

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF CHICANO AND LATINO STUDIES**

**REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY**

***EFFECTIVE FALL 2025***

1 This policy states the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies' expectations for candidates seeking  
2 reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The department recognizes that faculty must be evaluated in  
3 accordance with principles and requirements detailed in the University and College of Liberal Arts  
4 Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion policies. We will be guided by those principles and  
5 requirements and augment with the following department-specific provisions and expectations for  
6 faculty success. CHLS policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) defers to the College of  
7 Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP policy with the following additional specifications.  
8

**1.0 DEPARTMENT PURPOSE, GOALS, AND EXPECTATIONS**

10 **1.1** The Department's purpose is to improve the well-being of Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x communities  
11 and prepare students to lead efforts that contribute to a more racially and socially just society for all.  
12

13 **1.1.1.** The Department fulfills its purpose by pursuing the three fundamental goals:  
14

15 a. Generating knowledge that advances racial and social justice in the United States and Latin  
16 America, by  
17

- 18 i. investigating Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x experiences within the context of the United  
19 States and Latin American histories, societies, and cultures;
- 20 ii. producing works that create visibility, construct inclusive imaginaries, challenge  
21 categories, and demonstrate 'being' in community; and
- 22 iii. examining issues of ethnicity, 'race,' gender, class, and sexuality in Chicana/o/x and  
23 Latina/o/x lived experiences in the United States and Latin American societies to foster  
24 validation.

25 b. Fostering student well-being and success through teaching that increases knowledge, instills  
26 values, and cultivates skills in reading, speaking, writing, technology, and critical thinking  
27 required to effectuate social change in multicultural settings and contemporary national and  
28 global economies; and

29 c. Engaging diverse Chicana/o/x, Latina/o/x, and other marginalized communities modeling  
30 collaborative service and high-impact practices with a mind towards the wellness of community,  
31 campus, department, and self.

32 **1.1.2** To achieve these goals, the Department expects its faculty to become teachers-public scholars.  
33 Teachers-public scholars effectively balance teaching, research, service, and community engagement,  
34 but also recognize that quality instruction is their priority.  
35

**36 1.2 File Requirements**

37 **1.2.1** CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 1.2.1 through 1.2.2.  
38

41

### 42 **1.3 Values**

43

44 The criteria according to which decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are  
45 made are among the clearest expressions of the Department's values. The criteria in this policy are  
46 consistent with the values articulated by the College of Liberal Arts and the University. CHLS policy  
47 defers to CLA RTP policy 1.3 through 1.3.5, with the following additional specifications.

48

49 The Department values a spectrum of RSCA activities (Discovery, Engagement and Application,  
50 Integration, Teaching and Learning) and encourages faculty to use their RSCA to advance the public  
51 good.

52

## 53 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

54

55 The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The College of Liberal  
56 Arts requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines for each area of  
57 evaluation below.

58

### 59 **2.1 Instructional Activities**

60

61 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.

62

#### 63 **2.1.1 Instructional Activities File**

64

##### 65 **2.1.1.1 Required Materials**

66

67 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.1.1.

68

##### 69 **2.1.1.2 Optional Materials**

70

71 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.1.2, with the following additional  
72 specifications.

73

74 Peer observation of instruction is not optional. A teaching observation is mandatory in CHLS RTP Policy  
75 and will be referenced as Peer Observation of Learning (POL).

76

#### 77 **2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

78

79 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.2, with the following additional specification.

80

81 Because faculty teach many general education and elective courses, candidates are encouraged to describe  
82 how those courses introduce students to Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x Studies and to differentiate those  
83 courses from advanced courses for the major.

84

#### 85 **2.1.3 Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching**

86

87 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.

88

89 **2.1.3.1 Continuous Professional Learning**

90  
91 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.1.  
92

93 **2.1.3.2 Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction**

94  
95 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.2.  
96

97 **2.1.3.3 Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals**

98  
99 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.1.3.3, with the following additional specifications.  
100

101 Peer observations of learning (POL) must be included at least three times during the tenure process.

- 102 1. The first POL shall be conducted at the time of the candidate's first Periodic Mini Evaluation.
- 103 2. The second POL shall be conducted at the time of the candidate's Reappointment file.
- 104 3. The Department RTP committee will still submit comments on the candidate's instruction
- 105 during other Periodic Mini Evaluations.
- 106 4. The third POL shall be conducted at the time of the candidate's Tenure file, or Early Tenure
- 107 file if the candidate pursues Early Tenure.

108  
109 Because the Department believes strongly in the importance of teaching to students' success as reflected  
110 in the Department's purpose, these POLs will provide a rating of superior, high quality, and needs  
111 improvement for each of the items in the following rubric.

112 1. Course Document(s) Review

- 113 a. Alignment of Syllabus to SCO
- 114 b. Alignment of course goals and student learning outcomes
- 115 c. Appropriate assessments
- 116 d. Variety and appropriateness of teaching methodologies

117 2. Classroom Observations

- 118 a. Clarity of objectives for classroom session (per classroom observation and/or candidate  
119 / observer meeting(s))
- 120 b. Communication with Students
- 121 c. Effectiveness of teaching methodology (e.g. student interaction; checking for  
122 understanding)
- 123 d. Effective use of classroom time
- 124 e. Appropriateness of classroom content

125  
126 The Department RTP Committee shall designate at least two members to conduct the POL on behalf of  
127 the committee.

- 128 1. Although the preference is for both designated members to conduct the POL, the POL can be  
129 conducted by one person when faced with capacity issues (e.g., conflicting class schedules,  
130 time constraints, etc.).
- 131 2. If the POL is conducted by only one person, the Department shall note it was due to capacity  
132 issues.

133  
134 **2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

135  
136 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2, with the following additional specification.

137

138 For the Department, the quality of a faculty member's RSCA is the most important criterion for  
139 evaluating scholarly accomplishments. Quality refers to the degree to which a RSCA contributes to the  
140 discipline, community base of knowledge, and/or social impact and use. Contributions in these areas  
141 will further enhance achievement of the Department's purpose and goals. This is judged by evaluating a  
142 candidate's commitment and achievements to RSCA that advance the state of theoretical and/or applied  
143 knowledge in their field(s) and/or the social impact of their work (e.g., scholarship of engagement).

144

145 As the discipline of Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x Studies is an interdisciplinary field, "discipline" is  
146 defined as the candidates' field of expertise and methodologies that are applied within Chicana/o/x and  
147 Latina/o/x Studies' theoretical and/or applied contexts.

148

149 Candidates are responsible for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments  
150 use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. This section outlines the criteria for the evaluation of RSCA  
151 in the college and candidate's responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

152

## 153 **2.2.1 RSCA File**

154

### 155 **2.2.1.1 Required Materials**

156

157 Candidate's files **must** include:

158 a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.

159 b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative activities for the review period  
160 only. RSCA claimed in prior actions cannot be included. Examples of published peer-reviewed  
161 research include but are not limited to books, articles, films, art, photos and video of creative practice  
162 and projects, and other media, policy or program development, legislation, new statewide  
163 curriculum, patent applications, training videos, and digital creations or tools. Such materials shall  
164 be included in the file with links for digital products made included in the PDS or made available  
165 in the appropriate format.

166

167 Furthermore, candidates have the option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per  
168 The following guidelines:

169 1. Candidates submitting materials for RTP have the option to include accepted, in press, or  
170 forthcoming RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it beneficial for future  
171 actions, they may withhold such materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates  
172 decide to withhold these materials, such items must be listed under Works in Progress on the  
173 PDS.

174 2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only include publications and all in  
175 press, forthcoming, or accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a prior  
176 successful action.

177 c. For candidates who author externally funded RSCA grants and choose to highlight those as an  
178 achievement in the narrative, the file must include: (1) summary or description of funded project;  
179 (2) length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award; (5) brief description of  
180 candidate's role in authorship and implementation.

181 d. Proof of publication status as defined in Section 2.2.5 for all in press, forthcoming, and accepted  
182 RSCA submitted with the RTP file.

183 e. Proof of peer review as defined in Section 2.2.3.

184

185 **2.2.1.2 Optional Materials**

186

187 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.1.2.

188

189 **2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials**

190

191 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.1.3.

192

193 **2.2.2 RSCA Narrative**

194

195 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.2.

196

197 **2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition**

198

199 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.3.

