

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF EARTH SCIENCE
COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the Department of Earth Science establishes the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members within the Department of Earth Science.

Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This policy should not be considered as a substitute, however, for those parts of the agreement that affect RTP matters, readers should still consult the university policy for these sections.

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

1.1 Department Mission

The Department of Earth Science strives to educate students who will fill critical roles in industry and teaching, protect the environment, promote the wellbeing of people and society, and develop natural resources. Our faculty advance scholarship and knowledge in Earth Science as we broaden public understanding of the role of Earth Science in our economy and social well-being. In the rapidly changing and technologically oriented Earth Science disciplines, students must have a strong geological background. As such, students require an instructional program that communicates the fundamental geologic processes, explores novel methods of inquiry, cultivates skills in observation, integrates three-dimensional thinking and analysis, provides experiential learning that develops laboratory, computation, and field skills, and stimulates interest in the many sub-disciplines of Earth Science.

1.2 Values

Decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are based on the following values:

- Ability to balance effective teaching with a sustained research program.
- Attention to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility including varied opinions, skills, and backgrounds.
- Mentoring of students and junior faculty
- Quality Research with integrity
- Development of a highly trained workforce for the state of California and the nation
- Shared governance to maintain university operations at all academic levels.

1.3 Principles

Students are the focus of nearly all of the activities deemed critical for tenure and promotion. Faculty narratives should include discussion on how the candidate's work advances the core mission and values of the department and college to foster a student-centric instructional and research environment.

The Department of Earth Science gives its highest priority to quality instruction in the study of the Earth. The Department emphasizes learning by doing and believes that scholarly activity of faculty is an essential part of the educational program. All faculty are expected to supervise student research. Active research by faculty is critical for effective teaching and mentorship. Service that includes mentoring, advising, engaging in university governance, supporting the public sector and our professional communities is essential to carrying out our department mission.

RTP reviews must be clear, fair, transparent, and unbiased at all levels. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department standards and expectations will advance.

2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Candidates will be evaluated based on the standards defined by the Department of Earth Science related to 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP policies. Candidates for tenure and promotion recommendations are rated as Excellent, Competent, or Deficient in each category of evaluation. A candidate that does not meet the requirements for Competent in each category will be ranked as Deficient.

The following standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent, competent, and deficient in each area of evaluation for tenure and promotion are required for faculty of the Department of Earth Science. If a candidate does not meet the standards for Competent, they will be rated as Deficient. If a candidate is rated as Deficient in any area of evaluation, a candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion. To be recommended for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of research, scholarly and creative activities. To receive a positive recommendation for promotion to professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

The classification of candidate activities in the three areas of evaluation should follow the descriptions below. In certain circumstances, a set of candidate activities may be reasonably described as falling within more than one category, across multiple categories, or otherwise not clearly falling into just one category. In such cases, the activities should be placed into a single category of the candidate's choice. This is to avoid the appearance of attempting to receive more credit than a single activity would typically allow (i.e., "double-dipping"), and the candidate should provide justification for the category the activity is placed in. Candidates should make reasonable decisions about the classification of their activities insofar as they do not obviously contradict the classifications described below.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers of our diverse student body at CSULB and provide evidence of this effectiveness in their files. Instruction is defined by the university as any action designed to engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to their success, regardless of whether it is part of formal coursework.

The most important activity considered when evaluating a candidate's teaching is their performance as lead instructor of courses. Additional teaching activities that will be evaluated

include lab course supervision, mentoring students in research, and advising (if applicable). Each of the 4 criteria listed below will be evaluated based on the candidate's narrative, syllabi, peer review observations, and supplementary teaching materials supplied by the candidate to support what's stated in the narrative.

The Department recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available and effective strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. The Department also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students that use High Impact Practices and experiential learning such as field work. In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe how their instructional activities were influenced by this. The candidate's narrative should include sufficient information to allow the RTP Committee to appropriately assess the criteria to be evaluated described in the remainder of this section and facilitate the evaluation of activities described in this section. Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB compensation for any of the instructional activities described in their narratives. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward instructional activities.

