

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

EFFECTIVE FALL 2025

1 California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) is a teaching-intensive, research-driven university
2 that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global
3 perspectives. The College of Liberal Arts Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy for
4 CSULB establishes the criteria by which the work of tenure-track and tenured faculty shall be evaluated
5 within this context. The college expects all tenure-track and tenured faculty to demonstrate a sustained,
6 high-quality record in: (1) instructional activities; (2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);
7 and (3) service contributions.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

13 **1.1.1** [The University RTP Policy](#) provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on
14 this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of
15 faculty members in the college.

17 **1.1.2** All departments in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) are required to have an RTP policy.
18 Throughout this document the term “department” should be construed to refer to departments and
19 recognized independent programs. Department RTP standards shall not be lower than college-level
20 standards. Departments may adopt the college policy as their own. In all cases, basic principles of shared
21 governance must be followed in the creation, adoption, and amendment of such policies.

23 **1.1.3** Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and department RTP
24 policies.

26 **1.1.4** The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed work for specified periods
27 of review.

29 **1.1.5** Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As such, all statements
30 made by candidates and all materials put forth for consideration in RTP matters must abide by the
31 highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or
32 misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this principle. Such issues shall be
33 referred to Faculty Affairs.

35 **1.1.6** Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner organized according to
36 the policy requirements and instructions.

38 **1.1.7** Candidates’ narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as detailed on the [Professional
39 Data Sheet \(PDS\)](#).

40
41 **1.1.8** The CLA RTP policy requires mentoring of candidates and candidates' participation in the
42 mentoring process. While mentoring provides ongoing evaluative feedback for candidates, the RTP
43 process constitutes the formal mechanism for evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty.
44

45 **1.1.9** Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on criteria and procedures
46 delineated in university, college, or department RTP policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on
47 unprofessional sources such as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., social media, web
48 sites, etc.), petitions and anonymous letters, nor shall the evaluation consider materials not included in
49 the official RTP file.
50

51 **1.1.10** As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other materials obtained during
52 open period are to be considered as part of the evaluation of a candidate.
53

54 **1.1.11** Conciseness and accuracy guide the RTP process at all levels. The CLA RTP Policy requires a
55 streamlined approach to candidates' files. Forms shall be fillable to ensure compliance with word limits.
56

57 **1.1.12** Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more areas of evaluation. Multi-
58 faceted activities may be broken into components and discussed where appropriate. Components
59 discussed or listed under one area of evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.
60

61 **1.2 File Requirements**

62

63 **1.2.1** All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:
64

65 A. [Professional Data Sheet](#) labeled according to university requirements and with the following CLA
66 specifications:
67

68 1. Instructional Activities:

69 a. By semester, list formal academic advising activities and associated duties, if applicable.
70 b. By semester, list activities for which units are assigned (e.g., assigned time or other), such as
71 involvement in student mentoring, supervision of student research, projects, and/or fieldwork, if
72 applicable.
73 c. By semester, include instructional activities outside of the classroom. Such activities include but are
74 not limited to: (1) supervision of student independent research projects; (2) supervision of student
75 research assistants; (3) chairing or serving on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees; and (4)
76 supervision of student teachers, if applicable.

77 2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA):

78 For all RSCA that does not appear under Works in Progress, candidate must:
79

80 a. Label according to CLA definitions for publication status and peer review (see 1.2.1E).
81 b. Place all previously claimed work under the double line.
82 c. List RSCA-related external grants.
83 d. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication listed with the following:
84 i. Description of publication venue (e.g., journal, media, volume, event, performance,
85

86 etc.) vis-à-vis the discipline and/or subfield;
87 ii. Rationale for publication venue choice;
88 iii. Explanation of candidate's contribution to co- and multi-authored RSCA.

89

90 **3. Service activities, including term of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.**

91

92 B. Narrative addressing the three areas of evaluation (instructional activities, RSCA, and service). This
93 three-part narrative shall be submitted via the Candidate Statement Form*, which allows up to 3,000
94 words.

95 C. Workload Assignment Form.*

96 D. Academic Advisor Report[†] (as appropriate).

97 E. All peer-reviewed publications for the period of review, including (for each):

98 1. Proof of peer review for peer-reviewed publications, including documentation provided by the
99 publisher or editor, or as appropriate to the discipline or form of RSCA.
100 2. Proof of publication status for all RSCA submitted with the RTP file including in press, forthcoming,
101 accepted, or under contract with a complete manuscript, as appropriate to the discipline or form of RSCA.

102 F. Student course evaluation summaries for each section of courses taught for which formal student
103 course evaluations were required during the period of review.

104 G. One representative syllabus for each course taught during the period of review.

105 H. Course materials providing evidence of teaching effectiveness, as described in Section 2.1.3.

106 I. All prior RTP reviews, periodic evaluations, and evidence of mentoring (i.e., mini-review
107 evaluations or other) over the full review period, including the candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.
108 For promotion to rank of Professor, all evaluations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and
109 as applicable any ETF evaluations, shall be included.

110 J. Index of all materials prepared by the candidate except the index of open-period materials, which
111 shall be prepared by the department RTP committee chair or designee.

112 * Denotes official form available from the College of Liberal Arts.

113 † Academic Advisor form available from the College of Liberal Arts and only required of faculty who receive unit
114 compensation for advising activities.

115 **1.2.2** With the exception of optional written student evaluations, as per Section 2.1.1.2.b, any materials in
116 excess of those enumerated in Section 1.2.1 A-J, will not be considered for review by the committees.