200

201 **2.2.3.1 Definition**

202

203 Peer review may be defined as 1. a process by which qualified experts in the discipline evaluate the merit, 204 importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities; 2. a mutually constructive 205 process established in the reciprocal relationship between a researcher and the communities with 206 which they are engaged (e.g., organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry).

207

208 The candidate is responsible for documenting the peer review process.

209

210 Forms of peer review may include but are not limited to:

211 a. The process of selection of work for dissemination within academic publishing venues. This form of 212 peer review is appropriate for the scholarship of discovery. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, 213 for instance, journal impact factors, journal acceptance rates, citation indices, or research 214 productivity indices.

215 b. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the publishing venues of non-academic 216 sectors. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of 217 integration, teaching and learning, and application and practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated 218 by, for instance, editor or curator letters of acceptance, breadth of distribution or audience reception, 219 and/or acceptance rates.

220 c. Documentation of the quantity, strength, and impact of work on stakeholders (e.g., enactment of 221 related legislation, adoption of innovations, and/or widespread changes in professional practice, 222 etc.). This form of peer review would be appropriate for the scholarship of engagement, integration, 223 application and practice, and teaching and learning. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for 224 instance, internal reviews, adoption of product by external groups, or community reports.

225 d. The process of evaluation of external RSCA grant proposals by granting agencies or organizations. 226 This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery, 227 engagement, teaching and learning, integration, and application and creative practice. Evidence of 228 quality can be indicated by, for instance, internal reviews, competitiveness of the grant process, or 229 organizational reports.

230 e. A process leading to creative performances, exhibitions of work, or academic presentations in public 231 venues in which peers independently evaluated the work. This form of peer review would be 232 appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery, engagement, teaching and learning,

233 integration, and application and creative practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for  
234 instance, editor, organizer, or curator letters of individual invitation and/or acceptance, the prestige  
235 of the venue, published reviews, breadth of distribution or audience reception, or acceptance rates.

236 f. Testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adoptions from peers, professionals, community  
237 stakeholders, etc. that affirm the quality of the work; such materials would be from the period of  
238 review and may be distinct from those submitted during the open period. This form of peer review  
239 would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of engagement, teaching and learning,  
240 integration, and application and practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance, the  
241 extent to which others or the field have been influenced by the RSCA (e.g. changes in perspective in  
242 the field, widespread sharing of RSCA materials, positive end-user assessment, subsequent offers of  
243 consulting work, citation of adoption of RSCA work by a community, generation of gifts to endow a  
244 program, affirmation of improved economic, social or environmental conditions of a community,  
245 region, agency, industry or other sector).

246 g. Awards, honors, or other public recognition of the work by peers, professionals, community  
247 stakeholders, etc. This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of  
248 discovery, engagement, teaching and learning, integration, and application and practice. Evidence of  
249 quality can be indicated by, for instance, organizational sponsors or letters of award.

### 251 **2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement**

252 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.3.2.

### 255 **2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status**

256 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.4.

### 259 **2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status**

260 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.5.

### 263 **2.2.6 Number and Type of Publications**

264 The expectation for the number and type of publications for promotion and tenure includes one (a, b, or  
265 c) or a combination (a, b, and c) of the following (or their Justified equivalencies):

266 a. Target of 3-4 peer-reviewed products. These include peer-reviewed products such as journal articles  
267 and competitive major external grants received; peer-reviewed creative works; and other peer-  
268 reviewed publication types such as critical literature reviews that establish the state of knowledge in  
269 a field, historiographical essays, or publications in edited volumes or anthologies, and products from  
270 scholarship of engagement.

271 b. Target of 2-3 edited or co-edited books from a peer-reviewed press and/or edited or co-edited  
272 special-issue from peer-reviewed journals. If edited or co-edited, the candidate must document  
273 significant authorship or contribution to the publication.

274 c. A target of a 1 single-authored book or 1 co-authored book from a peer-edited press. If co-authored,  
275 the candidate must document significant authorship or contribution to the publication.

### 278 **2.2.7 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

280 **2.2.7.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

281

282 Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such proof must be provided in  
283 English. Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to the following, any of which forms of proof  
284 are equally valid

285 a. A statement of the venue's editorial policy.

