

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
Department of Health Care Management
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

EFFECTIVE FALL 2025

In concordance with CHHS RTP Policy, the Department of Health Care Management (HCM) is committed to recognizing the diversity of faculty expertise. This diversity is a testament to the interdisciplinary nature of the health care management field, and all levels of faculty review shall take into consideration diversity of faculty expertise when evaluating candidates seeking reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP). As a Department, HCM also encourages continued professional growth through teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service to the department, college, university, and profession.

This Department RTP policy is intended to provide the guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of probationary and tenured faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Portions of the University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) and the College RTP Policy deemed important are quoted verbatim and noted with *italics*.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Vision & Mission

The Department of Health Care Management (HCM) takes pride in offering a curriculum that supports the needs of the health care industry and meets accreditation standards. In addition to cultivating well-qualified students through substantive, challenging, affordable and convenient degree programs, the Department also conducts and disseminates research that positively impacts both the scholarly and practitioner communities. Furthermore, by developing and maintaining strong ties with HCM alumni, local and regional health care organizations, as well as national accreditation agencies and professional associations, the Department serves as a resource for advancing knowledge and bridging connections between academia and industry.

The Department of HCM has distinct vision and mission statements for its respective undergraduate and graduate programs.

The vision for the undergraduate program is to be a distinguished program of excellence in education, innovation and practice for the public good- equipping students for professional success. Its mission is to provide students with a high-quality foundation in partnership with health care organizations and community stakeholders. The undergraduate program fosters learning and professional development through innovative teaching and real-world experiences. Students who complete the program will have a competitive edge in the value-based healthcare system marketplace.

The vision for the graduate program is to be a premier program cultivating leaders to transform

healthcare systems. Its mission is to prepare students for executive leadership and management in the healthcare field. This comprehensive program employs current professional knowledge, fosters innovations and ethical practices, promotes research, and embraces inclusivity.

1.2 Department Values

The following values serve as the Department's guiding principles:

- **Collaboration** - