CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
Department of Family and Consumer Sciences
College of Health and Human Services
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) *and its faculty are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. In addition,* FCS *promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the* department *establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP).*

Evaluation of faculty at all levels of review shall take into consideration the diversity of expertise within the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences and the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS). The department recognizes this diversity as a source of strength that enables the department and college to grow in stature.

In this Department RTP Policy, the CHHS document serves as the foundation. *Portions of the University RTP Policy that are critical for clarity and emphasis are included. All University RTP Policy insertions in the College RTP Policy are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the University and College policies. Portions of the University RTP Policy not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the original University Policy.*

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 CSULB Mission, Vision, and Values

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world. In service to the university's mission, the CHHS seeks to be nationally and internationally recognized as an innovator and leader in community connections, the discovery of knowledge, and for educating diverse students in the health and human services professions.

Mission

CSULB enriches the lives of its students and its surrounding community through globally informed, high-impact educational experiences with superior teaching, research, creative activity and action for the public good.

Vision
California State University, Long Beach will be a force for good at the forefront of public education in California and the world.

Values
Teaching and learning are at the center of who we are and all we do.
Compassion, creativity and innovation characterize our culture.
Diversity is our strength.
The public good is our responsibility.

Department Mission, Vision, and Values

Mission
To advance equity, embrace diversity, and promote social justice to enhance quality of life for all individuals, families, and communities.

Vision
We envision a world where collaboration, innovation, and knowledge drive lasting solutions to social challenges, creating a future of inclusive communities and equal opportunities for all.

Values
Equity and Social Justice. We are committed to dismantling barriers and advancing policies and practices that promote fairness and inclusivity.
Multidisciplinary Collaboration. We integrate knowledge from diverse fields to create holistic solutions for complex societal issues.
Lifelong Well-Being. We prioritize research and education that support individuals and families across all stages of life.
Community Engagement. We actively partner with communities to develop culturally responsive and impactful initiatives.
Innovation and Excellence. We strive for academic and professional excellence through continuous learning, research, and creative problem-solving

The Department supports efforts that address diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of its operation, including classroom instruction and evaluation of faculty. The FCS Department recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within faculty evaluation areas. Mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. The FCS Department recognizes that service activities -- whether academic or personal, supporting faculty or students -- may be difficult for candidates to document.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

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

1.2.1 *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the academic unit (e.g., school, department, or program), college, university, community, and the profession. In concurrence with University RTP policy, the CHHS RTP policy provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing for flexibility to recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual disciplines.*

1.2.2 *RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels. Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.*

1.2.3 *Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.*

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

1.2.5 *All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the academic unit, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior.*

1.3 **Governing Documents**

1.3.1 The college adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of the Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 09-10) and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA or the university RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

1.3.2 Academic units within the college shall adopt RTP policies that elaborate on discipline-specific standards in all areas of evaluation. The standards adopted at the academic-unit level shall not be lower than university-level or college-level standards. If any provision of an academic unit RTP Policy conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university RTP Policy, or the RTP policy of the CHHS, the specific conflicting

provision shall be severed from the rest of the academic unit's RTP Policy, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

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

1.4 Obligations
All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and academic unit RTP policies. In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.5 Standards
Recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or directors of academic units (if submitted) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit. Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated ongoing *excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.*

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks
RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by each academic unit. Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The RTP policy of each academic unit applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria.

1.7 Narrative
In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements. Thus, it should address not only achievements, but also responsiveness to comments made by previous reviewers (with the exception of the initial candidate's review).

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

In addition to following the minimum standards that have been developed by the university and the college, academic units are responsible for defining further the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of both the university and the college. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the

university, in the community, and in the profession. The standards and criteria adopted at the academic-unit level shall not be lower than standards specified in this document.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities
Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to: curriculum development; academic and academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and related activities involving student learning and student engagement.

Activities associated with diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) are also a valuable component of teaching and student learning and may include: culturally responsive teaching, addressing implicit bias, equitable resource allocation, or diversifying curriculum content. Faculty are encouraged to address belongingness in their classrooms.

Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to: mentoring students; taking students on field trips or abroad for academic and cultural study; community outreach; *and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.* The FCS Department recognizes that study abroad activities are primarily instructionally related. However, study abroad activities may lead to student homesickness, language barriers, financial challenges, ethical dilemmas, harassment, etc. In addition, faculty may collaborate with professional organizations or networks to plan study abroad offerings. Faculty activities to alleviate or address these issues or to develop professional development opportunities may be considered as service-related and described accordingly in the narrative.

Faculty members must provide a list of courses taught during each semester of review. The list must include a description of any reassigned time that takes the place of teaching load.

CSULB recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CSULB also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:
- *continuous professional learning,*
- *thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction (formative assessment), and*
- *the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the*

achievement of course goals (summative assessment).

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members.   Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments.

Within their supporting documentation, candidates should provide evidence documenting this professional learning. Evidence supporting the narrative could include, but is not limited to, participation in on or off campus professional development activities, conferences, and lessons learned observing or discussing the instruction of peers.

Thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness are expected of all CHHS faculty. This pattern of change should be described in the candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials. These actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

> *(1)   Regular interactions with colleagues regarding various pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development.*

> *(2)   Developing innovative approaches to teaching; fostering increased student learning in the classroom; and participating in the evaluation of instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.*

> *(3)   Involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center; teaching-development seminars or conferences sponsored by the academic unit, college, university or relevant professional organizations; and formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.*

> *(4)   Development of new curriculum, instructional programs or materials, including electronic or multimedia instructional software or new advising materials or programs.*

2.1.2 Reflection & Institutional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective instruction requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning. Effective

teaching is thoughtful teaching. Deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and change their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate the need to do so.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and the committees should consider) their formative assessment practices, including: (1) discussion of one or more course goals, aims, or practices the candidate decided to change, (2) the evidence alerting the candidate something needed to change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided the course(s) would change.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes, and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes. Candidates may choose to keep a list of reflections for each semester of review, indicating changes they made in their courses, what prompted those changes, and a reflection on impacts of the change. This reflective narrative can cross-reference supporting material (syllabi, assignments, etc.).

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

Effective instruction engages and helps students learn the desired course outcomes. Instructional methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) effective instructional strategies for student learning.

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

2.1.3a Student Learning Outcomes

Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. Where candidates have made improvements to outcomes, goals, and/or assessments, these should be discussed in the narrative by the candidate with corresponding evidence. This reflection could be included in the list of reflections for each semester.

2.1.3b Syllabi

Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file, along with narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to syllabi.

At a minimum, course syllabi should adhere to current Senate syllabus and grading policies. Effective course syllabi:

- include a detailed description of the requirements of each assignment;
- explain how the student's performance will be assessed (e.g., scoring rubrics, score card, rating scale, or checklist, etc.);
- explain how the score on each requirement will contribute to the student's course grade

Note: If exams are used, examples of exam questions, linked to the student learning outcomes they assess, should be included.

2.1.3c Grade Distributions

Grade distributions of courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file along with narrative discussion of grading in courses. When assessing course grade distributions, evaluators compare the candidate's means for a given class to those for the department and college as a whole at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels as appropriate. The candidate should explain departures from those averages.

2.1.3d Student Response to Instruction

(a) Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness, and utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to instruction. Nevertheless, student course evaluations shall be used by the Department RTP committee to evaluate student response to instruction, among other evidence. All academic year (fall and spring) student course evaluations during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file. Candidates should demonstrate in their narrative deliberate efforts to improve instruction based on student course evaluations.

Faculty are also encouraged to explain scores that are significantly below department means. This could include changes in the course that might have impacted scores and actions faculty have taken to address low scores.

If one written student comment is referenced in the narrative, all original student perception of teaching forms for that course must be submitted in the faculty member's supplemental materials.

2.1.3e Peer Evaluations

(a) Effective classroom sessions, at a basic level, should include: a) an introduction, b) objective and rationale, c) content (a means of providing information), d) guided practice for students to apply the knowledge in class with the instructor's assistance, e) assessment (e.g. class discussion, group work, labs, or journal entries), and f) closure (wrapping up the session by having students indicate what they have learned).