2.1.1 Criteria to be Evaluated

2.1.1.1 Pedagogical Approach and Methods

Faculty members are expected to be current and adaptive in learning new content in the subject matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. They must show, through their narrative and supplementary materials, that their courses are high quality and up to date, fit within the prerequisite sequence and use current/modern pedagogical strategies and grading practices consistent with department norms. In addition, faculty members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and describe ways in which they assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning. This may result in the adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-classroom teaching duties.

Course materials should convey clearly to the students the learning goals for the course, and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline. Course policies and grading practices should also be conveyed clearly to students. The results of grading practices (i.e., GPAs and DFW rates) should be reasonably consistent with departmental norms for the same or comparable courses taught by other tenured/probationary faculty members. If a candidate has consistently high DFW rates in their courses (as per College RTP 2.1.1.1), they should address it in the narrative.

Supporting materials must include the most recent syllabus from each different course taught and the SPOT evaluations. Additional teaching materials may also be provided to add context or serve as examples discussed in the narrative document. Examples of these materials include additional syllabi showing evidence of course changes, samples of student work with instructor feedback, example assignments, etc. peer feedback, a short video clip of the candidate's teaching along with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, evidence of student success such as DFW rates, etc.

2.1.1.2 Quality of instruction and student engagement

Student ratings of instruction, faculty peer-review, and other input to the RTP committee should reflect a favorable perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to student needs. All candidates must

include the following in their RTP files:

(a). Student course evaluation (SPOT) summary pages for all courses evaluated during the period under evaluation.

(b). The most recent syllabus from each different course taught during the period under evaluation.

(c). Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and homework sets from select courses.

Candidates are expected to address aspects of their SPOT score summaries in their narrative, especially with regard to changes over time or differences among courses. Candidates should describe actions taken to improve student perceptions. Importantly, these evaluations alone do not provide complete or sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. It has been established that a variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence SPOT scores and the RTP Committee should consider these scores in that light. Nevertheless, some attention to SPOT score evaluations should be present in the candidate's narrative.

The RTP committee shall conduct an evaluation of all available numerical data from student evaluation sheets. This analysis may include a comparison of the candidate's scores with those for the entire department and college.

As part of the review process, class visits shall be made by at least two members of the department RTP committee and to at least two class meetings, preferably of different courses. Ideally, these class visits will be conducted during the semester in which the review takes place. Class visitations shall take place for the entire class period. If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made subsequent to the last RTP action during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be used. At least two observations must be performed during the review period. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in advance if this situation is likely to arise.

In addition to the class peer reviews, the committee shall also consider office hour availability and other instructional and assessment materials in relation to class size and level. If provided, any written comments will be analyzed critically by the RTP committee.

2.1.1.3 Ongoing professional development as a teacher

Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also with pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals.

There should be evidence that the candidate takes an active role in both maintaining the currency of the material in their courses, and in enhancing their teaching approaches used in the classroom or during other instructionally related activities.

The candidate should demonstrate thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant evidence. This may include activities such as classroom visitations, consultations on course improvement, involvement in pedagogical professional development programs, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving

or receiving pedagogical coaching, research or publication in educational journals, or other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness. Ideally, the narrative will include multiple examples of how participation in such activities led to specific changes in instruction.

2.1.1.4. Other criteria

The candidate should act as primary advisor for undergraduate and graduate student research. Mentorship also includes helping students prepare for professional presentations and job interviews, CV/resume/cover letter help, support for job/internship applications and active participation in student organizations, or mentoring research of students from high schools, other colleges, or universities.

Other criteria considered in the evaluation of the candidate's file include development of new curricula; development of innovative course materials or teaching approaches; publications or presentations at professional meetings regarding such innovations; publication of a textbook; conducting assessment of one's instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction; recruitment and retention activities; or other activities that lead to an enhancement of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.2 Ranking

For promotion and tenure (not reappointment), the Department is required to rank candidates in the category of Instructional Activities as (a) Excellent (b) Competent or (c) Deficient. A ranking of Deficient is given if a candidate does not meet the requirements for Competent in any category. For promotion to associate professor, for tenure, and for promotion to professor, teaching must be at least competent. The quality of teaching as the principal instructor for lecture or laboratory classes at multiple levels of coursework will be the most important activity considered in assessment of teaching. Supervision of laboratory sections of courses taught by others, mentoring CSULB students in research activities, and, when it is part of the candidate's assignment, advising will also be evaluated.

