

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY
POLICY EFFECTIVE FALL 2025**

The purpose of the Department of Geography Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Policy is to guide candidates in meeting the University and College of Liberal Arts (CLA) expectations in the RTP process by clarifying their meaning in the specific disciplinary and departmental context of Geography at CSULB. Candidates should consult both the University and CLA policies and align their file and narrative with these expectations while consulting this policy for departmental and disciplinary guidance. This policy retains the CLA RTP document section numbering for reference. *Only sections where we add clarification to the CLA document are referenced.*

2.1 INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Department of Geography recognizes that, as part of our instructional practices, faculty continually engage in adapting and refining their pedagogical practice. Instructional activities extend beyond the classroom to include mentoring students, supporting student involvement in research, and guiding special projects.

2.1.1.2 Optional Materials

- a. *Peer observation of instruction*: The department encourages faculty to request an optional peer observation of instruction as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) as one way to address student course evaluations (SPOTs) that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level. (For more explanation See section 2.1.3.3.). The peer evaluation can be included in the RTP file at the candidate's discretion.
- b. *Written remarks on student course evaluations*: The department encourages faculty to submit written remarks on student evaluations as one optional method for explaining evaluations that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level, or for offering evidence of a candidate's experience of cultural and identity taxation (refer to CLA document Section 2.1.3.3).

Section 2.1.3: Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching

In the narrative, Geography candidates should address at least one course taught during the period of review to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in the three required categories of "Effective Teaching" -- *Continuous Professional Learning (2.1.3.1)*, *Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction (2.1.3.2)*, *Fostering Student Learning and Achievement of Course Goals (2.1.3.3)*. While we encourage candidates to discuss more than one course, if a candidate chooses to focus on a single course for examples that meet each of these three categories, they should provide a rationale for doing so. In such cases, depth is preferred over breadth.

2.1.3.1 Continuous Professional Learning

In addition to the required documentation in the CLA and University policies, optional peer observation(s) of instruction is appropriate to include here when used to document engagement in continuous learning.

2.1.3.2 Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction

Candidates should select at least one course taught more than once during the review period and provide supplemental material to illustrate their reflective and adaptive teaching practices. In addition to the examples provided in the CLA document, the Department offers the following examples of supplemental documentation.

- Changes in course materials or methods based on newly acquired knowledge (e.g. incorporating results of research, updating courses based on new technologies, and updating course(s) based on continuous professional learning).

- Adjustments to course structure or content in response to evolving disciplinary knowledge.
- Implementation of new teaching techniques aimed at improving student engagement and learning outcomes.
- Changes in curriculum or instructional methods based on student feedback or assessment data.

2.1.3.3 Fostering Student Learning and Achievement of Course Goals

Per the CLA RTP policy, quantitative course evaluation summaries (i.e., SPOTs) are one among several ways to measure instructional effectiveness and should be evaluated relative to context as explained in the CLA RTP policy (2.1.3.3 a-d.). Department RTP evaluation committees should discuss, but are not required to privilege, SPOTs, especially if response rates are low. In the narrative, candidates are encouraged to comment on considerable departures from departmental or college norms in their teaching evaluations and/or grade distributions. The following guidance is provided to help candidates determine when such departures warrant additional commentary.

- *Student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level:*
SPOT evaluations can be expected to vary both above and below department and/or college means through simple sampling error effects. The Department is concerned only when the magnitude of these fluctuations varies *substantially* below peer means. In such cases, candidates should discuss class circumstances that explain the variation in their narrative.
- *Grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.*
Classes vary in the composition of the students enrolled in them, so it can be expected that some of a candidate's mean GPAs will be higher or lower than peer mean GPAs for a given class level and, thus, do not warrant commentary. If the departures substantially vary above or below the departmental means for a given course level, the candidate should explain the variation in their narrative. For example, a candidate could discuss that they follow a mastery pedagogy offering multiple opportunities for revision leading to higher GPAs.

2.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)

The Department of Geography identifies two specific RSCA expectations and enhancing criteria. A candidate's narrative will discuss how these expectations have been met and/or exceeded.

Expectation 1: Peer Reviewed Scholarship Requirements

The Geography candidate for tenure and promotion to **Associate Professor** shall have produced a minimum of three (3) peer-reviewed RSCA products, one of which must be from the following list (or provide justifiable equivalencies).

- Original research in a peer reviewed publication, including co-authored pieces to which the candidate demonstrates having made a major contribution
- Review Article
- Meta Analysis
- Scholarly book (e.g. a single-authored refereed monograph or manuscript in an academic press)
- Book chapter based on original research

The other two (2) required RSCA products may be from the above list, any RSCA products included in the CLA/University categories and/or an externally funded grant in which the candidate is a Principal Investigator. For candidates serving as a Co-PI on a funded grant proposal, to count in this category their role in the grant must be clearly articulated in the narrative and supporting documentation from the PI.