(b) Classroom sessions should be evaluated on some or all of the following aspects (using FCS Peer Evaluation form): a) organization and preparation, b) teaching to multiple and cultural groups, c) varied instructional methods, d) standards and academic rigor, e) connection between the instructor and students; and, f) genuine student engagement, interest, and motivation. If a faculty member teaches online or hybrid courses during the fall or spring semesters, at least one of these courses should include a peer evaluation in the period of review. The FCS Peer Evaluation Form for Online Instruction should be used in this case. Peer evaluators should be different each term, and include a diversity of classes. For candidates under review for promotion to Associate Professor, at least 5 classes should undergo a peer evaluation. For candidates under review for promotion to Full Professor, at least 3 classes should undergo a peer evaluation; evaluations should be completed in the five years prior to submission of the evaluation. This evaluation can include a classroom visit, a review of an online module, an assessment of course assignments and grading criteria, an assessment of student feedback, etc. A minimum of three peer evaluations should be classroom visits for either type of promotion.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Having varied topical coverage in one's research agenda is appropriate when the candidate makes a connection between their research agenda and the advancement of the discipline.

Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to, manuscripts that are reviewed by professional peers, books, scholarly book chapters, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, artistic exhibits or performances, and awarded grants or contracts (whether funded or not). It is imperative that the candidates explain their contribution (for example, what percentage of work is contributed by each author) to the publication and the publication's contribution to the discipline (e.g. impact factor, acceptance rate, audience and the scope, or using appropriate journal metrics that demonstrate

journal credentials). In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

Variability due to intense service roles
There may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in service, such as serving as the department chair, associate chair, program coordinator, or in a position of chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committee with significant workload. In such cases the reduction in scholarship should not be counted against the candidate, but there should be evidence that the candidate's scholarly activity has been maintained to some degree and has promise for full resumption when the other activities return to normal levels.

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines
Evaluation criteria should recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and values discussed in section 1, including the importance of involving students in RSCA.

The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Consistent with University expectations of all faculty members, RTP candidates within the CHHS must demonstrate achievements in research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in this Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in the RTP policies of their respective departments. When developing such policies, departments shall incorporate the standards specified below in subsections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

2.2.2 Research
*RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Examples below **should not** be construed as exhaustive or recommended:*
- *Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.*
- *Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge.*

Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.

- *Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.*

- *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.*

The following are expectations for typical progression for retention, tenure, and promotion:

Reappointment
- 1 peer-reviewed manuscript or justified substitution and
- 2 presentations, non-peer-reviewed publications, workshops, grants or other forms of RSCA (refer to 2.2.2 b, c, d & e below)

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
- 3 peer-reviewed manuscripts or justified substitutions. At least 1 publication should be as first author and/or corresponding author with at least 50% contribution; one of the 3 publications may be a peer-reviewed book chapter.
- 4 other forms of RSCA, including presentations, books/book chapters, non-peer reviewed publications, workshops, grants, creative designs, or other supplemental RSCA (refer to 2.2.2 b, c, d & e below).
- If the manuscript is published in a language other than English, then a 1-2 page extended abstract in English is required. The extended abstract should contain substantive information about the paper, including the purpose and rationale, method, results, and references.
- Note: For peer-reviewed manuscripts and other forms of RSCA, the candidate must supply information about the importance and value (e.g., impact factor, journal index, acceptance rate, affiliation with discipline-specific professional organizations, citation score, etc.) of each piece, and their role in its development.

Promotion to Full Professor
- 4 peer-reviewed manuscripts since last promotion or justified substitution.
  At least 1 publication should be as first author and/or corresponding author with at least 50% contribution; one of the 3 publications may be a peer-reviewed book chapter.
- 4 other forms of RSCA, including presentations, books/book chapters, non-peer-reviewed publications, workshops, grants, creative designs, or other supplemental RSCA since last promotion (refer to 2.2.2 b, c, d & e below)
- If the manuscript is published in a language other than English, then a 1-2 page extended abstract in English is required. The extended abstract should contain substantive information about the paper, including the purpose and rationale, method, results, and references.
- Note: For peer-reviewed manuscripts and other forms of RSCA, the candidate must supply information about the importance and value (e.g., impact factor, journal index, acceptance rate, affiliation with discipline-specific professional organizations, citation score, etc.) of each piece, and their role in its development.

(a) As used in this document, "research" involves scientific, clinical, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as, where appropriate, legal or policy analysis, clinical practice scholarship, or secondary data analysis) that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment or qualitative research methods such as critical and interpretive theory. For multiple use data sets, candidates should indicate the uniqueness of each paper. When developing a conference presentation into a publication, the candidate should discuss how the paper has evolved over time.