117 **1.3 Values**

118 The criteria according to which decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are

130 made are among the clearest expressions of the CLA's values. The criteria in this policy are
131 based on the following values:

132
133 **1.3.1.** College of Liberal Arts values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. All college and
134 department RTP policies should reflect these values. CLA recognizes that cultural and identity taxation
135 have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. Cultural and identity taxation
136 may be defined as the increased material and emotional labor undertaken to support diversity initiatives
137 that is expected of faculty based on their membership in a cultural or identity group due to the suggested
138 or unstated expectation that faculty from historically marginalized and/or minoritized groups (including,
139 but not limited to sexual orientation, gender, race, ethnicity, ability, etc.) should provide representation
140 on committees and/or showcase their knowledge of and commitment to the groups and communities to
141 which they belong. CLA and department RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that
142 minimize these inequities.

143
144 **1.3.2.** Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive, inclusive,
145 collegial environment benefiting the CLA and CSULB community. This policy should be interpreted as
146 valuing these activities. The college and department RTP policies should implement mechanisms to
147 recognize these contributions, and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these
148 activities.

149
150 **1.3.3.** CLA recognizes that faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways. This policy
151 and all department RTP policies should value diverse forms of RSCA and create mechanisms to
152 recognize and reward them.

153
154 **1.3.4.** Shared governance is vital to CLA's mission. Academic citizenship requires faculty, including
155 tenured faculty, to contribute to shared governance at more than one level. This policy and all
156 department RTP policies should acknowledge and reward service in shared governance.

157
158 **1.3.5.** Faculty must contribute to CLA's mission in all three areas: instruction, RSCA, and service.
159 However, since faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting CLA's mission, this policy should
160 be construed as allowing for adjustments in the weights assigned to instruction, RSCA, and service
161 based upon faculty strengths as well as department, college, and university needs.

162 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

163
164 The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The College of
165 Liberal Arts requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines for each
166 area of evaluation below.

167 **2.1 Instructional Activities**

168
169 Effective instructional activities within the College of Liberal Arts encompass a wide range of tasks and
170 responsibilities. The University RTP Policy (Section 2.1) defines instruction as "any action designed to
171 engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to their success, regardless of whether it is part of
172 formal coursework." Within CLA, instructional activities include but are not limited to classroom
173 instruction; chairing thesis committees; supervising individual students enrolled in activities like
174
175

176 independent study, research, internship, honors, student teaching; instructionally related mentoring and
177 advising students; curriculum and course development, including designing study abroad experiences.
178 Departments may define additional activities—such as serving on thesis or comprehensive exam
179 committees—as instructional activities. CLA requires faculty to identify any instructional activities for
180 which they received assigned time by including a Workload Assignment Form and, if applicable, an
181 Academic Advisor Report in their file.

182

183 **2.1.1 Instructional Activities File**

184

185 **2.1.1.1 Required Materials**

186 To demonstrate effective teaching as defined in CLA Policy section 2.1.3, candidates **must** submit:

187

- 188 a. A teaching narrative written on the fillable form.
- 189 b. Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal student course evaluations
190 were required during the period of review.
- 191 c. Grade distributions relative to course level.
- 192 d. One (1) representative course syllabus for each course taught during the period of review.
- 193 e. A Workload Assignment Form and an Academic Advisor Report, if applicable. Candidates who
194 have received assigned time to provide formal student academic advising shall report on their
195 activities per a consistent procedure approved by the Dean or designee.
- 196 f. Evidence of effective teaching in support of continuous professional learning, thoughtful
197 reflection on and adaptation of instruction, and the use of instructional practices that foster
198 student learning and the achievement of course goals. Suggestions for supporting evidence are
199 outlined in Section 2.1.3. This evidence should be included in the candidate's Professional Data
200 Sheet and listed in their index.

201

202 **2.1.1.2 Optional Materials**

203 To demonstrate effective teaching as defined in CLA Policy Section 2.1.3, candidates may also submit:

204

- 205 a. Peer observation of instruction. Candidates may request a peer observation.
- 206 b. Written remarks on student course evaluations. Candidates must include all remarks (whether
207 positive or negative) from written evaluations if they opt to include remarks.

208

209 **2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

210 CLA faculty members are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. The candidate's narrative of
211 instructional philosophy and practice provides the context necessary for understanding and interpreting
212 the candidate's instructional goals, materials, and accomplishments.

213 The ability to teach, mentor and serve our diverse students is highly valued by the university, college
214 and department. Candidates should pay special attention to the relationship between cultural and identity
215 taxation and teaching, if applicable. Candidates who experience cultural and identity taxation may
216 choose to describe this in their narratives, detailing how their positionality might impact their teaching
217 assignment, methodologies, and student perceptions of instruction. Candidates may wish to describe in
218

222 their narratives how their own unique circumstances intersected with the needs of the campus
223 community during the period under review, clarifying how this may have affected their teaching
224 performance. Committees, chairs, and the Dean shall consider cultural and identity factors in evaluating
225 candidate files.

226

227 **2.1.3 Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching**

228

229 The University RTP Policy grounds effective teaching in three principles: 1) continuous professional
230 learning; 2) thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction; and 3) the use of
231 instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals. This section
232 outlines the definition of effective teaching, the required contents of candidate narratives, supporting
233 evidence, and, as relevant, evaluation criteria for committees, chairs, and the Dean.