2.1.2.1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

(a) Ranking as Competent

The department recognizes that there are a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. The list below provides examples of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category:

To be judged competent for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate for any action must be effective in the following criteria of instruction and instructionally related activities:

- i. Pedagogical approach and method: Courses must be of high quality, and materials must fit within prerequisite sequence, be clear, up to date, use current/modern pedagogical strategies, and grading practices consistent with department expectations. Quality of instruction: Reviews from students (in the form of letters, SPOT scores) should be favorable in relation to the instructor's knowledge, effort, availability, organization and attention to student needs. Instruction and assessment must be consistent with course goals. The narrative should indicate how negative reviews, if any, were considered in revision of course materials.

- ii. Teaching development: Evidence of efforts to improve teaching/mentoring with participating in at least one professional development course. Additional evidence may include publication laboratory manuals, and study guides.
- iii. Student mentorship: Serving as a primary advisor for undergraduate and MS student research is a fundamental element of effective mentorship. Tutoring and assisting students in effective learning strategies is also considered mentorship. When serving on a graduate committee, the Candidate is requested to place this under Service. Additional activities such as career advancement, internship advice, letters of recommendation, CV/resume/cover letter help are also considered to be Service.

b) Ranking as Excellent

To be judged excellent, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must be effective in instruction and instructionally related activities and must successfully complete additional activities that can include, but are not limited to, the following. These activities should be significantly beyond the standards for effectiveness normally expected from faculty.

- i. Exemplary performance in classroom or field instruction
- ii. Extensive revisions of existing courses.
- iii. Development of new courses or programs.
- iv. Exemplary participation in the supervision of undergraduate or graduate research.
- v. Acquisition of funding for instructional projects that lead to curriculum enhancement and innovation.
- vi. Development of innovative curricular materials for use beyond the candidate's own teaching.
- vii. Authorship of a textbook.
- viii. Publication of pedagogical peer-reviewed journal article(s)

2.1.2.2 Promotion to Full Professor

(a) Ranking as Competent

Continued evidence of effective (Learning Outcomes met, engagement by students) instruction and instructionally related activities, based on the criteria outlined in section 2.1.2.1a.

(b) Ranking as Excellent

To be judged excellent in instruction and instructionally related activities, a candidate for promotion to full professor must show significant improvement/updating of existing courses (e.g., implementation of high impact practices, modify grading strategies, etc.) and be competent in all four categories of evaluation and beyond competent in at least two of the above four categories using at least extra arguments from the examples below. It is the burden of the candidate to make a compelling argument:

- development of, and teaching of, new courses or programs outside your specialty
- exemplary undergrad/grad mentorship – e.g., large number of research students (496), or students in research at other departments / schools
- acquisition of funding for instruction innovation
- significant innovation of courses / development of innovated materials for use beyond candidate's own teaching (e.g., material for SERC)
- authorship of a textbook adopted beyond the instructors own courses
- publication of peer-reviewed pedagogical paper
- Award in teaching (internal-university or external)
- Teaching mentorship of junior faculty

- Professional Development – leading workshops/PD courses, or attending one or more professional development courses/workshops outside of the candidate’s home institution

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Faculty members are expected to conduct scholarly research and all candidates for tenure or promotion are required to provide evidence that the candidate can carry out a sustained student-integrated research program at CSULB.

2.2.1 Criteria to be Evaluated

Candidates will address the following criteria in their narratives and provide evidence in supplemental material for support. The narrative submitted by the candidate should describe the overall goals and progress of the scholarly research, followed by documentation of published works, external funding, and student involvement. The narrative should highlight evidence that demonstrates the potential for a sustained research program at CSULB, even if the candidate has arrived with service credit from another institution.

