California State University, Long Beach

# 2025-2026 Evaluation for Reappointment, Tenure, and/or Promotion

## College of Education Department RTP Committee’s Review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EMPLOYEE’S NAME** | \*\*Click to enter Employee Name |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DEPARTMENT** | \*\*Click to enter Department Name |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COMMITTEE MEMBERS** | \*\*Click to enter all Committee Member Names |

|  |
| --- |
| **THE EMPLOYEE UNDER REVIEW IS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE FOLLOWING ACTION(S):** |
| **Check All That Apply:**  **Reappointment  Tenure  Early Tenure**  **Promotion  Early Promotion**  **Select Promotion Rank if Applicable:**  **Associate Professor  Professor** |

**The employee will be evaluated by the DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE in the following three areas:**

|  |
| --- |
| INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY-RELATED ACTIVITIES The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s instruction and instructionally-related activities during the period under review. Committee members shall consider all material submitted in the RTP file including the narrative, PDS, and supplementary file(s).  Committee members shall reference the [University](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/content_faculty-resources-support_ps09-10_2016-10-24.pdf) and [College of Education](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/ced_2018_rtp_policy.pdf) RTP policies available on the [Faculty Affairs website](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp-policies) for specific expectations to ensure alignment with the policies. Committee members shall reference College of Education RTP policy section 6.0 Reappointment and Promotion Level Criteria, beginning on page 15, when evaluating the minimum expectations for the candidate’s level of review. |
| **A. Instructional Philosophy and Practice**  Provide a holistic evaluation of the following:   * The candidate’s instructional philosophy and its alignment with their discipline and the needs of their students. * How the candidate’s philosophy translates into effective, high-quality teaching. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **B. Student Learning Outcomes**  Provide a holistic evaluationof the following:   * Effectiveness of differentiated instructional practices and course materials in supporting student learning outcomes. * Use of appropriate assessment methods. * Evidence of student learning. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **C. Student Response to Instruction**  Provide a holistic evaluationof the following:   * The candidate’s reflection on students’ responses to their instruction, including Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) data and additional sources of information provided in the supplementary materials. * Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness.   **Due to COVID-19, Spring 2020 SPOT summaries are not required for submission. Spring 2020 SPOT summaries may not be considered in an evaluation unless a candidate explicitly chooses to include the SPOT summaries in their materials.** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **D. Instructionally-related Activities**  Evaluate the candidate’s instructionally-related activities including teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom that fulfill the College of Education’s vision and mission. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **E. Overall Evaluation of Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities**  Highlight the candidate’s key accomplishments for this section and any recommendations or suggestions. Select one evaluation below.  **Exceeded Expectations**  **Met Expectations**  **Did Not Meet Expectations** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |
| --- |
| RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA) The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA) during the period of review. Committee members shall consider all material submitted in the RTP file including the narrative, PDS, and supplementary file.  Committee members shall reference the [University](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/content_faculty-resources-support_ps09-10_2016-10-24.pdf) and [College of Education](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/ced_2018_rtp_policy.pdf) RTP policies available on the [Faculty Affairs website](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp-policies) for specific expectations to ensure alignment with the policies. Committee members shall reference College of Education RTP policy section 6.0 Reappointment and Promotion Level Criteria, beginning on page 15, when evaluating the minimum expectations for the candidate’s level of review. |
| **A.** Assess the extent to which the candidate’s RSCA reflects quality contributions to the advancement, application, and/or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies, and the College of Education’s mission. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **B.** Evaluate the extent to which the candidate is participating in a variety of highly valued and valued scholarly and creative activities, including research that leads to peer-reviewed publications. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **C.** Evaluate the extent to which the candidate’s RSCA reflects intellectual and professional growth over time. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **D. Overall Evaluation of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities**  Highlight the candidate’s key accomplishments for this section and any recommendations or suggestions. Select one evaluation below.  **☐ Exceeded Expectations**  **☐ Met Expectations**  **☐ Did Not Meet Expectations** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |
| --- |
| SERVICE The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community (as appropriate based on rank per the CED RTP policy). Committee members shall consider all material submitted in the RTP file including the narrative, PDS, and supplementary file.  Committee members shall reference the [University](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/content_faculty-resources-support_ps09-10_2016-10-24.pdf) and [College of Education](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/ced_2018_rtp_policy.pdf) RTP policies available on the [Faculty Affairs website](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp-policies) for specific expectations to ensure alignment with the policies. Committee members shall reference College of Education RTP policy section 6.0 Reappointment and Promotion Level Criteria, beginning on page 15, when evaluating the minimum expectations for the candidate’s level of review. |
| **A.** Evaluate the quality and degree of the candidate’s service at the level(s) of service appropriate to the review level criteria (e.g., Assistant, Associate, Full Professor), which may include the following areas:   1. The department 2. The college 3. The university 4. The profession 5. The community |
| \*\*Click to enter text |
| **B. Overall Evaluation of Service**  Highlight the candidate’s key accomplishments for this section and any recommendations or suggestions. Select one evaluation below.  **☐ Exceeded Expectations**  **☐ Met Expectations**  **☐ Did Not Meet Expectations** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |
| --- |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS |
| The purpose of this section is to provide an overall evaluation of the candidate’s file. This statement should not summarize the candidate’s activities but should express the committee’s assessment of the candidate’s performance and achievements in relation to College and University criteria and expectations stated in the University and College of Education RTP policies for the level of review.  Highlight how well the candidate is progressing through the level of review (i.e., reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion) as appropriate.  Provide any recommendations that will help the candidate be successful for the next level of review (i.e., reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion) as appropriate.  **The committee must provide a specific recommendation below for each action under consideration (i.e., reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion).** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE VOTING SUMMARY** | **AFFIRMATIVE VOTES** | **NEGATIVE VOTES** | **MINORITY**  **REPORT** |
| **REAPPOINTMENT** | \*\*Enter vote | \*\*Enter vote | \*\*Select |
| **TENURE  EARLY** | \*\*Enter vote | \*\*Enter vote | \*\*Select |
| **PROMOTION  EARLY** | \*\*Enter vote | \*\*Enter vote | \*\*Select |

**I, Department RTP Committee Chair** \*\*Click to enter full name, **certify the members of the committee have collectively completed this review on** \*\*Click to select date.