

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
SCHOOL OF NURSING
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**

11-17-25

Portions of the University and College RTP Policies that are critical for emphasis and clarity are presented in italics in this document.

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. In service to the university's mission, the CHHS aims to convene and partner with the communities we serve to transform lives and advance health and human services. The mission of the CHHS is to cultivate a supportive and inclusive environment that promotes the success of diverse students, faculty, and staff through high impact student-centered learning, innovative research and scholarship, and service that improve the quality of life and holistic wellbeing of all the communities.

In accordance with the CSULB and CHHS mission statements, the School of Nursing strives to create nursing professionals that are prepared to meet evolving healthcare needs of all communities. This is done through the creation of a collaborative learning environment that empowers students to become nurse clinicians, scholars, and healthcare leaders to improve health and well-being. The School of Nursing cultivates a supportive and inclusive environment to promote the success of diverse students by providing highly valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities. The School of Nursing supports a faculty dedicated to providing excellence in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1.2.1 *A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service is essential to accomplishing the articulated mission and vision of the university, the college, and the School of Nursing.*

1.2.2 *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession as essential benchmarks to demonstrate the articulated mission of the School of Nursing, College and University. The School of Nursing RTP policy provides clear expectations of the teaching, scholarly activities/research, and service expected to demonstrate compliance with the dedication of excellence in their work. In concurrence with University and CHHS RTP policy, the School of Nursing RTP policy provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing for flexibility to*

recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty within the context of nursing as a discipline.

1.2.3 *RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels.* Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. Faculty 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 academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.*

1.2.4 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 based on all three areas.

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

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

1.2.7 The criteria in this policy are intended to embody the following values of the department, college, and university.

1.2.8 Alignment with University Values:

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

1.2.9 Alignment with CHHS Values:

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.

1.2.10 SON Values:

The School of Nursing Values are aligned with the CHHS Core Values. The candidate should discuss how their teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service align with these ideas.

- Excellence: the quality of being outstanding or extremely good
- Caring: displaying kindness and concern for others
- Integrity: the quality of being honest and having strong moral principles
- Innovation: original and creative thinking
- Respect: showing regard for their abilities and worth

Additionally, the School of Nursing is guided by the Nursing Ethical Code.

Nursing Ethical Code

The Code of Ethics for Nurses¹ serves as the “nonnegotiable moral standard of nursing practice for all settings” and informs all aspects of nursing practice and education in the School of Nursing. A core provision of the Code includes respecting “the inherent dignity, worth, unique attributes, and human rights of all individuals”. As a self-reflective discipline, nursing must address the history of racism in nursing and “recognize racism, not race, as the central force at the core of health disparity, inequity, and injustice”. All nurses, including nursing faculty, are called to engage in the personal and organizational reflective and transformational work that seeks to mitigate harmful effects of racism in our communities.

¹ American Nurses Association, Code of Ethics for Nurses, 2025.

1.2.11 Governing Documents

The School of Nursing *adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of 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 or the University RTP Policy, or the CHHS RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.2.12 Specific Role of Department Policy

This School of Nursing Policy serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the policies and procedures set forth in these other governing documents specified in Section 1.4.1 in a manner that provides comprehensive and specific guidance to faculty in the School of Nursing within their discipline-specific framework.

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

1.3 Obligations

1.3.1 Obligations of the Candidate

All participants in the RTP process are expected to adhere to the policies set forth in the university, college, and academic unit RTP policies. To be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

It is the candidate's responsibility to initiate the Department RTP process by complying with all published time frames for the handling of documents to be reviewed and to provide a complete and appropriately documented RTP file. All accomplishments claimed in a candidate's RTP file must be supported with appropriate documentation. Candidates must, therefore, furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation according to university deadlines.

1.3.2 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the School of Nursing are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which the School of Nursing RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating evidence to determine its recommendations.

1.3.3 Department Standards

The Department RTP Committee (and Department Chair, if they submit an evaluation) shall *evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established 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 the department. 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.*

1.4 Profiles of Academic Ranks

RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by the University, the College of Health and Human Services, and the School of Nursing. The university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The School of Nursing policy

applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria.