234

235 **2.1.3.1 Continuous Professional Learning**

236

237 Candidates must show efforts to improve their teaching. In demonstrating continuous professional
238 learning ([University RTP Policy](#) Section 2.1.1), candidates should explain how they have remained up to
239 date with course content, pedagogical methods, and best practices for educating a diverse student
240 population. Their narrative should discuss how they have engaged in professional pedagogical
241 development activities during the period of review to ensure their instructional activities reflect current
242 best practices. They may also discuss the relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to
243 instruction (this discussion should not be duplicated in other sections of the narrative -- see 1.1.12).

244

245 Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to participation in professional
246 development activities (both on- and off-campus), attendance at professional conferences, and
247 observations or discussions of instruction by peers. Candidates should document supporting evidence in
248 their PDS and list evidence in their index. Departments may define additional supporting documentation
249 as appropriate to their disciplines.

250

251 Committees, chairs, and the Dean shall consider evidence demonstrating application of professional
252 development activities and the implementation of pedagogical training into course materials during the
253 period under review.

254

255 **2.1.3.2 Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction**

256

257 Candidates must show reflection on and adaptation of instruction. In demonstrating reflection on and
258 adaptation of instruction ([University RTP Policy](#) Section 2.1.2), candidates should discuss modifications
259 to their teaching during the period under review. Their narrative should explain how they have examined
260 their instructional practices and made deliberate efforts to improve student learning. This might include
261 specifying one or more instructional goals or practices the candidate decided to change, followed by a
262 discussion of the evidence that indicated the need for a change, and concluding with an explanation of
263 the effort undertaken to make the change.

264

265 Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to instructional materials that show
266 what the course was like before and after the changes. Instructional materials include but are not limited
267 to class handouts, lecture notes/slides, descriptions of class activities, and web page printouts.

268 Candidates should document supporting evidence in their PDS and list evidence in their index.
269 Departments may define additional supporting documentation as appropriate to their disciplines.
270

271 Committees, chairs, and the Dean shall consider evidence regarding changes to course syllabi,
272 instructional goals or practices, assignments, or other materials that show modifications to instruction
273 over time based on reflection.
274

275 **2.1.3.3 Fostering student learning and the achievement of course goals**
276

277 Candidates must show how they have engaged and helped students achieve course outcomes. In
278 demonstrating instructional practices that foster learning and achievement of course goals ([University](#)
279 [RTP Policy](#) Section 2.1.3), candidates should explain how they have supported student learning, achieved
280 course outcomes, and accommodated student differences. Their narratives should discuss their
281 philosophy and how it aligns with their instructional strategies. Their narratives should also address, as
282 appropriate, student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level
283 as well as grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.
284

285 Evidence supporting the narrative must include course syllabi, quantitative student course evaluation
286 summaries, and grade distributions. For courses taught more than once during the period of review, only
287 one representative syllabus shall be submitted. Candidates may include additional syllabi as needed to
288 demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation. Evidence supporting the narrative could include
289 student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback),
290 formative or summative assessments (e.g., discussion assignments, labs, quizzes, papers or project
291 assignments, or comprehensive final assignments or exams), a short video clip of the candidate's
292 teaching together with a narrative description, qualitative student perception data, observations by
293 trained or peer observers, or support letters submitted during open period. Candidates should document
294 supporting evidence in their PDS and list evidence in their index. Departments may define additional
295 supporting documentation as appropriate to their disciplines.
296

297 In line with the [University RTP Policy](#), the CLA requires RTP committees to consider multiple modes
298 of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness as it relates to fostering student learning, achieving
299 course goals, and accommodating student differences. In considering course syllabi, committees, chairs,
300 and the Dean shall additionally consider evidence such as syllabi content relative to course level and
301 catalog description as well as currency in the discipline and consistency with current Academic Senate
302 syllabus policies.
303

304 Course evaluation summaries provide one among several ways to measure instructional effectiveness
305 and should be supplemented with other instructional materials. Although student course evaluation
306 summaries must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations are
307 required during the period of review, committees, chairs, and the Dean shall evaluate quantitative
308 student perceptions of teaching (i.e., SPOT forms) relative to context, including:
309

310 a. Class characteristics
311 1. Course level
312 2. Course type and mode (e.g., required, elective, writing intensive, online
313 synchronous/asynchronous/hybrid/face-to-face, for majors only or GE, etc.)

314 3. Number of enrolled students (vs. number of SPOT responses)
315 4. Whether this was a new course preparation
316 5. Course meeting time

317
318 b. Candidate's teaching assignment

319 1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of evaluation
320 2. Total number of different course preparations during the period of review
321 3. Alignment of Standard Course Outline with the candidate's area of expertise/training

322
323 c. Candidate's experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness

324
325 d. Trends over time, keeping in mind that it is impossible to remove or account for all bias in student
326 evaluations

327 Grade distributions must be included, as they provide a measure for contextualizing assessment of
328 student learning and student course evaluations. As grade distributions necessarily differ from one group
329 of students to another, committees, chairs, and the Dean will consider overall trends in grade
330 distributions relative to the contextual factors listed for course evaluations.

