

College of Liberal Arts

Department of Political Science

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy

Effective Fall 2025

I. Preamble

A. The teacher-scholar model underpins the Department of Political Science RTP Policy. Teaching and scholarship are complementary activities. Teaching engenders ideas that lead to scholarly and creative activities. Scholarly and creative activities bring new ideas and concepts into the classroom. Scholarship engenders enthusiasm for teaching and currency in one's discipline. Faculty cannot teach how to create new ideas, but faculty actively engaged in scholarly and creative activities can identify, inspire, and nurture the creative spark in students. We expect all candidates for RTP actions to address the teacher-scholar model in their narrative and other parts of the file, where appropriate.

B. Service to the local, national, and international community can provide examples for the classroom and experiences that broaden and deepen scholarly and creative activities. Community service promotes the goals of the university by extending learning into the community. Service to professional and academic organizations provides opportunities to share ideas, to communicate and express scholarly and creative activities, and to learn and develop teaching skills, materials, and methods. Shared governance is an important aspect of maintaining an open environment in the academy, encouraging a diversity of opinions and input from a variety of disciplines. Shared governance depends on active faculty involvement in university service. We expect all candidates for RTP actions to address these service expectations in the narrative and other parts of the file, where appropriate. Candidates should clarify how they have met specific demands for service commensurate with rank.

C. The Department of Political Science values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility and shares in the recognition explicit in the University and College RTP policies that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. The Department RTP policy should be interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

D. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive, inclusive, collegial environment benefiting the CSULB community. The Department RTP policy should be interpreted as valuing these actions.

II. Definitions

A. This is the Department of Political Science Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, referred to as the Department RTP Policy, establishing criteria, standards and procedures for appointment and for performance reviews for reappointment, tenure and promotion as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

B. “College” refers to the College of Liberal Arts.

C. RTP means Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion.

D. “Department” refers to the Department of Political Science.

E. “Department Chairperson” refers to the Chair of Political Science.

F. “Research and scholarly activities” includes activities designated in Section V.B., Research and Scholarly and Creative Activities.

G. “Peer-reviewed” refers to a process leading to selection of experts in the discipline to evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of scholarly and creative activities. This process can be the selection by editors of anonymous referees to help decide on journal publications, and selection of anonymous referees by publishers to help decide whether to publish a book, or whether to include a chapter in an edited volume.

III. Interpretation and Standards

A. This Department RTP Policy amplifies and adds specificity to the University Policy on RTP, and in some cases, establishes additional standards. The University Policy on RTP shall be interpreted as setting minimum standards for the College.

B. In accordance with the above paragraph, this Department RTP Policy does not substitute for the University Policy on RTP but adds to it.

C. The Department RTP Policy further amplifies the College RTP Policy and the University Policy on RTP, while providing specificity and clarity regarding additional Departmental standards. The Department RTP Policy does not substitute for the College RTP Policy, nor substitutes for the University Policy on RTP.

IV. Responsibilities and Procedures

A. General Responsibilities

1. At all levels of review, those responsible for evaluating faculty and recommending actions shall provide a thoughtful and constructive assessment in the RTP evaluations and recommendations included in the RTP file. Each candidate shall be evaluated with clear and specific reference to RTP Policies and Procedures, and provided with acknowledgment of areas of superior performance, areas of deficiencies, and in reappointment cases, clear expectations for positive future personnel decisions.

Recommendations at each level of review, and the decision shall be supported by and include that level's written evaluation. Minority reports, if any, are allowed, and shall accompany the majority report.

2. Personnel evaluations, recommendations, and decisions shall be based solely on information in the candidate's RTP file. If the file is missing required documentation, and additional information is inserted at any level of review, it shall be made available to all prior levels of review, as provided in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, affording the opportunity for revising, amending, or substituting recommendations.

3. At every level of review, evaluation and recommendations shall be forwarded within the established deadlines. Should deadlines pass without evaluation and recommendation at any level, the RTP file shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review or the appropriate administrator.