2.2.1.1. Published Works

Peer reviewed publications (or works equivalent in nature) are the primary basis for evaluation. Regardless of the seniority of the authors (first, second, last, etc.), the candidate should explain clearly their role in the conception, development, and documentation of the research. The quality of the journal in which the work was published should be noted. The candidate should document that peer-review was conducted by other knowledgeable scientists in the field, rather than editorial staff. Non-peer reviewed work, such as field guides, published maps, or extended abstracts may also be used as evidence of scholarly activity, but the candidate should explain the impact of these publications on the profession. Products for public consumption such as educational material or outreach publications are generally better documented in service, unless the candidate was specifically hired as a researcher in education.

2.2.1.2 External Funding

College and department operations rely partially upon indirect funds from external funding. The maintenance of a competitive quality graduate student population also benefits greatly from external research. Consequently, although a candidate’s research may not be heavily dependent upon external funding, candidates for tenure are expected to demonstrate the potential for sustaining an externally funded research program. Candidates for promotion are expected to have demonstrated that they have the potential to acquire substantial external funding. Particularly competitive research funding sources, such as the National Science Foundation, further demonstrate the quality of the candidate’s research. The candidate should include in their file program director or reviewer comments of unsuccessful proposals from the period of evaluation.

2.2.1.3 Student Involvement

The core mission of the Department is to train students. Hence, the involvement of undergraduate or graduate students in research is an important component of the evaluation of RSCA. Often, involvement of students in a candidate’s research activities may delay progress to publication or the acquisition of external funding. Such a trade-off should be clearly explained in the narrative, although it will not alter the requirements as explained in the ranking as explained below (2.2.2).

2.2.2 Evaluation and Ranking

During promotion and tenure evaluation, the Department is required to rank candidates in the categories of Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service as (a) Excellent (b) Competent and (c) Deficient. If a candidate does not meet the standards for Competent in any category, they will be rated as Deficient. If a candidate is rated as Deficient in any area of evaluation, a candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion. To be recommended for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of research, scholarly and creative activities. To receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

2.2.2.1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

(a) Ranking as Competent: To be ranked Competent in RSCA toward Associate Professor, there must be clear evidence of sustained and ongoing research in which the candidate has a major responsibility, conducted to a substantial degree while a faculty member at CSULB or at any previous institution for which the candidate received service credit. Evidence of sustained and ongoing research includes peer-reviewed publications, non-peer reviewed publications and conference abstracts, funded and unfunded external grants and contracts. The review committee will place greater weight on peer-reviewed evidence that speaks to the quality and significance of research in the Earth Sciences. A candidate that does not meet the requirements below for Competent will be ranked as Deficient.

To be ranked competent in RSCA, a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of contributions, or equivalent contributions, from each category in the following list:

- i. A publication (or accepted publication) in a peer-reviewed journal resulting from work initiated and conducted during the probationary period. This work must be conceptualized and led by the candidate, as documented by a narrative describing the relative contribution of all authors. The candidate will typically be listed as first or senior author, not including students mentored by the candidate who are listed as author. Copies of peer review should be included in the file.
- ii. A publication (or accepted publication) in a peer-reviewed journal that may be a continuation of work conducted prior to the probationary period but with most of the effort toward the research and publication expended during the probationary period. The candidate need not be a senior author on this publication, but a narrative describing the relative contribution of all authors should be provided. Copies of peer review should be included in the file.
- iii. Evidence of a concerted effort to obtain external research funding through a peer-reviewed award process. Proposal peer-reviews, letters of explanation from program managers, and copies of the proposals themselves may be placed in the dossier as evidence of potential for future acquisition of external funding.
- iv. Involvement of undergraduate or graduate students in research. Conference abstracts or publications with student authors, or registration of students in research credits may be used as evidence of student involvement in RSCA activities.

(b) Ranking as Excellent

To be ranked Excellent in RSCA toward Associate Professor, a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must meet the qualifications listed above to be judged competent and, in addition, present evidence of at least one of the following contributions or their equivalent:

- i. An additional publication (or accepted publication) in a peer-reviewed journal resulting from work initiated and conducted during the probationary period. This work must be

conceptualized and led by the candidate, as documented by a narrative describing the relative contribution of all authors. The candidate should be listed as first or senior author, unless students mentored by the candidate are listed as first or senior author(s). Copies of peer review should be included in the file.

- ii. Acquisition of external research funding through a peer-reviewed award process. The candidate must be the lead PI on this award as defined by the CSULB Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. The award must include some support for student involvement in research, e.g. through stipends, travel, or supplies for student research.