331
332 **2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

333
334 The College of Liberal Arts requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)
335 of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The CLA recognizes and appreciates the diversity of
336 methods, epistemologies, and perspectives represented within the college. The CLA understands that
337 faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways, including but not limited to original
338 research, making connections between and across disciplines, bridging theory and practice,
339 communicating knowledge effectively to students and peers, or reciprocal partnerships with broader
340 communities. The CLA values scholarship as a continuum of diverse forms which create, apply, or
341 expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities.
342 RSCA involves the dissemination of products and findings. The value of these products is not
343 determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable RSCA is not restricted to professional
344 audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. All RSCA,
345 however, must be peer reviewed by other experts, practitioners, partners, or reciprocal collaborators.
346 Standards for peer review are determined by the forms of scholarship being undertaken (the scholarship
347 of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application or engagement, and/or the
348 scholarship of teaching and learning; definitions are in Section 2.2 of [University RTP Policy](#)).
349 Departments should not limit candidates to an exhaustive list of research, scholarly, and creative
350 activities; contributions may be in one form or across multiple forms of the continuum of scholarship.
351 Departments may indicate disciplinary standards.

352
353 Scholarly contributions to any form (s) of scholarship (as defined in Section 2.2 of the [University RTP](#)
354 [Policy](#)) are valued equally by the CLA.

355
356 Candidates are responsible for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their
357 accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. This section outlines the criteria for the
358 evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidate's responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

360

361 **2.2.1 RSCA File**

362

363 **2.2.1.1 Required Materials**

364

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

366 a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.

367 b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative activities for the review period only.

368 RSCA claimed in prior actions cannot be included. Examples of published peer-reviewed research
369 include but are not limited to books, articles, films, and other media, policy or program development,
370 legislation, new statewide curriculum, patent applications, training videos, and digital creations or tools.
371 Such materials shall be included in the file, with links for digital products made included in the PDS or
372 made available in the appropriate format. Furthermore, candidates have the option to include accepted,
373 in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per the following guidelines:

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

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

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

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

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

387

388 **2.2.1.2 Optional Materials**

389

390 The inclusion of non-peer-reviewed publications is optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall
391 not be viewed as negative for any candidate.

392

393 **2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials**

394

395 Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g., works in progress, conference
396 presentations, and invited lectures). Listing such items on the PDS is sufficient.

397

398 **2.2.2 RSCA Narrative**

399

400 The RSCA narrative should be written for a nonspecialist audience and should provide context for the
401 candidate's RSCA overall; candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment. Candidates
402 are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. For the period
403 of review, the narrative must address:

404

405 a. The scholarly vision or program of the candidate's RSCA, including the questions, issues, or

406 problems addressed by their work, as well as the aims or expected outcomes.

407 b. The trajectory and development of the RSCA and its quality, significance, and impact, especially in
408 regard to the form of activity (scholarship of discovery, integration, application, engagement, and/or
409 teaching and learning as per [University RTP Policy](#) Section 2.2), and the communities and
410 constituencies involved.

411 c. The quality, significance, and impact of non-peer reviewed products, if included in the candidate's
412 RTP file.

413 d. Any RSCA for which the candidate received reassigned time or additional compensation.

414

415 **2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition**

416

417 In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate's RSCA and its impact can take many forms. Peer review is
418 the primary requirement for the majority of a candidate's research, scholarly, and creative activities. Peer
419 review should be executed by expert scholars, practitioners, partners, or reciprocal collaborators in the
420 field, depending upon the form of scholarship undertaken (the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship
421 of integration, the scholarship of engagement, the scholarship of application and practice, and/or the
422 scholarship of teaching and learning); see Section 2.2 in College and [University RTP](#) policies. It is the
423 candidate's responsibility to clarify how their work meets the standards for peer review, to explain the
424 appropriateness of the kind of peer review for the form of RSCA, and to make the case for the impact of
425 their work.

426 **2.2.3.1 Definition**

427

428 Peer review may be defined as 1. a process by which qualified experts in the discipline evaluate the
429 merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities; 2. a mutually
430 constitutive process established in the reciprocal relationship between a researcher and the communities
431 with which they are engaged (e.g., organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry,
432 etc.). It is the responsibility of the candidate to document the process of peer review.

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

434

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

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

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

449 d. The process of evaluation of external RSCA grant proposals by granting agencies or organizations.

450

452 This form of peer review would be appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery,
453 engagement, teaching and learning, integration, and application and practice. Evidence of quality
454 can be indicated by, for instance, internal reviews, competitiveness of the grant process, or
455 organizational reports.

456 e. A process leading to creative performances, exhibitions of work, or academic presentations in public
457 venues in which peers independently evaluated the work. This form of peer review would be
458 appropriate, for instance, for the scholarship of discovery, engagement, teaching and learning,
459 integration, and application and practice. Evidence of quality can be indicated by, for instance,
460 editor, organizer, or curator letters of acceptance, the prestige of the venue, published reviews,
461 breadth of distribution or audience reception, or acceptance rates.

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

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

477 **2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement**

479 The term peer review encompasses the terms “juried” and “refereed,” which may be used for all RSCA
480 evaluated by qualified experts in specific disciplines. For each RSCA item on the Professional Data
481 Sheet, candidates are required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using consistent labels
482 of “Peer Reviewed,” “Refereed,” or “Juried” as appropriate to the field and form of scholarship
483 undertaken.

485 **2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status**

487 RSCA not yet in print or otherwise in the public domain must be labeled on the Professional Data Sheet
488 according to the following definitions of publication status:

489 a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable. Both refer to an accepted work that is in the copy-
490 editing, page proof, or other pre-publication state.