B. Candidate

1. RTP File

The candidate shall assemble a RTP file that meets the requirements of RTP Policies and Procedures within the established deadlines. It is the candidate's responsibility to request Department assistance.

The candidate shall also provide the following for the RTP file:

- a. all items delineated in Section 1.2.1 of the College RTP Policy.
- b. a PDS showing the years when all higher degrees were granted, the year of appointment (starting semester) to a tenure-track position at CSULB, years of credit from CSULB or other

institutions prior to tenure-track appointment at CSULB, effective date of tenure at CSULB, if any, and effective date of promotion at CSULB, if any. The PDS may be accompanied by a curriculum vitae.

c. a Department Academic Advisor Evaluation Form for faculty who receive unit compensation for advising activities.

2. Candidate Responses and Rebuttals

As stipulated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the candidate shall have ten calendar days to respond to and/or rebut a review at any level.

3. Candidate Withdrawal

In cases of early decisions and in cases not involving reappointment or tenure, candidates wishing to withdraw from the RTP process should refer to University RTP Policy 7.1.

C. Department

1. Department Chairperson

In conformity with section 3.5 of the College RTP Policy,

a. the Department Chairperson shall provide all faculty, and newly hired faculty upon appointment, copies of RTP Policies.

b. at least once a year the Department Chairperson shall meet with each probationary faculty member and candidate for tenure or promotion to provide mentoring, discuss performance, and discuss presentation of the RTP file.

3. Department RTP Committee

a. Committee and Subcommittee Membership

(i) The Department's RTP Committee is made up of only tenured faculty members who have been elected in a department vote.

(ii) Members of the Department RTP Committee who participate in promotion decisions must have higher rank than the candidate.

(iii) In a given year, all recommendations for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to a given rank shall be considered by the same Department RTP Committee or subcommittee.

(iv) Members of Department RTP Committees shall normally be from that Department, unless the Department has insufficient numbers of faculty to meet the requirements of the above paragraphs. If insufficient numbers of eligible faculty are elected, the tenured and probationary Department faculty shall elect additional members from related disciplines. When considering RTP decisions for joint appointments, the Department RTP Committee shall follow the current Academic Senate policy on joint appointments.

b. Department RTP Committee Procedures

(i) In accordance with Section 3.2 of the University Policy on RTP, each Department shall submit a Department RTP Policy to the College Faculty Council, the College Dean, and the Provost for approval.

(ii) As provided for in Section 2.1.1.2 of the CLA RTP Policy and Section V.A.2.b of the Department RTP policy, classroom visitation is optional, but may be part of an instructional improvement plan agreed upon by the candidate and the chair. If performed, the evaluation must adhere to the CBA, including compliance with the requirement that notice be given at least five (5) days before a classroom visit. If performed, the Department RTP Committee shall select two members for classroom visits. Each candidate shall have two visits, one from each of the randomly selected members of the Department RTP Committee. Written reports of classroom visits from the two Department RTP Committee members shall be placed in the candidate's file during the Open Period.

(iii) External review procedures will be conducted in accordance with AS Policy 10-10 External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

V. Evaluation Criteria

A. Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

The Department adheres to Section 2.1 of the College RTP policy, with the following additions:

1. In addition to the items (a-d) listed in Section 2.1.3.3 of the College RTP Policy, the Candidate shall address: (e) cases in which student evaluations differ substantially from the candidate's typical evaluations by referencing their efforts to engage in "continuous professional learning" (2.1.3.1), "reflection on and adaptation of instruction" (2.1.3.2), and "fostering student learning and the achievement of course goals" (2.1.3.3).