86 **Expectation 2: Dissemination of RSCA**

87 To demonstrate ongoing engagement in and contributions to the discipline, the candidate for promotion shall have
88 given a minimum of two (2) presentations of RSCA findings international, national, regional or local conferences
89 either in person or virtual, or alternative venues for disseminating RSCA. We expect funding support from the
90 institution to assist candidates in satisfying this expectation.

91 **Enhancing RSCA**

92 The purpose of enhancing RSCA is for a candidate to demonstrate continuous engagement in and
93 contributions to the discipline to enhance an RTP case. Candidates must explain their specific contribution
94 and differentiate if counted under different categories or if components apply to various areas.

- 95 ■ Additional RSCA products from Expectation 1.
- 96 ■ Additional RSCA dissemination
- 97 ■ Unfunded external grant proposals
- 98 ■ Peer-Reviewed conference proceedings
- 99 ■ Peer-Reviewed White Papers
- 100 ■ Applied RSCA activities within the discipline (e.g., contracts or consultancies)
- 101 ■ Publication of peer reviewed software and associated user manuals
- 102 ■ Publication of disciplinary book reviews (the Department defines these book reviews as non-peer reviewed
103 summaries).
- 104 ■ Publication of non-peer-reviewed RSCA (e.g. essays, white papers, invited commentaries, introductions to
105 special issues of academic journals, introductions to edited books or technical non-refereed publications).
- 106 ■ Participation in RSCA-related professional development seminars and institutes.
- 107 ■ Successful University competitions, such as RSCA, Mini-Grant, and/or Summer Stipends

108 **2.3 SERVICE**

109 **2.3.1 Service File**

110 In their narrative candidates should explain what differentiates committee work as “*high-quality*” service. For
111 example, labor intensity, time commitment and specific role.

112 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

113 **3.5 Mentoring**

114 The Department Chair may serve as a candidate’s mentor and/or designate a faculty member as a candidate’s mentor
115 in consultation with the candidate. The assigned mentor will provide guidance to the candidate and convey
116 departmental expectations regarding evaluation criteria and standards.

117 **5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA**

118 **Section 5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor**

119 In accordance with section 5.4 of the CLA policy, standards for promotion to Full Professor shall be higher than
120 standards for promotion to Associate Professor.

121 **Instructional Activities:** In addition to demonstrating “high-quality instructional activities”, candidates seeking
122 promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate leadership in instructional activities. This includes, for example,
123 demonstratable contributions to the curriculum and programmatic development of the Department of Geography
124 such as, updating or developing Standard Course Outlines and/or the development of new courses, programs,
125 participation in or leading assessment.

126 **RSCA:** The candidate is expected to have high-quality RSCA contributions and a substantial record of peer-reviewed
127 work. *Minimum* expectations for promotion to Professor follow the expectations set forth in Section 2.2 above
128 with an additional clarification – the three peer-reviewed RSCA products in our ‘Expectation 1’ may include any
129 products included in the CLA/University peer-reviewed RSCA categories and/or an externally funded grant(s) in
130 which the candidate is a PI. For candidates serving as a Co-PI on a funded grant proposal, to count in this category
131 their role in the grant must be clearly articulated in the narrative and supporting documentation from the PI.

132 **Service:** The CLA document provides guidelines in Section 2.3.2.1 and 5.4. The Department of Geography values
133 leadership in service. It is the responsibility of the candidate to clarify the significance of leadership and articulate
134 their leadership in their narrative.

135 **5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

136 The Department privileges quality over quantity in each of our three expectations. The Department Chair and
137 Candidate will discuss with the Dean a candidate’s intention and qualifications for early tenure and/or early
138 promotion. Such a decision will be made in consideration of the outcomes of this consultation.

139 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

140 Amendments to this policy shall be by secret ballot by the Department’s Tenured and Tenure Track faculty.
141 Proposed amendments shall require approval by two-thirds (2/3rds) of the ballots cast by eligible voters and
142 subsequent approval by the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost. Approved amendment(s) shall go into
143 effect at the beginning of the following academic year.

144 **Approved by Department of Geography: February 10, 2025**
145 **Revisions Requested by CLA Faculty Council: March 5, 2025**
146 **Revisions Approved by Department of Geography: March 21, 2025**
147 **Approved by CLA Faculty Council: March 28, 2025**
148 **Approved by Faculty Affairs: September 3, 2025**
149 **Effective: Fall 2025**