491 b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has
492 agreed to publish without major changes.

493 c. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract and a
494 complete manuscript draft. Candidates have the option to include works under contract with complete
495 manuscript draft as RSCA if they deem it beneficial to their current RTP action; see Section 2.2.1.1.

496 d. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation
497 from a publisher or other entity, indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be

498 published.

499

500 e. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation
501 from a publisher or other entity, indicating that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final
502 decision.

503 f. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.

504 g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract
505 granted without a complete manuscript draft.

506

507 **2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status**

508 For in press, forthcoming, accepted and under contract with a complete manuscript RSCA submitted
509 with the RTP file (e.g., Section 2.2.4.a-c), candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a
510 letter from the publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation (e.g., work
511 in progress /ongoing work as per Section 2.2.4.d-g) does not require such documentation.

512

513

514 **2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

515

516 **2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

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

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

521 b. Copies of reader reports. Candidates who submit these for evidence of peer review should be aware
522 that any materials submitted in RTP files can be used by evaluators to assess their work in any capacity.
523 Candidates who are concerned that critiques in their readers' reports may reflect negatively on their
524 overall RSCA are encouraged to submit alternate proof of peer review, such as Section 2.2.6.1 a, c or d.

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

526 d. Letters, testimonials, evaluations, public recognition, etc. from community stakeholders or
527 participatory agencies, communications between the community and researcher, and other similar
528 evidence of peer review.

529

530 **2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns**

531

532 Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative. Ethical concerns include but are not
533 limited to conflicts of interest, monetary payment to secure publication, and undisclosed duplicate
534 publications.

535a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include but are not limited to having collaborated on the RSCA
536 works being evaluated.

537b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author is required to make a monetary
538 contribution in order to secure publication (e.g., for-profit presses and predatory presses) shall be
539 considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection process. This does not include venues that
540 require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for publication on its
541 scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images, open access, or subvention).

542c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in their narratives. Examples include
543 but are not limited to the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprints

544 must be labeled as such.

545

546 **2.3 Service**

547

548 High-quality, sustained service contributions to their department, college and the University as well as to
549 the profession and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts. It is the
550 responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a
551 way that leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation. Service
552 contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by
553 candidates or evaluators. Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty
554 member.

555

556 This section delineates service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.

557

558 As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, mentoring, advising, and outreach activities,
559 including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting
560 underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. The CLA recognizes that
561 the quality and degree of a candidate's service may be impacted by disproportionate expectations placed
562 upon them for this work. Specifically, the labor undertaken to support diversity initiatives is often
563 provided by, or extracted from, marginalized and/or minoritized faculty as a direct result of their
564 identities. Cultural and identity taxation is defined in Section 1.3.1.

565

566 Although such work may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways, college and
567 departmental policies and reviewers should still recognize its importance. The sections below provide
568 guidelines to candidates on how to discuss service impacted by issues of cultural and identity taxation in
569 their files, and to RTP committees on how to evaluate files impacted by such issues.

570 **2.3.1 Service File**

571 Candidates **must** submit:

572 a. Narrative written on the fillable form. The narrative shall address the significance and impact of
573 service identified on the PDS. Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever
574 activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of
575 the service activity.

576 b. Professional Data Sheet. The PDS must address dates of service, offices held, objectives of activity,
577 degree of participation, concrete contributions, and responsibilities. In the case of student mentoring or
578 advising, the PDS should include the nature and extent of the work, and the number of students
579 impacted.

580

581 In their service file, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or
582 actions (for instance, what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions
583 to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts
584 of memos or policies), and describe outcomes or impact of the work. If the candidate chooses to discuss
585 student mentoring or advising as service, that could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or
586 philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g. number of students, extent of work) and impact of
587 the candidate's work, highlighting student success. Candidates can describe off-campus or profession-
588 linked work in terms of what the work is, how it utilizes the candidate's academic expertise, and how it
589 impacts the profession or wider community. In general, candidates should discuss and (when possible)

590 document the importance, scope, and length of their service accomplishments, noting the time, effort,
591 and amount of work involved in the activities as well as (when possible) the overall impact of the
592 service and the number individuals impacted.

593 Candidates who experience cultural and identity taxation may choose to describe this in their narratives,
594 detailing how their service is in high demand due to their positionality, and how their service obligations
595 may have exceeded typical expectations due to their marginalized and/or minoritized identities. While
596 not easily quantifiable, the increased service workload undertaken by these faculty can be described in
597 terms of the impact their work has had on their department, college, university, community and/or
598 discipline. Faculty may wish to describe in their narratives how their own unique circumstances
599 intersected with the needs of the campus community during the period under review, clarifying how this
600 may have affected their work performance in teaching, RSCA, and service activities.

601
602 Examples of work associated with cultural and identity taxation include, but are not limited to advising
603 student organizations, serving on campus committees, advocating for or counseling marginalized and/or
604 minoritized students (e.g., students of color, queer students, students with disabilities, etc.), defending
605 scholarship on marginalized and/or minoritized communities, meeting with marginalized and/or
606 minoritized students, commenting on drafts of papers, writing letters of recommendation, sharing career
607 and academic opportunities, giving public lectures on diversity, and mentoring junior colleagues.

608
609 Review committees should recognize that faculty experience various forms of cultural and identity
610 taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring, and other activities on and off campus that
611 are essential to the mission of the university. The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is
612 incumbent upon evaluating committees to contextualize this service, and to recognize service
613 accomplishments that are tied to cultural and identity taxation.