2.2.2.2. Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor

(a) Ranking as Competent

To be judged Competent in RSCA toward promotion to Full Professor, there must be clear evidence of a sustained research program that involves students in a significant portion of activities. Promotion to Full Professor also requires engagement in the candidates professional and/or academic community that brings recognition to the Department and University.

Evidence of sustained and ongoing research including peer-reviewed publications, publications and conference abstracts, funded and unfunded external grants and contracts, or equivalent products. The review committee will place greater weight on peer-reviewed evidence that speaks to the quality and significance of sustained research in the Earth Sciences. A candidate that does not meet the requirements below for Competent will be ranked as Deficient.

To be ranked competent in RSCA, a candidate for tenure and promotion to Full Professor must present evidence of contributions from the following list or their equivalent:

- i. A publication in peer-reviewed journal resulting from work initiated and conducted since promotion to Associate Professor. This work must be conceptualized and led by the candidate, as documented by a narrative describing the relative contribution of all authors. The candidate will typically be listed as first or senior author, not including students mentored by the candidate who are listed as author. Copies of peer review should be included in the file.
- ii. Acquisition of external research funding through a peer-reviewed award process from work initiated and conducted since promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate must be the lead PI on this award as defined by the CSULB Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. The award must include some support for student involvement in research, e.g. through stipends, travel, or supplies for student research.
- iii. Graduation of at least one graduate student and involvement of undergraduate students in RSCA.

(b) Ranking as Excellent

For a ranking of Excellent in RSCA, the candidate for promotion to Professor must have met all requirements for Competent and made substantial contributions beyond those enumerated above in publications and funding acquisition. These contributions must be documented in detail in the RTP file. Examples of additional contributions include:

- i. Additional peer-reviewed original publications in which the candidate is the primary originator of the investigation and its ideas, has carried out a substantial portion of the data interpretation, and has developed the scientific conclusions for the project
- ii. Substantial research-supportive external funding (e.g., large grants or many small grants)
- iii. A substantial body of research contributions that the RTP committee deems equivalent in quality and scope to one of the first two items (e.g., distinguished lecture series, texts

books/guides, organized research cruise, multi-institutional or ambitious research projects).

2.4. Service

Service consists of activities other than teaching and RSCA that result from the candidate's academic expertise and contribute to the mission of the university and the scientific community. Faculty workload includes 3 WTUs of service and thus all faculty are expected to participate in service contributing to the mission and governance of the university, benefiting students, faculty, department, college, university, profession/discipline, and/or community. Of note, service can be divided into compensated and uncompensated. Compensated service includes course release and/or additional pay, and faculty should note in their files when service is compensated. Compensated service does not include that which is covered by the designated 3 WTUs mentioned above. Compensated service must be documented as such, and the narrative must delineate how much time/effort was compensated or not. Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity. Service contributions based on consulting shall be evaluated on the basis of the contributions to the mission of the University and particularly to the Department of Earth Science. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service.

2.4.1. Criteria and Expectations for Service

All faculty members must actively participate in service activities including:

- (i) Contributing to shared governance at the department, college, university or Chancellor's Office levels
- (ii) Mentoring/Advising students in non-research/non-instructional activities.
- (iii) Participating in outreach activities and community engagement resulting in societal benefits (broader impacts parallel)
- (iv) Serving academic/professional community

2.4.1.1 *Contribution to shared governance*

Shared governance is an important and fundamental aspect of maintaining an open environment in the academy and encouraging the pursuit of truth and knowledge. Shared governance depends on active faculty involvement in university service at all academic levels. All faculty in the Earth Science Department must participate in faculty governance. Faculty members who are probationary are normally expected to serve on committees at the departmental and college level. After reappointment, probationary candidates are expected to expand the scope of participation beyond their department, and candidates for promotion to professor are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect of service and to demonstrate willingness to expand their service to University-level committees.