(b) Other forms of scholarly and creative activity are valued and strengthen the candidate's portfolio. RSCA items in this category may or may not present original work. Anonymously reviewed works are more highly valued in this category. (Examples include but are not limited to: textbooks, invited manuscripts, research presentations at conferences, poster presentations at conferences, books/book chapters, internal/external grants, reviewed juried shows or exhibitions, creative designs/projects, market generated product designs, patents, program evaluations, and technical reports). Creative designs/projects may include costume designs, fashion designs, software development, filmmaking, videography, etc. Examples include:
  - **Visual creative works:** Installations, publications, or distribution of digital art created by the professor that demonstrate originality, technical skill, and intellectual depth. These pieces may reflect the professor's teaching, research, service, critical thinking, and theories within their academic field. *Measurable Definition:*

> *Originality and innovation can be assessed through exhibition history (number of galleries, solo shows, extent of distribution), recognition (awards, grants), and critical reception (reviews in reputable art journals).*

- **Media Projects:** Film, video installations, or digital performances created by a professor as a form of scholarly creative expression. *Measurable Definition: Distribution metrics (number of screenings, online views), critical reception (reviews in film or media journals), and academic citation in interdisciplinary studies.*

(c) Securing external funds to support RSCA is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support RSCA (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored RSCA funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank. Securing such sponsored opportunities, though, shall constitute an enhancing criterion that is given positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities. The award of sponsored funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the entirety of the probationary period, merely applying for sponsored opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills.

During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related scholarly activities, allowances should be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly manuscripts. Such allowances must recognize that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming and, therefore, publication of the results of such activity may be delayed until after an extensive data-collection and analysis process. Candidates for promotion to full professor are encouraged to provide evidence of externally funded grants.

(d) RSCAs that strengthen a candidate's file in FCS, but are not alone sufficient, are activities that are not generally peer-reviewed, but could be either editorially reviewed, or valued for other contributions to the discipline (e.g. instructor manuals, editorial published work, solo exhibitions, original work included in collections, books/ book chapters).

(e) The candidate should increasingly demonstrate the ability to contribute to the theoretical edifice of their discipline. Both solo and collaborative production are valued. However, in collaborative authorship, it is expected as a candidate progresses through the ranks from assistant to associate to full professor that the candidate will engage in significant contributions to the RSCA products (e.g. 50% or greater).

(f) Mentorship of students in RSCA is also highly valued, and should be highlighted in the RSCA section.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA
Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to disseminate their research and other scholarly and creative activities to appropriate audiences through discipline-specific (or relevant interdisciplinary), peer reviewed publications and scholarly presentations.
(a)   Publication of scholarly and creative works is required of all candidates.
(b)   Conference proceedings and presentations, as well as other conference-related exhibitions and creative activities strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank.

2.3 Service
Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to engage actively in faculty governance by collaborating effectively and productively with their colleagues.

At all levels, the quality and extent of participation in service activities will be given greater importance than the sheer number of committees on which candidates serve.

2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments
FCS faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession. Quality service means active participation and contribution to the committee a candidate serves. Membership and attendance alone are not sufficient. Documentation of the candidate's contributions to committee output produced should be provided.

The FCS Department recognizes that social inequalities impact educational opportunities. Accordingly, activities that promote social justice and belongingness are valued. These include activities that promote empathy, justice, and equality; awareness of important societal issues; challenges and responses to social injustices; and the examination of structural features that contribute to oppression. Faculty are encouraged to include these activities in their service work.

Note about compensated service: Service that is compensated with reassigned time should be noted as such in the RTP file. Compensated service that reduces teaching load does not take the place of other service roles required for promotion and tenure. 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.

(a)   *The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience.*
     (1)   During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty

14

members are not required to participate in college and university service; however, they are expected to perform quality service at the department level.

(2) For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make high-quality service contributions to the department, and to either the college or university. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have made quality service contributions to the community and/or to the profession.

(3) For promotion to the rank of Full Professor (consistent with Section 5.4 of the University RTP policy and Section 5.4 of this Policy governing the CHHS), faculty members are required to have provided significant (substantive) service record that includes: (1) service at the department, college, and university levels; (2) record of leadership at the University; and (3) record of service in the community and/or the profession. Leadership role may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g. committee chair) and/or active engagement in faculty governance (e.g. active participation in accreditation or policy writing processes). Refer to 2.4.1 (a) for details.