614
615

616 **2.3.2 Service Expectations**

617 All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by
618 working collaboratively and productively with colleagues. At all levels, quality and degree of
619 participation of service activities shall be weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees
620 on which candidates serve.

621
622 Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, can take any of several forms.
623 Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus,
624 community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of
625 service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles. The following examples should
626 not be construed as exhaustive.

627
628

629 Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to:

630 **Campus Service:** Service on department, university, CSU systemwide committees and taskforces;
631 program development; sponsorship of student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and
632 projects; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies
633 and procedures; mentoring of fellow faculty members and staff; mentoring of students; service or
634 leadership activities for university committees; service to CFA (California Faculty Association).

635

636 **Service to the Profession:** Service to professional organizations or boards; conducting external
637 evaluations; external grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; mentoring, coaching and
638 advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.

639
640 **Service to the Community:** Consulting in public schools and other agencies relevant to academic
641 expertise, serving in local government, and board membership in community organizations.
642

643 **2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank**

644 a. Tenure-track faculty members in the first three years of appointment typically are expected to focus
645 service activities at the department level.
646 b. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, tenure-track faculty members are
647 expected to make high-quality service contributions to their department, and to either the college or the
648 university.
649 c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates are expected to have a substantive
650 service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) a record of
651 leadership at the college and/or university levels; and (3) a record of service in the community and/or the
652 profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g.,
653 committee chair) and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g., active participation in
654 accreditation or policy-writing processes).

655 656 **2.3.3 Evaluation of Service**

657 RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service activities relative to
658 department, College, and University RTP policies as well as the CBA. When evaluating candidate files
659 that demonstrate patterns of cultural and identity taxation affecting workload, RTP committees must also
660 account for those contributions when evaluating service.

661 662 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

663
664 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process and
665 emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.

666 667 **3.1 Candidate**

668 Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that complies with all
669 specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking guidance from the department chair
670 or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are
671 the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.
672

673
674 **3.1.1** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually accurate.
675 Misrepresentations shall be referred to Faculty Affairs.

676
677 **3.1.2** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required materials are included in the RTP file
678 before submission to the department RTP committee.

679
680 **3.1.3** As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become accessible after the file

681 completion date. Insertion of materials after the date of file completion must have the approval of the
682 college RTP committee, which is the peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.
683

684 **3.2 Joint Appointments**
685

686 The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with a joint
687 appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates that for RTP purposes
688 the administratively responsible department shall initiate the formation of an evaluation committee. This
689 committee shall consist of members selected from among the peer review committees of the departments
690 within which the candidate holds a joint appointment.
691

692 **3.3 Department RTP Policy**
693

694 The University RTP Policy dictates that all departments shall have RTP policies. The
695 document also delineates ratification procedures and review requirements. All department
696 policies must then be ratified by the Faculty Council in a majority vote and must be
697 approved by the Dean and the Provost.
698

699 In the College of Liberal Arts, departments may adopt the college policy as their own.
700 Department policies shall be subject to review as needed. If changes are made to those
701 policies, they must then be ratified and approved as outlined above.
702

703 **3.4 Department RTP Committee**
704

705 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities for department RTP committees and stipulates
706 that no one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of
707 review. It is expected that all evaluators attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest
708 policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.
709

710 **3.4.1** In the College of Liberal Arts, departments must elect no fewer than three (3) tenured, full-time
711 faculty members to department RTP committees. As per the CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty
712 Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if elected by majority vote and
713 approved by the President, yet no RTP committee may comprise solely faculty participating in FERP.
714

715 **3.4.2** Department constitutions or RTP policies may stipulate that larger committees or separate
716 committees may be elected for different actions (i.e., reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Professor).
717 In all cases, at least three (3) members of the department RTP committee must evaluate each candidate.
718

719 **3.4.3** As per the CBA (15.43), in promotion considerations, RTP committee members who evaluate a
720 candidate must have a higher rank/classification than the candidate.
721

722 **3.4.4** Department RTP committees are encouraged to provide concise evaluative commentary of
723 candidates' files.
724

725 **3.4.5** As per the academic honesty (Section 1.1.5), misrepresentations, if detected, must be noted by the
726 department or CLA RTP committee in the evaluation.

727
728
729

3.5 Mentoring

730 The College of Liberal Arts recognizes the importance of mentoring in the success of RTP candidates
731 and requires candidates to participate in ongoing mentoring activities, which aim to help candidates
732 maintain a clear trajectory of their professional accomplishments and goals. The University RTP Policy
733 identifies the department chair as having the responsibility for communicating the department, college,
734 and university policies to candidates and for providing mentoring to candidates. In the College of Liberal
735 Arts, mentoring can be performed by the chair or a mutually agreed-upon tenured, full-time faculty
736 designee. Candidates are charged with seeking guidance from the department chair or designated mentor.
737 Evidence of mentoring shall be included in the candidate's file and can include, but is not limited to,
738 feedback provided on mini-review evaluations.

739

3.6 Department Chair Evaluations

741

742 Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates at each action level unless
743 the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion
744 considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for
745 promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a
746 department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.
747 In the College of Liberal Arts, the absence of such a letter shall not be construed as a negative judgment
748 on the candidate. If the chair elects to write a separate evaluation, that document usually will not exceed
749 500 words.

750

3.7 College RTP Policy

752

753 The [University Policy](#) specifies that the College RTP policy must be ratified by a majority of voting
754 tenured and tenure-track faculty members and approved by the Dean and the Provost. College RTP
755 policy shall be subject to review by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the College. The Faculty
756 Council shall be charged with facilitating those reviews. Any substantive change in the policy requires
757 ratification as per the procedures outlined in Section 8.0 of this policy.

758

3.8 College RTP Committee

759

760 The College RTP committee reviews materials submitted by candidates, departmental committees, and
761 department chairs. Evaluation by the College committee must take into account the RTP policy of the
762 candidate's department as well as the university and college RTP policies. It is expected that all
763 evaluators attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation
764 guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels. The committee renders its own evaluation,
765 which it forwards to the Dean.

766

3.8.1 Election of the Committee

767

768 The College RTP committee shall have ten (10) full-time, tenured faculty members. The committee shall
769 be constituted in the following way:

770

- a. The committee must have seven (7) tenured, full-time faculty members at the rank of Professor and

773 three (3) additional members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.
774 b. Additionally, one (1) alternate at the rank of Professor shall be elected for one year. If the alternate
775 does not serve on the committee, this individual is eligible for election to the committee when the term
776 ends.
777 c. Members shall be elected as per the election procedures delineated in the [CLA Constitution](#).
778 d. As per the CBA Article 15.41, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP)
779 may serve on RTP committees if elected by majority vote and approved by the President, yet no RTP
780 committee may be comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
781 e. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms and shall not be re-elected for more than three (3)
782 consecutive terms.
783 f. In the event that the committee cannot be populated with members who are all from different
784 academic areas, up to two faculty members may be elected from the same academic area.

785 **3.8.2 Structure and Duties of the College RTP Committee**

786 **3.8.2.1** The RTP committee shall consist of two standing sub-committees:
787 a. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of tenure and promotion. A
788 minimum of five (5) committee members at the rank of Professor must serve on this committee.
789 b. The Reappointment Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of reappointment. A minimum of three (3)
790 committee members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must serve on this committee.
791
792 **3.8.2.2** At the first meeting of the CLA RTP Committee:
793 a. The committee shall elect a chair who holds the rank of Professor. This chair also shall serve as chair
794 of the Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee.
795 b. Once elected, the CLA RTP committee chair, in consultation with the members of the committee,
796 shall determine the size and membership of the two sub-committees based on the relative number of
797 reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions to be considered.
798 c. The entire CLA RTP Committee then shall elect a chair of the Reappointment Sub-Committee. The
799 sub-committee chair shall report to the CLA RTP committee chair.

800 **3.8.3 The sub-committees are bound to the following rules:**

801 a. As per the CBA (15.43), in promotion considerations, RTP committee members who evaluate a
802 candidate must have a higher rank than the candidate.
803 b. No RTP sub-committee may be comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
804 c. If department chairs serve on the CLA RTP Committee, they will be recused from decisions involving
805 any faculty from their department or program.
806 d. For each action, a majority recommendation must be made by the members of the sub-committee. A
807 minority report may be submitted. No RTP subcommittee may have more than one person from a given
808 academic area. Committee members with joint appointments shall not serve on subcommittees with
809 colleagues from either of their academic areas.

810 **3.8.4 Evaluation and Recommendations**

811 a. The College RTP committee must make its own independent evaluation of each candidate.
812 b. The College RTP recommendation usually shall not exceed 750 words.

819

820 **3.9 Dean of the College**

821

822 The Dean is charged with mentoring department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process. The
823 Dean also communicates standards and expectations and ensures the integrity of the RTP process across
824 the college. The Dean writes an independent evaluation and recommendation for each candidate and
825 forwards that evaluation to the Provost.

826

827 **3.10 University-Level Review**

828

829 **Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs**

830

831 The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the
832 RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to
833 prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees. The
834 Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final
835 recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the
836 university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this
837 authority to the Provost.

838

839 **4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

840

841 The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review requirements
842 for tenured and probationary faculty. All tenure-track and tenured faculty undergo performance review
843 and evaluation. Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate
844 is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic
845 review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years. The following timelines apply to
846 candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor with no service credit; actual timelines
847 may vary according to level of appointment and service credit:

848

849 **4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Reappointment**

850 In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review.
851 The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic
852 review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the College Dean. The
853 periodic evaluation in the first year may just be reviewed by the department chair and the Dean. In the
854 third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful
855 candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.

856

857 **4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion**

858 In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the
859 annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year
860 of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the annual evaluation takes the form of a
861 tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion. A tenure-track faculty member may request
862 consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is
863 discussed under Section 5.5.

864

865 **4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion**

866 An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to Full Professor in the fifth year at the
867 associate rank. A tenured Associate Professor may seek early promotion to Full Professor prior to the
868 fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 5.5.