2. While recognizing that student evaluations represent only one measure of teaching effectiveness, the department expects that, taken as a whole, student course evaluation summaries will reflect favorably on the effectiveness of the candidate's instructional practices and overall teaching ability. Evaluations that fail to do so may be a cause for concern, and, if repeated across multiple courses and or/semesters, may be potentially harmful to the candidate's success in the RTP process if the candidate does not demonstrate that they have made successful efforts to engage in "continuous professional learning" (CLA 2.1.3.1), "reflection on and adaptation of instruction" (CLA 2.1.3.2), and "fostering student learning and the achievement of course goals" (CLA 2.1.3.3). These efforts should be addressed and accounted for in the candidate's narrative.

3. In regard to Section 2.1.3.3 of the College RTP policy, the department recognizes that student evaluations may be affected by many different factors, and so the Department RTP Committee shall carefully examine the entire record of student evaluations included in the file. In addition, if warranted by evidence in the file, the Department RTP Committee will weigh any unique or unusual circumstances that might affect a given candidate's record, including but not limited to the following:

- a. Discrepancies between written comments and numerical markings on student evaluation forms
- b. Anomalies or variations among student evaluations
- c. Other forms of instructional assessment employed by the candidate
- d. Pedagogical approaches

5. At the candidate's discretion, the following may be included under either "Service" or "Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:" oversight of student theses, comprehensive examinations, and independent studies; and organization of pedagogical or curricular workshops.

B. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The Department adheres to Section 2.2 of the College RTP policy, with the following additions: Candidates are expected to maintain a continuing program of scholarship or creative activity that demonstrates, by favorable review of peers, intellectual and professional growth. For candidates

for tenure and/or promotion, this generally is accomplished through meeting the following standards (1, 2, and 3), or justified equivalencies, during the period subject to RTP review:

1. A publication record that includes *one* of the following (a, b, c, or d):

(a) authorship of three peer-reviewed articles in academic journals and/or peer-reviewed chapters in edited books published by academic or other quality presses.

(b) authorship of a monograph published by an academic or other quality press.

(c) authorship of a stand-alone academic textbook and at least two peer-reviewed journal articles or peer-reviewed chapters in edited volumes published by academic or other quality presses.

(d) editorship of an academic collection of essays, and at least two peer-reviewed journal articles or peer-reviewed chapters in edited volumes published by academic or other quality presses.

The Department recognizes that scholarly contributions take many forms, encompassing a variety of academic tracks pursued by individual faculty members. These include: (i) **discovery-focused scholarship**, which involves creating new knowledge through rigorous research or critical thinking to advance understanding in a given field; (ii) **integration scholarship**, which critically evaluates, synthesizes, and analyzes knowledge from multiple sources, disciplines, or perspectives, fostering innovative connections and insights; (iii) **application and practice scholarship**, which addresses pressing individual, institutional, or societal challenges by translating research into practical solutions; (iv) **engagement scholarship**, which emphasizes collaborative partnerships with communities to co-create knowledge and promote mutual learning; and (v) **teaching and learning scholarship**, which focuses on developing, refining, and disseminating effective pedagogical practices to enhance educational outcomes.

While the department encourages alternative scholarships, including integration scholarship, application and practice scholarship, engagement scholarship, as well as teaching and learning scholarship, works emanating from tracks other than discovery-focused scholarship are not necessary nor sufficient to earn tenure or promotion. Alternative forms of scholarship may be considered as substitutes for discovery-focused scholarship (a, b, c, and d from the list above) only when they meet the same standards of quality and undergo similarly rigorous peer review processes. Candidates should provide a letter from their collaborators detailing the internal peer review process and clarifying whether the work was subjected to external peer review.

In all of the above scenarios (a, b, c, or d):

Regarding the status of the publications, “in press,” “forthcoming,” and “accepted” are counted as effective publications.

In all of the above scenarios (a, b, c, or d), scholarly work must undergo peer review through a single- or double-blind process conducted by qualified experts in the discipline. This differs from

editor reviews, which primarily rely on editorial oversight rather than an evaluation by independent disciplinary peers. Even though this peer review definition is narrower than the definition of peer review found in the College RTP Policy, the Department of Political Science believes it is appropriate due to the wide array of journals, presses, and other outlets that publish political science research, which may not be the case in other disciplines.