1.5 Narrative

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. Candidates should reflect on impact of their work and reflection of department, college, university values in their teaching, RSCA, and service.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

RTP standards and criteria shall articulate 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 School of Nursing has developed discipline specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. These discipline specific standards are consistent with College and University level standards and RTP policies.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Consistent with the expectations of the University and College of Health and Human Services, School of Nursing faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. To be considered effective teachers, faculty must develop and implement quality teaching practices that are responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse student body and the University's educational mission. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally related activities include but are not limited to:

- a. Curriculum and course development;
- b. Academic and academic unit advising;
- c. Supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work;
- d. Supervision of students in clinical settings;
- e. Activities involving student learning and student engagement mentoring students;
- f. Taking students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.

Candidates must include a table of courses taught and any assigned time received as part of teaching assignment for each semester during the period under review. *Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:*

- *continuous professional learning,*
- *thoughtful and deliberate 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).*

The School of Nursing 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. The School of Nursing also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning

opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices; therefore, we support multiple modes of evidence to assess teaching effectiveness.

To facilitate evaluation of a candidate's instructional philosophy, practice, and teaching effectiveness, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall submit five types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: 1) student evaluations, 2) peer evaluations, 3) course syllabi, 4) samples of course materials, and 5) grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the SON RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using criteria specified in this policy. Additionally, candidates may (but are not required to) submit additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher.

2.1.1 Evidence of effective teaching can include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Maintaining subject mastery and currency in one's nursing specialty including teaching and education;
2. Facilitating a welcoming, respectful learning environment that values faculty and student contributions (e.g. inclusive language in syllabus, learning management site);
3. Incorporating scholarship into teaching;
4. Engaging with students in scholarship/research as appropriate (e.g. mentoring students in research or doctoral projects);
5. Demonstrating reflective teaching practices by:
 - a. incorporating teaching methods and strategies received through peer evaluation or professional development to enhance student learning;
 - b. Describing how personal teaching philosophy has changed/grown and/or how dept/college/university values are exemplified in approaches to teaching
6. Creating and/or revising courses and curricula in ways that foster a vibrant, intellectual community emphasizing a shared commitment to scholarly inquiry
7. Utilizing teaching expertise to foster an educational environment characterized by creative expression, critical thinking, clinical judgment, scholarly inquiry, and community engagement.
8. Collaborating with School of Nursing faculty team to revise course objectives, student learning outcomes, and assignments as needed to ensure alignment with current professional and accreditation standards.
9. Providing mentoring and advising of students that contribute positively to students' sense of belonging and professional development.
10. Demonstrating timeliness and professionalism in conducting classes and evaluating student work.
11. Demonstrating consistency and clarity in evaluating student work.

2.1.2 Continuous Professional Learning

Requirements for Ongoing Professional Development in Teaching

1. School of Nursing faculty are required to maintain certification, licensure, clinical and professional subject mastery in one's nursing specialty and demonstrate currency with disciplinary and specialty knowledge developments through discipline-specific activities, conferences, and continuing education.
2. School of Nursing faculty shall provide evidence of a continued and progressive record of participation in activities that contribute to professional learning and evidence of

application to teaching practices as demonstrated by involvement in the following professional development activities. If professional development workshops/courses are attended, documentation of attendance must be provided. Examples may include:

- a. Consultation, both formal and informal, with colleagues within and outside of discipline regarding best practices related to teaching (e.g. classroom visits, course development);
 - b. Sustained record of participation activities and teaching related programs offered by the University, College or professional organizations.
3. Faculty are strongly encouraged to mentor graduate students through active participation on committees that supervise DNP projects. (This expectation starts after reappointment and increases at the Associate and Full Professor ranks).

2.1.3 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation

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.

Within their narrative candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion should 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.

Indicators of need to change may include:

- a. Attendance at professional instruction workshop/conference
- b. Student feedback (incl. quantitative and qualitative data from student course evaluations)
- c. Peer evaluation
- d. Formal educational mentoring feedback
- e. Curricular/accreditation changes

Rather than only listing activities, candidates should provide a discussion in their narrative of the meaning and impact of the indicator on their teaching perspective and practice. If candidates have not made changes, they should include evidence of reflective practice and rationale of decision to not make change.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes, and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes. This could also include evidence generated from taking part in faculty development initiatives at the college or university level. CHHS values culturally responsive teaching and encourages faculty to undertake professional development to advance culturally relevant pedagogical strategies that focus on student-centered practices of setting high expectation, honoring different communication styles and practicing critical consciousness that values student agency and input.

