investigator or lead researcher) works as well as works published with student collaborators, are evaluated most positively. Due to the collaborative nature the fields related to HSC research, sole-authored works are less common and more difficult to complete, thus are also viewed quite favorably, but are not required. Second-authored works also indicate primary roles of the candidate and are viewed favorably. Absent unusual circumstances (such as using a unique methodology or participating in long-term grant research with other scholars, etc.), all RTP candidates who contribute to multiple-authored works are expected to

balance such collaborative research projects with research and publication from their own independent research, distinguishing them in their narrative. Given the collaborative nature of the field, RTP candidates who contribute to multiple-authored and collaborative research projects and publication should be evaluated positively.

- Journals: Must be peer-reviewed; metrics available for journal ranking (e.g., impact factor, usage metrics, etc.) should be evaluated; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal; status of the journal within the subfield (for open access journals, particularly those that require payment by the researcher, evidence of the journal credibility and peer-review standards should be identified; if a candidate publishes in a journal that requires payment for publication, the peer reviews for the publication must be submitted with the publication in the candidate file); status of the members of the journal editorial board within the subfield; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and/or citations to the article.
 - Conference Presentations: Must be peer reviewed; the scope and prestige of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local, prestigious, top-tier, leading, flagship, or main venue for a particular research area, sub-field or discipline) should be taken into account.
- (2) The impact of scholarly works must always be taken into account when assessing the significance of any publication. Candidates must show evidence of impact of their peer reviewed work in at least one of the following areas (having impact in more than one area is viewed more favorably):
- Impact on Students: CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. HSC evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses). Publications and presentations that include student co-authors are highly valued.
 - Community Impact: HSC recognizes the impact of RSCA in various types of community settings (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at different levels of community effort (local, state, national, and international communities).
- (3) The RTP Committee must apply the following standards for evaluation of the candidate's peer reviewed work:
- For mini reviews during the first three years of appointment, faculty members are likely to just be starting to advance a research agenda. Thus, in the first year, new faculty members might be more likely to publish books or literature reviews, invited essays, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. During their first two years (prior to initial reappointment), faculty members are expected to be submitting abstracts, presenting at conferences, and/or working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals for publication. It is the duty of the HSC RTP committee to assess and provide feedback on the candidate's trajectory toward meeting department expectations to ensure the candidate is on track to meet requirements for reappointment.

- By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have peer-reviewed scholarly work either in-print or formally accepted for publication. Quality, however, is more important than quantity. At minimum, candidate must have at least one accepted or published peer-reviewed article to be recommended for the maximum of three years of reappointment. Exceeding these baseline expectations by a greater publishing output shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement. Candidates who have multiple published/accepted peer-reviewed conference abstracts or manuscripts under review may be recommended for reappointment for less than the three-year maximum (i.e., one- or two-year reappointment) when all other RSCA requirements have been met.
- After initial reappointment (typically years four through six), faculty members should be publishing in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least four scholarly peer-reviewed articles (or equivalents). A maximum of two peer-reviewed articles may be substituted by equivalents. As in other evaluative areas, quality, however, is more important than quantity. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have published at least six scholarly peer-reviewed articles (or equivalents). To align with the CHHS expectation to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers, at least five of the publications (or equivalents) should be with the five years prior to promotion review. A maximum of three peer-reviewed articles may be substituted by equivalents. Quantity does not substitute for quality. Candidates who guide students to publish peer-reviewed articles should be viewed more favorably. Research products that include student authors enhance evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement. Candidates who guide students to publish peer-reviewed articles should be viewed more favorably.
- Research products that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated favorably.

Sponsored research. Procurement of RSCA funding in the form of assigned time or additional compensation can greatly enhance opportunities for engagement in significant scholarly activities and dissemination of research. Internal funding from the university and college are important strategies for supporting RSCA and developing grant writing skills that can facilitate obtaining external funding and is valued by HSC. Securing external sponsored research opportunities shall constitute a significantly enhancing criterion that is given extremely positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.

- Internal funding opportunities may include, but are not limited to, awards offered through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (e.g., RSCA, Mini Grants/Summer Stipends, Multidisciplinary Research Grants) the Ukleja Center,

research training programs (e.g., BUILD, UROP, etc.), and Academic Affairs (e.g., sabbatical leave).

- External funding opportunities may include, but are not limited to, federal funding (e.g., NIH, CDC, SAMHSA, USDA, USDE), CSU funding opportunities to support students (e.g., Sally Casanova, Chancellor's Doctoral Incentive Program), state funding, awards from private entities as well as foundations and non-profit organizations.

It is the candidate's responsibility to explicitly identify any internal and externally funded research activities and deliverables. In their narratives the candidates must disclose and describe the details of the RSCA activities and how they have demonstrated accountability to the funding entity, whether internal or external.

Required Documentation

While there are no requirements to secure research funding, candidates who do secure funding must describe the award in the narrative and must submit evidence of proposal submissions and research awards. These may include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Evidence of submissions
- (2) Award letters
- (3) Candidates must provide evidence of accomplishments achieved as a result of the award, such as the stated products or milestones (e.g., external proposal submission from internal funding, publication, target enrollment reached, etc.) or required annual reports to external sponsors. If extraneous factors prohibited completion of targets, an appropriate explanation is required (e.g., COVID-19 pandemic prevented in-person research activities).

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

- (1) The number and scope of activities supported by sabbaticals, and other forms of internal support for scholarly research funded by CSULB should be assessed.
- (2) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the entirety of the probationary period, merely applying for sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant writing skills.
- (3) While not required, candidates for promotion to full professor are encouraged to provide evidence of externally funded grants.
- (4) Funding that explicitly supports efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

2.2.4. Advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one's knowledge has the potential for improving the quality of education by introducing state-of-the-art methods for the field and keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline.

All candidates are expected to contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy in health science, public health, community health, health education, and

related fields or interdisciplinary studies. Candidates should demonstrate their contributions through various methods, such as, but not limited to:

- Engaging in innovative and novel RSCA that increases the knowledge base of the field (e.g., new populations, new methodologies, new technology)
- Building inter/trans/multidisciplinary collaborations that generate new and/or enhance the knowledge upon which the profession is based
- The impact of RSCA on the discipline

Required Documentation

- (1) Candidates should describe how their RSCA advances the field in the narrative
- (2) Products, letters or other evidence supporting the descriptions in the narrative
- (3) Impact on the discipline should be demonstrated with a citation analysis that provides an estimate of the number of times published work was cited by other researchers. There are several options and metrics available for this metric (e.g., citation index, H-index) which can be obtained from online databases that provide citation information

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

- (1) RSCA are novel and utilize effective methods to expand the knowledge base of the discipline and support interdisciplinary work. Across successive publications, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).
- (2) Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge): is based on the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress (e.g., addresses a public health priority) and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary journals; thus, results of citation analysis for peer reviewed should be considered in evaluating disciplinary impact.
- (3) RSCA that significantly impact and support efforts to enhance health equity and support diversity should be evaluated more favorably.

2.2.5. Other Evidence. Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences quality RSCA as set forth above. If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee must review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate's RSCA achievements.

D.1. The following provides examples of other RSCA that may be included in the candidate's file. While the list is not exhaustive, it is intended to provide the candidate and RTP Committee guidance in what activities strengthen the candidate's RSCA portfolio.

- Other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, article reviews, and invited research lectures) are valued and strengthen the candidate's portfolio. These types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the HSC RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate. Examples may include:
 - Books, including textbooks, and book chapters provide illustrations of synthesizing research and scientific facts for academic and lay audiences which contribute to further development of the field. Thus, original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully advance theory, theoretically based scholarly

writing may also constitute “research,” depending on the candidate’s area of expertise, even if it does not include the quantitative or qualitative examination of empirical data.

- Invited research presentations (e.g., keynote speaker, panelist, etc) for colloquia series offered by the university, other institutions or professional organizations.
- Design of community surveys, health interventions, and program evaluations.
- Committee work that supports dissemination and exposure to faculty research across the campus, particularly for students to learn about possible research opportunities.
- Research products related to building or supporting community efforts to solve community issues, such as policy briefs, white papers, policy testimony.
- Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers. These types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the college and HSC RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate. Examples may include:
 - Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; membership on a grant-review panel; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications.
- Candidates may strengthen their RSCA portfolio by engaging in activities that improve and build skills and knowledge as a researcher/in a particular area of research. These may include, but are not limited to, training to use of a new software tool for data collection or analysis, attending trainings on grant writing for research proposals, and other professional development specifically related to RSCA.

Required Documentation. While there are no requirements to submit additional evidence, if candidates do describe such in their narrative, they must submit documentation that provides evidence of those activities. These may include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Copies of all such scholarly works
- (2) Evidence of training (e.g., certificate of completion; application of the skills in RSCA, etc.)

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

- (1) Books and chapters: The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency should be evaluated.
 - Both scholarly books and textbooks as well as book chapters are valued for RTP purposes.
 - Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books and chapters written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.
- (2) Invited publications and/or presentations: Evaluation should consider the stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e.,

international, national, regional, or local).

2.3. Service

Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, and the academic profession and strengthens shared governance processes. Universities cannot and should not function without faculty service contributions. Therefore, service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators. It is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation. Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. Service to HSC is required of all candidates at all ranks.

2.3.1. Range and Depth of Service Commitments *All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of shared governance on campus and to maintain active engagement benefitting the university, community, and/or profession through high-quality service contributions and activities throughout their careers. Differential workloads may result in varied service expectations. It is expected that early career faculty members will be protected from excessive service obligations so that they may focus their time on achieving teaching excellence and developing their research agenda to reach publication requirements; thus, faculty members at higher ranks should be engaging in significant service to the department throughout their tenure.*

The University, CHHS and HSC recognize that cultural and identity taxation have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas, service done on behalf of students or on behalf of the department, college and university that might otherwise go unrecognized or disproportionately fall on faculty should be considered in the evaluation process. While all tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in shared governance and maintain active engagement, HSC considers the role cultural and identity taxation plays in the service activities of faculty. These activities include, but are not limited to, mentoring students or supervising student clubs that might not constitute formal committee work, but still take up considerable time. Moreover, academic units should consider ways to minimize these inequities by proactively working with faculty, prior to undergoing review, to ensure equitable distribution of service. Candidates are encouraged to discuss and document in their materials any service activities they feel may have been disproportionately completed in light of cultural and identity taxation.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although the following text 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:

- *Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university, CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to CFA.*

- *Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise.*
- *Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.*

2.3.2. Quality of Service Commitments The quality of contributions to service is fundamental to meeting HSC service requirements. The evaluation of service goes beyond quantity and must be based on the quality, duration, and significance (i.e., value and impact) of the service activity. HSC committee responsibilities and charge documents should be consulted to provide information on the quality and significance of activities. *As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), 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. Service activities like these (whether academic or personal, supporting faculty or students), may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways. This HSC RTP policy specifies the evaluation criteria and the process to recognize importance of these activities and guides candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities. It is recognized that many service roles are not strictly “service” in the sense of being voluntary commitments for which no assigned time/release from teaching is given.* Service activities that receive assigned time are counted towards service credit; however, service outside of that supported by assigned time is required to meet minimal HSC expectations for service activities (i.e., candidate must engage in service activities beyond those for which they receive assigned time). Relevant factors for assessment of all service activities are noted below in evaluation criteria for the RTP Committee.

Department service: All faculty members must serve on department committees, contribute to activities (which may be scholarly and/or administrative) to support program implementation and improvement (e.g., conducting course assessments for program review, completing surveys for accreditation, reporting numbers for program evaluation, etc.) and participate in program governance. A non-exhaustive list of possible activities includes:

- Student advising and mentorship, including career advising, and provision of or referrals to relevant resources;
- Serving as an internship preceptor for non-HSC students;
- Advising HSC student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies, i.e., Health Science Graduate Association, Health Science Student Association and Eta Sigma Gamma Honor Society. Participation in activities that are sponsored by student organizations are recognized as service to the department, although advising roles are weighted heavier;
- Mentoring colleagues is highly encouraged and valued;
- Participating actively and substantially in departmental committees, (especially by chairing a department committee);
- Engaging in activities to establish, maintain and improve departmental operations, such as revision of policies, development of bylaws, handbooks and other department guiding documents
- Committee work that is necessary for instructional program success, such as reviewing applications for admission to the graduate program
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department

- such as preparing program reviews, accreditation reports, or certification;
- Attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;
- Creating, promoting and/or implementing workforce development opportunities made available to units within the university as well as the community and other professional organizations and institutions.
- Examples of service activities that are expected of tenured faculty members include, but are not limited to:
 - Mentoring early career faculty members
 - Chairing the department, serving as the graduate advisor or undergraduate advisor, chair program reviews or accreditation review process;
 - Chairing major departmental committees (e.g., search committee, RTP committee, chair voting committee, program assessment/accreditation committees);
 - Creating or significantly revising entire department/program curricula or developing new courses (e.g., development of programs to support instruction, guidelines to outline program expectations).

College service: Service to the CHHS may include, but is not limited to, serving on CHHS committees, engaging in activities to represent and support the CHHS mission and strategic initiatives and supporting programs and their students in other departments within CHHS. Possible activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on the CHHS RTP Committee, Faculty Council, Graduate Council, Educational Policies Committee, CHHS General Education Committee, Research Committee; Awards/Scholarships Committee, Professional Leave Committee, etc. as well as other committees on which the College invited the candidate to serve;
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to CHHS
- Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing CHHS committees, organizations and/or task forces;
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university, college, or department;
- Participating in CHHS activities, including academic (e.g., convocation, commencement, roundtable events with community) and social events (e.g. meet the department); taking lead roles or assisting in organization of any of these activities is given more weight.

University service: University service requires that candidates contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of CSULB. Service to the university may include, but is not limited to, serving on university-level committees, engaging in activities that promote the reputation of and support the CSULB mission and strategic initiatives (e.g., Beach 2030) and supporting programs and their students in other colleges within the university. A non-exhaustive list of possible activities includes:

- Since face-to-face/virtual responsible conduct of research training workshops are offered to faculty and students across the university, service credit is given for providing these workshops;
- Providing training workshops that are open to faculty and/or staff across the university;

- Serving on university committees, such as IRB, University Awards; Committee; Assigned Time Committee, etc. as well as other committees on which the College invited the candidate to serve;
- Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing university-wide committees, organizations or task forces;
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university.

Service to the Community: If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member such that they apply academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional, national, or international issues. For any research-related projects/collaborations/partnerships, only activities that go above and beyond those required for the research will count as community service. Possible activities include, but are not limited to:

- *Consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.*
- Participating in community service events organized by student clubs and organizations;
- Attending community events sponsored by community organizations and partners;
- Providing technical assistance and/or training to community organizations.
- Helping to organize or facilitate events for charities health and civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise;
- Acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for community and educational organizations, government, business, or industry.
- Taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;
- Serving as a director, co-director, and/or affiliate of a research center whose mission is to serve the community
- Holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to the candidate's professional expertise;
- Consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
- Serving on governing boards and/or advisory boards, and chairing meetings of public health and health education-focused organizations (program planning committees; external scholarship committees; external research review committees)
- Engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to public health; serving as a health-related consultant; provide events or news stories; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with health-related missions; writing relevant health editorials in non-academic media outlets, such as newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding a position as an elected civil officer.
- Facilitating community outreach and/or assessment in partnership with schools, health and human services agencies and organizations, local, state, federal, or international governments, and/or community organizations.

Service to the Field and/or Profession: Service to the profession should connect to

candidates' academic expertise and professional goals and may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews/articles and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected professional offices in a health or public health related professional organization. Professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for the American Public Health Association, Society for Public Health Education, or other health-related professional organizations.

Possible activities include, but are not limited to:

- Professional consulting activities (whether paid or volunteer) that may, but are not required to, result in technical reports, grant proposal applications or other products.
- Professional honors, awards, and other forms of recognition
- Election as an officer of a professional organization
- Serving as an abstract, grant, or journal reviewer and/or editorial board member (must describe and provide evidence of reviews, e.g., Publons profile information for manuscript, email acknowledgments of completed reviews, or other relevant activities, such as compiling a special issue)

As the preceding do not provide exhaustive lists, HSC considers activities that meet the following criteria as those that should be given service credit:

- In absence of HSC faculty members receiving instructional units for thesis advising, the time spent advising and reviewing is credited toward service for any student within the department. Serving on thesis committees in other departments will count towards service to the college where the student is housed. Thesis advising also enhances the field, therefore service to the field is acknowledged for these efforts.
- Development of courses or instructional programs outside of HSC that enhance the capacities of campus entities to meet their missions and support students earning highly valued degrees.
- Advising or research commitments to students outside of HSC and/or programs that support students in other units across the university—credit is given to the unit that the program serves (e.g., ANDALE serves CHHS while BUILD and UROP research training programs serve the university).
- Reviewing applications for student admission to educational, training and/or research programs.
- Reviewing applications for internal funding award mechanisms.
- Directing research centers that provide internship placements for students for the administration and management of volunteer and internship programs.
- Administration, management and/or operation of programs, funded grant awards, and research centers (such as the Center for Health Equity Research and Center for Latino Community Health Education and Leadership Training).
- Service activities that promote and support inclusive excellence, serving the needs of underrepresented groups, and achieving health equity and eliminating health disparities are given more weight.

Required Documentation *It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a documented narrative of their service contributions and the time commitment given their various committee assignments within each committee. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative criteria in their narrative.*

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.

In general, 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 then describe outcomes or impact of the work.

Student mentoring or advising (when being considered as service) could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g., numbers 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 of individuals impacted.

Candidates should describe, and department should recognize and take into account as part of the service workload activities supporting our diverse student population, including underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students.

- (1) Candidates must summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance in addition to documenting their attendance and participation. Per CHHS guidelines above, the narrative should provide an explanation of the quality and significance of their service within the specific domain (i.e., to the department, college, university, community, or the profession). In addition, candidates should cite the HSC committee responsibilities and charges to support illustration of the quality and significance of services, including required time commitment. Beyond simply listing service activities, the candidate must provide details of (in the PDS or narrative) contributions and accomplishments of service activities to facilitate evaluation of quality.
- (2) *Candidates must provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.*

Evaluation Criteria for RTP Committee

All evidence as well as clarifying narrative explanations should be considered in evaluation of meeting minimum standards.

- (1) Assessment of the depth, quality of service should consider, but is not limited to:
 - Committee responsibility and charge documents must be consulted to inform evaluators about the required service commitments in evaluation of the quality and significance of service;

- Invited service on College and University activities indicate recognition of the candidate's expertise and shall indicate high quality service;
 - The nature of the service commitment, particularly in terms of the time commitment required (total time commitment/percent of work week hours needed to complete the service activities), duration (length of service) and impact;
 - The depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students;
 - The significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and/or social climate of the university, college, and/or department;
 - The depth and quality of activities that enhance the university's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional, and prospective students;
 - The degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, college, and/or HSC;
 - The depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers their services; and
 - Most importantly, the degree of the candidate's leadership in the service activity. In evaluating this criterion, the RTP Committee must be mindful of the fact that leadership is not exclusively defined by one's position in a hierarchical structure, but rather is something that can be demonstrated at all levels by influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the group in which they serve (e.g., taking initiative to equally share the burden of service needs, proactively seeking out and/or implementing service efforts; collegiality, teamwork and collaboration to move service efforts forward).
 - Abstract and grant proposal reviewer: Evaluation should consider the status of the organization or institution for which the review was completed, as well as the type of review. Given the significant amount of time required for grant proposal reviews, these are viewed more favorably than abstract review activities. Reviews of the submissions by academic peers are viewed more favorably than those by students.
 - For consulting activities, considerations may include the number and scope of technical reports, and the frequency and range of clients for which consulting activities were provided.
 - For professional recognition, considerations may include, the scope of the organization (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); recognition through fellowship status in a professional organization, including consideration of the scope of the organization; awards, prizes, and other forms of recognition for service activities, including consideration of the scope of the organization presenting the award.
 - Letters and/or other communications (whether formal or informal) from peers and/or colleagues affirming the quality of the candidate's service.
- (2) Faculty members who were assigned to a committee or other service activity but did not contribute to the activities shall be evaluated as not having met HSC expectations for service.

- (3) Faculty members who mentor early career faculty members should be evaluated very favorably.
- (4) The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience.
 - During the first three years of appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in college and university service; however, they are expected to perform quality service in HSC. If faculty members at this level take on service activities that are expected of tenured faculty members, this shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of exceptional service.
 - For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to HSC that demonstrate leadership (as defined in evaluation criteria above) within the department and to CHHS. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have made quality service contributions to CHHS as well as to the community and/or to the profession. University-level service is desirable, but not required.
 - *For promotion to the rank of Full Professor (consistent with Section 5.4 of the University RTP policy and Section 5.4 of the CHHS Policy), faculty members are required to have provided significant, quality service and leadership in HSC, CHHS, and the university, as well as a sustained pattern of quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession.* Faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor who have actively protected early career faculty members from excessive service obligations through their commitment and participation in service shall be commended.

3.0. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1. Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to

use additional trainings and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. It is recommended that the narrative be between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any. Candidates are encouraged to provide a table that lists the RTP evaluation criteria and provides a summary of what is included in their file to illustrate how they have met criteria.

3.2. Department RTP Policy

The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college-level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.

The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.

3.3. Department RTP Committee

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

3.3.1. Election of Committee *The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to their department's RTP committee.*

3.3.2. Committee Composition

The committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members. Members of department RTP committees who participate in promotion recommendations must not only be tenured, but also must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be comprised of tenured Associate and Full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be comprised of tenured Full Professors. Moreover, they must not themselves be candidates for promotion.

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

It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

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

Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on an academic unit RTP committee.

Chairs or directors of academic units may serve as members of their unit RTP committee, if elected. However, if they serve as a member of the academic unit RTP committee, they may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this document. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, chairs or directors of academic units may not sit with department RTP committee during the time that it is considering their own materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

3.3.3. Responsibility and Accountability

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

3.3.4. Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

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

3.3.5. Ad Hoc Committees

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

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

After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for

election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members in a department will be eligible to vote.

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

3.4. Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

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

3.4.2. Optional Independent Evaluation by Director or Chair *Directors or chairs of academic units may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the director or department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a director or department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a director or department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.*

3.4.3. Candidate's Rights *At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the candidate's file and also be sent to all previous levels of review. This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.*

3.5. College RTP Policy

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

3.5.1. Ratification *The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost.*

3.5.2. Review for Currency *The college RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the college.*

3.6. College RTP Committee

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

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

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

3.6.2. Membership *The college RTP committee shall consist of eight (8) tenured, full-time faculty members. A minimum of five (5) faculty members must hold the rank of Full Professor. Up to three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members may serve at the rank of Associate Professor.*

Only tenured Full Professors may vote on applications for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

3.6.3. Election, Service, and Terms

- (a) Annually, each department shall be invited to nominate from its membership one professor and an associate professor to the dean of the College during their first/second department meeting. Members of the college committee shall be elected by secret ballot of the college faculty;*
- (b) There shall not be more than one member from any one academic unit; an exception may occur and a second member from the same department can be elected only after all academic units are represented from the eligibility pool;*
- (c) Elected members shall serve staggered, two-year terms;*
- (d) Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e., more than four consecutive years). After serving four consecutive years in any capacity (e.g., alternate), an individual is ineligible to serve the following year in any capacity.*
- (e) A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee of peer review.*
- (f) A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee (one-year term at a time) if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President.
However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of whom, are FERP participants.*

3.6.4. Vacancies *In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the college RTP committee, either a meeting of the college faculty*

shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the office of the Dean of the college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).

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

3.6.6. Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files

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

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

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

3.6.7. Recommendations

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

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

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

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

3.7. Dean of the College

The Dean has a unique role in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college.

3.7.1. General Responsibilities *The Dean mentors department chairs regarding their roles in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, facilitates mechanisms for guiding/mentoring candidates in the RTP process, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The Dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.*

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

3.8. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and academic units' RTP committees. The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9. President

The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.

4.0. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

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

5.0. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION LEVEL CRITERIA

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

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

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

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in exceptional cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. The candidate's record must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

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

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

5.5.2 Early Promotion

To receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements department policies.

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

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

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

5.5.3. Department Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Instruction

- An average score on overall averages of all SPOT items above both the HSC and college averages (separate comparisons should be made for the department and college scores) for all courses since initial appointment.
- Completed at least one extensive course (i.e., multi-session or certificate program) on instructional development, with emphasis on equity in instruction during the evaluation period.
- At least two peer observations from external reviewers outside of the HSC department that attest with concrete examples to innovative, effective teaching practices and extensive student engagement during the evaluation period.
- Extensive mentoring beyond the classroom, with supporting documentation that can support quantity, quality and/or student impact since initial appointment.

RSCA

- At least six peer-reviewed articles (or equivalents; maximum of two publications may be substituted) during the review period.
- Submission of at least two external grant proposals for federal (e.g., NIH, USDA, HRSA, CDC), foundation (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, California Wellness Foundation), and/or other external funding entity (that requires effort to develop and submit proposal equivalent to that of a NIH grant) since initial appointment.

Service

- Leadership service roles in HSC and CHHS as well as quality service contributions to the community or profession and the University.

5.5.4. Department Criteria for Early Promotion to Full Professor Instruction

- An average score on overall averages of all SPOT items above both the HSC and college averages (separate comparisons should be made for the department and college scores) for all courses since last promotion.
- Completed at least one extensive course (i.e., multi-session or certificate program) on instructional development, with emphasis on equity in instruction since last promotion.
- At least two peer observations from external reviewers outside of the HSC department that attest with concrete examples to innovative, effective teaching practices and extensive student engagement since last promotion.
- Extensive mentoring beyond the classroom, with supporting documentation that can support quantity, quality and/or student impact since last promotion.
- High-quality instruction as evidenced by teaching award(s).

RSCA

- At least nine peer-reviewed articles (or equivalents; maximum of three publications may be substituted) since last promotion.
- Receipt of external federal (e.g., NIH, USDA, HRSA, CDC), foundation (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, California Wellness Foundation), and/or other external funding entity (equivalent to that of a NIH grant) funding since last promotion.

Service

- Leadership service roles in HSC, CHHS and University as well as quality service contributions to the community and profession with documented recognition for their contributions (e.g., awards).

6.0. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

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

7.0. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

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

8.0. APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

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

8.1. Ratification

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

8.2. Amendments

This policy must always align with CHHS and University requirements and policies. Thus, amendments to this policy may be required to remain in compliance with University policies. Upon receiving a notice of required amendment by the university or CHHS, the HSC Department Chair shall communicate the required amendment(s) to the tenured and probationary faculty members in the Department and the policy shall be amended accordingly.

Effective: Fall 2026



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2026**

Department of Health Science

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

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Date:

Nathan Gerard

Nathan Gerard

12/2/2025

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Date

Grace Reynolds, D.P.A.

Grace Reynolds, D.P.A.

12/2/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Date:

Patricia Perez

Patricia Perez

12/2/2025

Provost Signature:

Date:

[Signature]

12/2/25