With regard to co-authored work, candidates shall clarify in their narrative the nature and extent of their contribution to the project. They must elaborate upon the work undertaken separately from their co-author, documenting this work whenever possible. They must also elaborate upon the nature of the work undertaken jointly, explaining in simplest terms the division of labor that characterized the co-authorship. Such elaborations must cover every step in the jointly-assumed project, from conception of the project to its publication. While the Department of Political Science in no way disparages co-authored work, it also expects at least one significant single-authored publication for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Full Professor. Should co-authored projects constitute the sole form of scholarly activity during any phase of the RTP process, candidates must demonstrate that this is the norm within their field of research, and must explain why their work should be viewed as comparable to significant single-authored work.

It is the responsibility of the Candidate to provide the RTP Committee with a narrative or measure of the quality of publication venues (including, where available, acceptance rates, standing in the discipline, and an explanation as to why certain publication venues have been chosen if this does not appear obvious). It is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee to evaluate the quality of the journal and academic or other presses.

2. a minimum of three presentations of research findings at meetings or conventions of professional political science and related organizations;

3. engagement in two or more of the following activities: participation in academic seminars and institutes; securing externally-funded research grants and fellowships; service in editorial positions; review of personnel cases and academic programs at other universities; service as referee for academic publications, grants, or fellowships; publication of reviewed software or electronic documents; publication of book reviews and/or invited review essays in academic journals; serving as a discussant of presented conference papers; publication of work in edited electronic or traditional media outlets; and consultation or review work of a clear and documentable academic nature.

C. Service

The department adheres to Section 2.3 of the College RTP policy, with the following elaboration:

In addition to the examples of service contributions listed under Sections [2.3.1](#) and [2.3.2](#) of the College RTP policy, the Department adds: student recruitment and reappointment activities; service to academic organizations, including organizing sessions at conferences, and serving on boards and committees; service in an advisory capacity and/or presentations to non-academic organizations; media interviews; and letters to the editor published in non-academic media outlets.

At the candidate's discretion, the following may be included under either "Service" or "Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:" oversight of student theses, comprehensive examinations, and independent studies; and organization of pedagogical or curricular workshops.

VI. Promotional Level Criteria

The Department adheres to Section 5.0 of the College RTP Policy, with the following additions:

A. In addition to Section 5.3 of the College RTP Policy, for Promotion to Associate Professor the Department requires:

1. fulfillment of the research, scholarly and creative activity expectations outlined in Section V.B. of the Department RTP Policy.

2. demonstrated high-quality instruction and instructionally-related activities as evaluated according to the criteria outlined in Section V.A. of the Department RTP Policy.

B. In addition to Section 5.4 of the College RTP Policy, for Promotion to Professor the Department requires:

1. fulfillment of the research, scholarly and creative activity expectations outlined in Section V.B. of the Department RTP Policy.

2. demonstrated high-quality instruction and instructionally-related activities as evaluated according to the criteria outlined in Section V.A. of the Department RTP Policy.

3. a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at the Department, College, and University levels; (b) a record of leadership at the College and/or University levels; and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession. This record may also include service contributions in areas outlined in Section V.C. of the Department RTP Policy.

348
349 **VII. Amendments**

350
351 ***A. Amendment Proposals***

- 352 1. Amendments may be proposed by the member/s of the Department.
353 2. The Chair shall call a meeting of the Faculty to discuss proposed amendments.
354

355 ***B. Ratification***

356 Amendments are ratified by a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured and probationary faculty
357 and approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.
358

359 ***VIII. Effective Date***

360
361 All amendments shall become effective the following academic year.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of Political Science

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

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Date:

March 28, 2025

Chris Karadjov

Chris Karadjov

9/18/2025

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Date

March 29, 2025

Daniel O'Connor

Daniel O'Connor

9/19/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Date:

August 27, 2025

9/19/2025

Patricia Perez

9/19/2025

Provost Signature:

Date:

[Signature]

09/19/25