2.1.4 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning

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. Within their narratives, candidates should discuss effective instructional strategies for student learning.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), assessments, syllabi, peer observations, a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, support letters, qualitative or quantitative student perception data, and other supporting documentation.

2.1.5 Student Learning Outcomes

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. *Instructional practices and course materials shall 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.* For example, candidates may include weekly SLOs, assignment rubric, curricular map/course blueprint, lesson plan, etc.

2.1.6 Syllabi

Course syllabi shall be included withing the candidate's RTP file to document alignment with Campus instructional policies. The candidate should include a narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to syllabi. Only one syllabus per course shall be submitted, not multiple copies of identical syllabi used in different sections of the same course or different semesters unless substantive changes were made.

2.1.7 Grade Distributions

Required Documentation: A table with the course GPAs compared to the department and college reflecting grade distribution of courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file. A narrative discussion should address the pattern of grades for courses. Candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.

2.1.8 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 College and Department RTP committees to evaluate student response to instruction, alongside other evidence. Candidates shall submit the quantitative student course evaluation summary sheet for all courses taught within the academic year during the period under review and provide explanation for mean teaching effectiveness scores falling below dept and/or college mean. Optional considerations for candidates to include qualitative student commentary and/or courses taught outside the academic year (i.e., winter, summer, and special sessions). If qualitative student comments are included – all comments for the given section must be included. Candidates are expected to demonstrate in their narrative (at all levels of review, reappointment, and promotion), deliberate efforts to reflect on teaching effectiveness and instructional techniques and initiate improvements as needed based on student course evaluations.

Student evaluations submitted by candidates provide evidence of the following trends:

- a. For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching must show evidence of either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of quality teaching.
- b. For tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, student evaluations of teaching submitted by candidates must show evidence of a sustained level of high quality teaching.
- c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, student evaluations submitted by candidates must evidence that the candidate has demonstrated a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.1.9 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations of the candidate's instruction are important sources of evidence that may 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. Evidence demonstrating peer evaluations could include (but are not limited to) formative feedback activities, peer evaluations of different types of courses and their modalities (e.g., face-to-face or online), and the completion of evaluation forms approved by the SON. Along with CHHS, the SON values growth mindset for faculty in terms of continuous quality improvement for teaching.

The School of Nursing provides faculty peer evaluation forms that are aligned with the CHHS values as well as being reflective of the type of course under evaluation. Evaluators are encouraged to use evaluative statements in their assessment of performance and activities. Required Documentation for peer evaluations are as follows:

- Candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion shall submit at least one (1) peer evaluation each year.
- For promotion to Full Professor, candidates shall submit one (1) peer evaluation at least every other year (minimum of two).

These evaluations, regardless of a candidate's rank or position in the RTP process (i.e. probationary or tenured) must be conducted by a variety of colleagues (at least half must be tenured). When possible, the evaluations must be in more than one course. It is the candidate's responsibility to request colleagues to conduct peer reviews of their teaching. The candidate shall discuss how they incorporated peer review feedback and recommendations into their course development.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

In accordance with University and CHHS policy, the School of Nursing recognizes that *faculty engage in a variety of valuable scholarly and creative activities*. The following guidelines are intended to provide guidance on requirements for RSCA as it relates to *scholarly contributions which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities*.

2.2.1 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.*

The SON values scholarship in each of these four areas as part of the evaluation of RSCA. Candidates are not limited to the example activities listed below:

Scholarship of Discovery

- Publications in peer reviewed journals
- Juried Presentations
- Book Chapters

Scholarship of Integration

- Literature Reviews
- Textbooks
- Meta-Analyses
- White Papers

Scholarship of Application/Engagement

- Technical Reports
- Program Evaluations
- Grant Proposals
- Mentorship of students in research activities (i.e., Honor students)
- Serving on DNP student project committees
- Clinical practice that adds to the body of knowledge or creates practice change
- Establishes practice guidelines or policy change in health care

Scholarship of Teaching & Learning

- Published Manuscripts on educational practice
- Professional Presentations
- Publishing a new instructional method
- Grant proposals supporting instructional activities

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.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) 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 are encouraged to 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.

2.2.2 Dissemination of RSCA

In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings.