(b) If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member. Such community service may include consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations. Parallel to the Department's mission, candidates should participate in service which utilizes their area of expertise to improve the lives of individuals and families across the life span.

(c) Service to the profession may include elected leadership positions, organizing workshops, conferences, symposiums, speeches, media interviews, news/media articles, and/or editorships; performances and/or displays; and/or professional committees, reviews of abstracts for conferences, as well as reviews of manuscripts for journal publications. The RTP committee recognizes that leadership in a professional or community organization counts as exceeding service requirements for promotion to Professor.

Candidates may strengthen their required program of service with editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments
The quality of contributions to service is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in Section 2.3.1.

2.4 Evaluation of Service

2.4.1 Candidate's Responsibility
Candidates must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions and address the significance and impact of service. The candidate must address dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.

(a) Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance. In addition to documenting their attendance and participation in the department of FCS, candidates should detail the nature of the position and the committee. Membership and attendance alone are not sufficient. Documentation of the candidate's contributions to committee output produced should be provided.

(b) Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the quality and quantity of the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.

(c) Candidates (in their narratives) and evaluation committees (in their evaluations) should carefully consider the connection between cultural/identity taxation and service, when relevant.

Candidates who face cultural/identity taxation may choose to address this in their narratives, explaining how their service responsibilities are heightened due to their positionality, and how their service obligations may surpass typical expectations because of their marginalized or minoritized identities. Although it is not always easy to quantify, the increased service workload taken on by these faculty members can be described in terms of the impact their contributions have had on their department, college, university, community, and/or discipline. Faculty may choose to explain in their narratives how their unique circumstances intersected with the needs of the campus community during the review period, emphasizing how this may have impacted their work performance.

2.4.2 Quality of Participation
The evaluation of service shall be based on the quality and significance of the service activity. Relevant factors include, but are not limited to, the nature of the service commitment; the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, College, and the department of FCS*; the depth/extent of the candidate's involvement and contribution to the service activity; and the degree of the candidate's leadership in the service activity.*

Evaluating committees should recognize that many faculty experience various forms of cultural/identity taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring, and other activities on and off campus that are essential to the mission of the university. The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is the responsibility of evaluating committees to contextualize this service, and to recognize extraordinary service accomplishments that are tied to cultural/identity taxation.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

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

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

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate
A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional trainings and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.
The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college- level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.

The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.

3.3 Department RTP Committee
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.

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

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

Within each academic unit (e.g., department or school), all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.

3.3.1 Election of Department Committee
The tenured and probationary faculty members of an academic unit elect representatives to their unit's RTP committee.

(a) The committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full- time

faculty members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be comprised of tenured Associate and Full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be comprised of tenured Full Professors.

(b) Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on an academic unit RTP committee.

(c) Chairs or directors of academic units may serve as members of their unit RTP committee, if elected. However, if they serve as a member of the academic unit RTP committee, they may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this document. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, chairs or directors of academic units may not sit with an academic unit RTP committee during the time that it is considering their own materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

3.3.2 Committee Composition
(a) *Members of academic unit RTP committees who participate in promotion recommendations must not only be tenured, but also must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. Moreover, they must not themselves be candidates for promotion.*

(b) *Within each academic unit, all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.*

3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability
(a) *The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.*

(b) *Candidates may request a meeting after the review to discuss recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit if the chair wrote a review. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations.*

3.3.4 Ad Hoc Committees
If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit

RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

(a)   Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.

(b)   After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election.

3.3.5 Joint Appointments
Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy Statement 94-11.

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

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

Please reference College RTP document for College, Dean, Provost, and President responsibilities.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members undergo performance review and evaluation. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five

(5) years.

The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.

4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment
4.1.1 Periodic Review
In the first year and second years of service, as well as in successive probationary years during which a candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review is conducted by the academic unit RTP committee, the chair or director of the academic unit, and the college Dean. The periodic review provides guidance for professional development, especially with regard to the candidate's progress toward reappointment and, later, tenure. Thus, periodic reviews shall commend probationary faculty member for meeting or exceeding expectations in the relevant areas of review, while providing written guidance for making improvements in areas which need strengthening.