Examples contributing to shared governance:

- Serving on department, college, or university level committees (both *ad hoc* and standing)– narrative must describe role (e.g., member, chair, authorship of documents, reports, and other materials)
- Actively engaging in institutional educational and mentorship programs
- Authorship of college/university documents

2.4.1.2 Non-research/non-instructional support for students

The department recognizes that some faculty engage in service to support individual students that is beyond the scope of teaching, RSCA, or sponsoring student groups. The department also recognizes that certain faculty may be called upon due to their gender, cultural identity, and ethnicity to provide more of this service than other faculty. These types of services help to keep the department functioning and achieve our goals of preparing students for Earth Science careers in industry and teaching; thus, mentoring students in non-research activities is highly encouraged and appreciated.

Examples contributing to non-research/non-instructional mentoring:

- Writing letters of recommendation
- Providing feedback and editing resumes, CVs, cover letters, interview questions, and job application materials
- Applying to state, federal or community grants that provide non-research related resources to CSULB students (e.g. NSF S-STEM grants)
- Fund-raising for student scholarships and capital equipment used in education
- Sponsoring and guiding student groups such as clubs

2.4.1.3 Community outreach and engagement

Engagement and outreach to local, city, and state communities is necessary to keep the public informed and increase Earth Science literacy.

Examples contributing to community engagement and outreach:

- Talks at high schools, community colleges, elementary schools, local governments or community centers
- Participating in/running on-campus outreach activities (e.g., Day at the Beach, Long Beach Promise 5th grade Fridays, freshman showcase, CC visits, Science Live! Open house etc.)
- Leading fieldtrips for alumni/conferences/local societies
- Media interviews
- Participation in alumni events/outreach (e.g., hosting gatherings, newsletter, Instagram, letters, LinkedIn email posts)

2.4.1.4 Professional Service

Faculty members must participate in service to professional organizations and in professionally related activities at local, state, national, or international levels.

Examples contributing to discipline specific professional service:

- Reviewing manuscripts, proposals, textbooks
- Leading workshops
- Giving invited lectures
- Convening/chairing sessions conducted at regional, national, and international meetings or congresses
- Board/panel membership for professional society committees
- Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline
- Leading fieldtrips for alumni/conferences/local societies,
- External reviewer for tenure at other institution

2.4.2. Evaluation of Service

Faculty members must participate actively in faculty governance through involvement on department and college level committees to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor. The emphasis in the evaluation of service shall be on: 1) the quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions of the university, the college, and the department, especially its commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and access; and 2) the extent and level of the candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service.

The department recognizes the variety of service activities taken on by faculty and encourages candidates to use the examples listed above to provide evidence for participation. To aid in evaluating the merits of various service activities related to committee work, the department suggests that the candidate's narrative describes their role within the committee (e.g., member, chair) as well as the purpose of the committee, provide evidence of the work completed by the committee (e.g., authorship of documents, reports, and successful selection of candidate for a position), and amount of time spent on the activities (including time in meetings, frequency of meetings, and any time spent outside of meetings).

2.4.3 Ranking of Service

The Department is required to rank candidates in the categories of Service as (a) Excellent (b) Competent and (c) Deficient during promotion and tenure. Ranking is not required during reappointment.

2.4.3.1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

(a) Ranking as Competent

To be judged competent a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor should be consistently engaged in service with contributions to each of the 4 expectation categories (above).

(b) Ranking as Excellent

To be judged excellent a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor must exceed the requirements for a competent rating by carrying out additional significant and impactful activities (e.g. Chairing certain committees) with priority on building professional service. To be considered impactful the narrative must include evidence of far-reaching and/or lasting impact.

(c) Ranking as Deficient

If the requirements for the competent level have not been met, a candidate will be judged as deficient in service.

2.4.3.2 Promotion to Full professor

A faculty member being considered for promotion to full professor must demonstrate significant service at the college, university, or CSU system level. A candidate's service to their respective profession will be given consideration. Candidates are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect of service.

(a) Ranking as Competent

To be judged competent a candidate for promotion to professor must have a level of service that has increased substantially both in depth, in terms of overall commitment, and breadth, in terms of active university service outside the department, since promotion or appointment to associate professor. The candidate must maintain participation in each of the 4 expectation

categories (above). Priority should transition from emphasis on professional community service to building internal/university service.