Peer reviewed publication of scholarly and creative works are required of all candidates . The School of Nursing aims to provide specific publication requirements of the department, including the minimum requirement at each level of review. In addition, equivalencies that may count in lieu of scholarly publications given disciplinary standards are provided.

Reappointment

- Minimum of 1 publication (peer reviewed article or new/significantly revised book chapter)
- and:
 - One peer-reviewed podium presentation or,
 - An additional manuscript under review with a peer-reviewed journal

Associate Professor

- Minimum of 3 peer reviewed scholarly works produced for dissemination, defined as:
 - 3 peer reviewed publications or,
 - 2 peer reviewed publications with an equivalency:
 - One peer-reviewed podium presentation at a national conference;
 - External grant submission as the primary PI (submitted, funded or unfunded);
 - Implementation of evidenced based practice guideline or initiative;
 - If an equivalency is used, no more than 1 equivalency shall count in lieu of a publication.

Full Professor

- Minimum of 4 additional peer-reviewed scholarly works beyond the Associate Professor level, defined as:
 - 4 peer-reviewed publications, or
 - 3 peer-reviewed publications plus 1 equivalency such as:

- One peer-reviewed podium presentation at a national or international conference.
 - External grant submission as primary PI (submitted, funded, or unfunded).
 - Implementation of an evidence-based practice initiative with measurable outcomes.
 - Development or significant revision of a book chapter or textbook.
 - Leadership in a funded research project or multi-site study.
- Note: Only 1 equivalency may be counted in lieu of a publication.

2.2.3 Reporting of Grant and RSCA Funding

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. For collaborative works, the candidate must articulate their contributions and how they are distinguished from the efforts of others on the research team.

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.

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.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles. Candidates should explain in the narrative the significance and impact of their service.

The School of Nursing will recognize not only quantity of service activity but also its quality and duration. Evaluation criteria will consider the value and impact of each candidate's service activities. The School of Nursing encourages service across the campus, community, and profession.

Campus service should be progressive and can include serving at the Department, the College, and the University levels. The faculty member typically engages differently depending upon rank:

- During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty are expected to perform quality service at the Department level. Faculty are not required to participate in College and University level service.
- For tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, faculty are required to make quality service contributions to the Department at a leadership level and participate at the Campus level.
- For promotion to Full Professor, faculty are required to demonstrate evidence of sustained quality service and leadership at the Department and campus level.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles.

2.3.1 Requirements for Retention

Candidates for **retention**, shall demonstrate:

1. Participating actively and collegially on a School of Nursing standing committee; AND
2. Attending and meaningfully participating in faculty meetings and professional development opportunities sponsored by the School of Nursing (e.g. volunteering for ad hoc subcommittees, participation in undergraduate or graduate interview process); OR
3. Actively participating in student programs (e.g., Commencement, Pinning & White Coat Celebrations, Hooding, CNSA events).

2.3.2 Requirements for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate a progression of involvement in shared governance and of service reflecting impact and influence within the campus, community, and/or profession. The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive:

1. Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university committees or initiatives:

- Department service should reflect increasing engagement beyond attendance at faculty meetings, such as:
 - a. Serving as chair of a SON standing or ad hoc committee;
 - b. Representing the SON at local, national, or international conferences (e.g. American Association of Colleges of Nursing [AACN], Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education [CCNE], California Association of Colleges of Nursing [CACN]);
 - c. Providing significant assistance with authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the SON (e.g. curriculum revision, course/program development, accreditation);
 - d. Initiating and leading creation of policy and revision to policies of the SON;

- e. Oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations.
2. College and University Level Service:
- Active participation and/or leadership in quality initiatives or committees such as:
 - a. Academic Senate
 - b. Presidential Commissions/Councils
 - c. Campus search committees (e.g. Dean, Associate Dean, AVP, Provost, President)
 - d. Other College or University committees and initiatives
3. Community Service:
- Advisory board membership; consulting with agencies or volunteering in areas relevant to academic/professional expertise
 - Organizing or leading on- or off-campus programs or workshops;
 - Actively participating in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations and/or agencies related to one's professional expertise;
 - Acting as a resource person or consultant for educational, government, business, industry, or community organizations.
4. Service to the Profession:
- Advancing one's academic profession through active participation in appropriate professional, community, and scholarly organizations. Examples of this type of service include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. External grant reviewer or peer-reviewer for scholarly publications;
 - b. Leadership role in professional organizations active participation as members;
 - c. Mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline;
 - d. Providing workshops, speeches, performances, displays, and/or media interviews;
 - e. Authoring non-scholarly documents (e.g., reports and policies) relevant to a professional organization