4.1.2 Reappointment Review
In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years.

4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion
In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service) the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion.

A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion
An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to the rank of Professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured Associate Professor, however, may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in accordance with the provisions Early Tenure or Early Promotion of Section 5.5. Standards for promotion to Full Professor for faculty shall be higher than those for Associate Professor. Candidates should describe how they have met all requirements related to each area of evaluation in the narrative with supporting evidence since achieving tenure.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a

given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in relevant Academic Senate policy documents.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty
The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he or she is making significant progress toward tenure. Based upon criteria established by the academic unit and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. Candidates are expected to show progress in their program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the academic unit level and consistent with academic unit and college service expectations.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure
The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.

The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, college, and the university. For review of an Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor normally are awarded together.

5.3   Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor
An Associate Professor is expected to be an excellent teacher who is highly effective in the classroom, fosters quality learning experiences, and is responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA. Candidates are expected to have produced high- quality peer reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Standards for promotion to the rank of Professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to Associate Professor. A Full Professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development. Successful candidates 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. Candidates are expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer reviewed work at the national or international levels. In addition, a Full Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university, as well as either in the community or to the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

Potential candidates shall receive initial guidance from the chair or director of their academic unit and the 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 with the Dean's and Chair's documented support. Assistant Professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Tenured Associate Professors may apply for early promotion to the rank of Full Professor. However, non-tenured faculty members who hold the rank of Associate Professor may not apply for early promotion to Full Professor without also seeking early tenure.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the academic unit and college policies. Criteria for exceeding requirements for promotion to Associate Professor include:
- Teaching: At least two peer evaluations from faculty outside of the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences must be included.

These evaluators should be carefully selected to add depth to the evaluation of the candidate's teaching. A statement of why the recommender was selected is to be included. To be considered for early promotion to Associate Professor, a minimum of 6 WTUs per semester must be taught in the period of review.

- RSCA: A minimum of 8 peer-reviewed publications and 8 other forms of RSCA (or justification for equivalencies) are required.
- Service: The candidate must have contributed significantly to both college and university committees.

Criteria for exceeding requirements for promotion to Full Professor include:

- Teaching: At least two peer evaluations from faculty outside of the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences must be included. These evaluators should be carefully selected to add depth to evaluation of the candidate's teaching. A statement of why the recommender was selected is to be included. To be considered for early promotion to Full Professor, a minimum of 6 WTUs per semester must be taught.
- RSCA: A minimum of 10 peer-reviewed publications and 8 other forms of RSCA (or justification for equivalencies) are required in the period of review.
- Service: The candidate must have held a significant leadership position in a university, professional, or community organization, such as serving on the editorial board for a journal. Leadership in a professional organization also counts.

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

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.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

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

6.2 *The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.*

6.3 *Academic units shall post in their offices a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The chairperson of the academic unit RTP committee prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.*

6.4 *Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the academic unit RTP committee by the deadline.*

6.5 *The academic unit RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.*

6.6 *The chair or director of the academic unit, if eligible and if not an elected member of the academic unit RTP committee, may review the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.*

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

6.8 *The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.*

6.9 *The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.*

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

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

7.2 *If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.* Moreover, if anything is added when the file is at the

CHHS level of review, it must go back to the department level for review.

7.3 *At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as to any previous review levels.*

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

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

8.1 Ratification
Pursuant to Section 3.5.1, this policy must be approved the FCS *faculty under the terms and conditions specified in Sections 8.3.1 to 8.3.3 below. This document should be reviewed regularly by FCS Faculty to maintain currency and accuracy. Following approval by the FCS faculty, the CHHS Faculty Council, CHHS Dean, and Provost will approve the document for implementation.*

8.2 University Approval of this Document
The RTP policies and procedures of the academic units and the college are subject to the review and approval of the Provost.

8.3 Amendments
Amendments to this document may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the entire full-time tenured and probationary faculty of the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences*. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Dean* (either directly or through the Department Chair) *shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the* FCS *faculty at least two weeks prior to voting.*

8.3.1 Voting
Voting on amendments shall be by secret ballot of the preceding academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CBA.

8.3.2 Majority Approval Required
To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean and the Provost.

8.3.3 Voting Rights
Tenured and probationary faculty in FCS*, including those on leave and those participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) during a semester of active service, are eligible to vote on RTP policy matters.*