(b) Ranking as Excellent

To be judged excellent in service a candidate for promotion to professor must have an extensive active service record that includes multiple leadership roles, such as chairing critical college or university councils/committees, organizing professional conference sessions, and serving as officers in professional societies.

(c) Ranking as Deficient

If the requirements for competent level have not been met, a candidate will be judged as deficient in service.

3. THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process governed by this document include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, and the Dean. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, and the dean. In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate Responsibilities

3.1.1 Candidates should consult the university RTP policy and mission statements of the college and university. A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional training opportunities and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

3.1.2 The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

Faculty achievements may vary among colleagues and still meet the standards consistent with the department for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence in their narrative of how their activities meet these standards.

3.1.3 The CNSM candidate's narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins). In addition to the material above, the narrative should include a discussion of how the candidate addressed any substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.

3.2 Department RTP Committee

3.2.1 The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for evaluating the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.

3.2.2 The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

- a) The Department of Earth Science RTP Committee shall not exist as a standing committee and will be formed as needed.
- b) The minimum number of faculty members on the department RTP committee will be three.
- c) The committee will be elected among tenured faculty by secret ballot in which all tenured and probationary faculty members in the department are eligible to vote. A vote will be deemed unnecessary if the number of eligible faculty is only three. If the number of eligible faculty is less than three, additional faculty will be requested from another department. If an elected member resigns or otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which they were elected, and if the resignation reduces the number of committee members below the required three, then the department will elect a replacement to serve the rest of the unexpired term.
- d) The department chair may be elected to the department RTP committee. If elected, the department chair cannot write a separate evaluation for any candidate being considered for RTP action during that academic year.

3.2.3 No single individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops, equity workshops, and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

3.3. Department Chair Responsibilities

3.3.1 The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring. The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university processes and procedures.

3.3.2 Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4 College RTP Committee

3.4.1 The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee must take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

3.4.2 The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.

3.5 Dean of the College

3.5.1 The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, facilitates mechanisms for guiding/mentoring candidates in the RTP process, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

3.5.2 The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

Consult the university RTP policy.

5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

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

5.2. Awarding of Tenure

Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is awarded when the candidate has demonstrated sustained and ongoing and distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure recommendations are based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's overall record of accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the continuation of this record.

5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of RSCA.

5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in Section 2.1.1 of this policy.

5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue making distinguished contributions in RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in Section 2.2.1 of this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the departmental standards for assessment of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments. All levels of review will use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.

5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in service are listed in Section 2.4 of this policy.

5.4. Promotion to Professor

5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the departmental RTP policy. A professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or

international level. In addition, a professor shall have provided significant service and leadership on campus and service in the community or the profession.

5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion

5.5.1. A potential candidate should seek (and receive) initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons as in 5.5.2. A candidate for early tenure and promotion must also be rated as excellent in all three categories, as stated in department RTP policies.

The University Policy states: "a candidate [for early tenure or promotion] must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways."

The college interprets this as meaning achieving a rating of "excellent" in each of the three categories and exceeding a rating of "excellent" in substantial ways in at least one of these categories. It must also include at least one exceptional circumstance and compelling reason as described in 5.5.2.

5.5.2. Examples of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons: (the list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category):

- (a). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality teaching (e.g. major teaching award, primary author on a college-level textbook).
- (b). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality service.
- (c). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality RSCA (e.g. NSF or NASA Career Award).
- (d). Grant success well beyond what is typical in the discipline for rank (e.g., multi-institution grant).
- (e). Extremely prominent publications in highly ranked journals.
- (f). Leading the creation of a significant new curricular or instructionally-related program (beyond the creation of courses).

5.5.3. Exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons shall occur within the evaluation period and while the candidate is a CSULB faculty member.

5.5.4. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

5.5.4.1. In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the current Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

5.5.4.2. Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

6. Steps in the RTP Process

Consult the college RTP policy which follows the University policy.

7. Additional Processes

Consult the college RTP policy which follows the University policy.

8. Joint Appointments

All information in this policy applies to a faculty member appointed jointly to two or more departments. The departments involved must maintain a clear set of requirements for tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the dean(s).

9. Changes and Amendments to the Departmental RTP Policy

Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members of the department voting in a secret ballot.