2.3.3 Requirements for Promotion to Full Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor shall demonstrate:

- Consistent service and leadership at the Department, College, and/or University levels, such as:
 - a. Serving as a major Department administrator (i.e., Chair/Director or Associate or Assistant Chair/Director);
 - b. Chairing major Department committees or programs;
 - c. Holding elected or appointed leadership positions on College and/or University committees, organizations, or task forces;
 - d. Authoring policy documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or Department;
 - e. Developing or significantly revising Department curricula and programs.
- They shall also have made service contributions to at least *one* of the following:
 - a. A record of involvement in professional organizations (e.g. serving on committees; leading workshops; giving speeches or presentations; serving as a professional expert consultant, writing relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or holding leadership positions).
 - b. A record of meaningful service in the community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international problems), such as:

- Serving in a leadership role in on- or off-campus programs or workshops;
- Holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to one's professional expertise
- Consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations; and
- Serving on governing boards and/or chairing meetings.

Candidates shall provide evidence from community and/or professional societies attesting to the candidate's participation and/or leadership roles in such organizations (e.g., letters, e-mails, minutes, reports, programs, etc.).

2.3.4 Evaluation of Service

The candidate must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions, expanding in detail on the impact of their service to the School, College and/or University, and to the community and/or profession. The evaluation of service shall be based on the quality and significance of the service activity. Relevant factors include, but are not limited to:

- a. The degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, College and/or School of Nursing, community, and/or community/profession;
- b. The depth and extent of the candidate's involvement and contribution to the service activity.
- c. The degree of the candidate's leadership in the service activity.

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.

Insofar as the University, CHHS, and the SON 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, the SON RTP committee will consider the role cultural and identity taxation plays in the service activities of faculty. These activities could 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. Candidates are encouraged to discuss and document in their materials any service activities they feel may have been disproportionately completed considering cultural and identity taxation.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide documentation of service roles, and the time commitment given within them. *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.

2.4 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to the rank of Professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. The five years is counted starting from the time the faculty submitted their file for promotion to Associate Professor. A tenured Associate Professor, however, may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.5. Standards for promotion to Full Professor for faculty shall be higher than those for Associate Professor. Candidates should describe how they have met all requirements related to each area of evaluation in the narrative with supporting evidence since achieving tenure.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in relevant Academic Senate policy documents.

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, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.0.1 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 utilize resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for

collecting and presenting 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 to the university, community, and/or profession. 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.

3.0.2 School of Nursing RTP Committee

The School of Nursing 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. The School of Nursing RTP committee members are responsible for evaluating the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.

The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. 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.

No single individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review. 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.

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.

3.0.3 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

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

3.0.4 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:

- a. 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.
- b. 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.

3.0.5 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.

3.1 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. 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.

Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a 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 department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The School of Nursing RTP Policy follows the timeline designated by the University Policy (see sections 4.0-4.3 of Policy Statement 23-24).

4.0.1 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

The School of Nursing RTP Policy follows 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:

5.0 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should 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.

5.0.1 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.*

5.0.2 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 in 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.***

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.

5.0.3 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The School of Nursing RTP Policy follows the steps in the RTP process designated by the University Policy (see sections 6.0-6.10 of Policy Statement 23-24).

5.0.4 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The School of Nursing RTP Policy follows the additional processes designated by the University Policy (see sections 7.0-7.6 of Policy Statement 23-24).

5.0.5 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

The School of Nursing RTP Policy follows the changes and amendments procedures designated by the University Policy (see sections 8.0 of Policy Statement 23-24).

Effective: Fall 2026 (8/17/26)



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2026**

Department of Nursing

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

11/20/2025

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Nathan Gerard

Nathan Gerard

Date:

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

11/20/2025

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Grace Reynolds, D.P.A.

Grace Reynolds, D.P.A.

Date

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

11/21/2025

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Patricia Perez

Patricia Perez

Date:

Provost Signature:

[Signature]

Date:

11/21/25