869 A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the
870 faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty.
871

872 **5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA**

873 Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1) instructional
874 activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three
875 areas to receive a positive recommendation for any action.
876

877 **5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-Track Faculty**

878 The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate significant
879 progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the college and the candidate's department, a
880 candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.
881

882 The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the
883 learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the University's educational mission. The candidate
884 is expected to show progress in their program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly
885 and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at
886 the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.
887

888 The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any area have been
889 identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).
890

891 **5.2 Awarding of Tenure**

892 The awarding of tenure represents the CLA's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted
893 when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished
894 professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure is based on a candidate
895 demonstrating a sustained record of high-quality work over multiple years and evidence leading to the
896 belief that a candidate will continue being productive in all three areas. Tenure is not based solely on the
897 quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.
898

899 The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all areas of evaluation as
900 established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant
901 professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.
902

903 **5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor**

904 The University RTP Policy states the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate
905 Professor, including the expectation that a candidate shall have a record of high-quality peer-reviewed
906 work that has contributed to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or
907 interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition to the minimum standard stated in that policy, the College of
908

911 Liberal Arts requires the candidate to make high-quality service contributions to the department and to
912 either the College or the University.

913

914 **5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor**

915

916 The [University Policy](#) states that standards for promotion to Full Professor shall be higher than standards
917 for promotion to Associate Professor. In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for
918 appointment/advancement to Professor must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three
919 areas of evaluation. The successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include high-quality
920 contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields
921 of study. The candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed work. In addition, a
922 candidate for promotion to Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional
923 activities. The candidate also is expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at
924 department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership at the college and/or university
925 levels; and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

926

927 **5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

928

929 As outlined by the University RTP Policy, early tenure and/or early promotion are
930 awarded in exceptional circumstances in which a candidate demonstrates a superior record of
931 accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation. That policy states that candidates for early tenure and/or
932 promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the university
933 policy on external evaluation.

934

935 **5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts**

936

937 In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a potential candidate is
938 encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources and mentors, including the department chair,
939 Dean, and, if possible, department RTP committee members.

940

941 **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

942

943 **6.1** The Office of Faculty Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including deadlines for
944 the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period, completion of all RTP reviews by
945 all review levels, and final decision notification to the candidate. The deadlines for notification of final
946 actions shall be consistent with the requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement
947 (CBA).

948

949 **6.2** The Office of Faculty Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies
950 items required to be provided by all candidates.

951

952 **6.3** Departments must post outside the department office a list of candidates being considered for
953 reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by
954 the Office of Faculty Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. Departments must also
955 disseminate this list to department faculty unit employees, staff, and students electronically. The

956 announcements shall invite statements about qualifications and work of the candidate and its impact.
957 These submissions may be electronic but cannot be anonymous.
958

959 **6.4** A copy of all statements submitted during the open period shall be provided to the candidate by the
960 department RTP committee chair or department chair. The department RTP committee chair or
961 department chair collects, prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be
962 included in the candidate's file, and submits the materials via the university-approved process.
963

964 **6.5** Candidates prepare materials for review and submit them via the university-approved process by the
965 deadline.
966

967 **6.6** The department RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and, using the standard university
968 form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.
969

970 **6.7** The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee,
971 reviews the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and
972 recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.
973

974 **6.8** The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written
975 evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.
976

977 **6.9** The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and
978 recommendation to the President (or designee) by the deadline.
979

980 **6.10** The President (or designee) reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written
981 review and recommendation.
982

983 **6.11** The President (or designee) makes final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment,
984 tenure, and promotion. The President (or designee) notifies the candidate (and all levels of review) in
985 writing of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline. The
986 decision letter shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the
987 faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.
988

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

991 **7.1** Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from
992 consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early
993 tenure.
994

995 **7.2** If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is
996 discovered, the RTP file shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have
997 been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.
998

999 **7.3** Either the candidate or evaluators may ask to have new materials placed in the file after the deadline.
1000 Such additions shall be limited to items that became available after the file was submitted as verified by
1001 the College RTP Committee. Copies of the added material shall be provided to the faculty unit
1002

1002 employee. When material has been added to the file in this manner, the file shall be returned to the
1003 initial evaluation committee (the Department RTP Committee) for review, evaluation, and comment
1004 before consideration at subsequent levels of review.

1005
1006 **7.4** At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the evaluation and recommendation,
1007 which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before it is forwarded to the next review
1008 level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10)
1009 calendar days (as defined in the CBA) following the receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the
1010 candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP file as it advances and shall also be sent to any
1011 previous review levels.

1012
1013 **7.5** The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent
1014 with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

1015
1016 **7.6.** When ratings (e.g., excellent, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) are used in evaluation reports, the
1017 definition and scales of rating must be provided to the candidate.

1019 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

1020
1021 Changes to the College of Liberal Arts RTP policy may occur because of changes to the
1022 CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement or to [University RTP Policy](#). Additionally, campus
1023 administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other
1024 campus needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty. The tenured and
1025 tenure-track faculty of the CLA may vote to amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this
1026 document.

1027
1028 Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

1029 (1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty (20) percent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to
1030 the chair of the Faculty Council.
1031 (2) By a majority vote of the full membership of the Faculty Council.

1032
1033 Proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Faculty Council, who shall discuss and vote on them. If
1034 approved by a majority vote in Faculty Council, the amendment(s) shall be relayed to faculty and Dean of
1035 the College of Liberal Arts for public discussion within fifteen (15) instructional days.

1036
1037 Within twenty-two (22) instructional days of the public discussion, amendments to this document shall
1038 be submitted to a vote by the entire tenured and tenure-track CLA faculty. The voting process shall be
1039 conducted by the Faculty Council.

1040
1041 If amendment(s) receive(s) favorable vote by a majority of those who cast ballots from the entire tenured
1042 and tenure-track CLA faculty, changes to this document will become effective upon concurrence from
1043 the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Provost.