286 b. Copies of reader reports. Candidates who submit these for evidence of peer review should be aware  
287 that any materials submitted in RTP files can be used by evaluators to assess their work in any  
288 capacity. Candidates who are concerned that critiques in their readers' reports may reflect negatively  
289 on their overall RSCA are encouraged to submit alternate proof of peer review, such as Section 2.2.7.1  
290 a, c or d.

291 c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.

292 d. Letters, testimonials, evaluations, public recognition from community stakeholders or participatory  
293 agencies, media outlets, communications between the community and researcher, and other similar  
294 evidence of peer review.

295

296 **2.2.7.2 Ethical Concerns**

297

298 Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative. Ethical concerns include but are not  
299 limited to conflicts of interest, monetary payment to secure publication, and duplicate publication. In  
300 accordance with CLA RTP Policy Section 2.2.6.2, CHLS emphasizes the following:

301 a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include but are not limited to having collaborated on  
302 the RSCA works being evaluated.

303 b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author is required to make a  
304 monetary contribution in order to secure publication (e.g., for-profit presses and predatory  
305 presses) shall be considered a priori an ethical concern, regardless of selection process. This does not  
306 include venues that require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for  
307 publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images, open access, or subvention).

308 c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in their narratives. Examples include  
309 but are not limited to the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprints  
310 must be labeled as such.

311

312 **2.3 Service**

313

314 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.

315

316 **2.3.1 Service File**

317

318 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.1, with the following additional specification.

319

320 Examples of work associated with cultural and identity taxation include, but are not limited to advising  
321 student organizations, serving on campus committees, serving on thesis or comprehensive exam  
322 committees, advocating for or counseling marginalized and/or minoritized students (e.g., students of  
323 color, queer students, students with disabilities, etc.), defending scholarship on marginalized and/or  
324 minoritized communities, meeting with marginalized and/or minoritized students, commenting on drafts  
325 of papers, writing letters of recommendation, sharing career and academic opportunities, giving public  
326 lectures on diversity, and mentoring junior colleagues.

327

328 **2.3.2 Service Expectations**

329

330 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.2.

331

332 **2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank**

333

334 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.2.1.

335

336 **2.3.3 Evaluation of Service**

337

338 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 2.3.3.

339

340 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

341

342 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process and  
343 emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.

344

345 **3.1 Candidate**

346

347 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.1 through 3.1.3.

348

349 **3.2 Joint Appointments**

350

351 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.2.

352

353 **3.3 Department RTP Policy**

354

355 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.3.

356

357 **3.4 Department RTP Committee**

358

359 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.4 through 3.4.2 and 3.4.4 through 3.4.5, with the  
360 following additional specification regarding 3.4.3.

361

362 RTP committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a higher rank/classification than the  
363 candidate.

364

365 **3.5 Mentoring**

366

367 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.5.

368

369 **3.6 Department Chair Evaluations**

370

371 CHLS policy defers to the CLA RTP Policy Section 3.6.

372

373 **4.0 APPROVAL AND AMENDMENTS TO THE CHLS RTP POLICY**

374

375 **Approval**

376

377 This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty  
378 members in the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies and approval by the Faculty Council, the  
379 Dean, and the Provost.

380

381 **Amendments**

382

383 Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by at least three tenured and  
384 probationary Department faculty. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Chair of the Department  
385 shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the tenured and probationary faculty members and  
386 place the proposed amendments on the agenda of the next scheduled Department meeting. Once  
387 agendized and discussed in a Department meeting, the proposed amendment (as proposed or amended)  
388 will be voted on within 30 days of a regular or special Department meeting.

389

390 **Voting on Amendments**

391

392 Voting on amendments shall be prior to the close of the preceding academic year of adoption.

393

394 **Majority Needed to Adopt**

395

396 To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured  
397 and probationary faculty members and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.

398

399 **Voting Rights**

400

401 All tenured and probationary Department faculty members – including those on leave, sabbatical, and  
402 FERP—are eligible to vote.

Adopted by the Faculty of the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies on February 17, 2025.

Ratified by CLA Faculty Council on [ADD].

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ (Dean, CLA) \_\_\_\_\_ (Provost)

Effective: Fall 2025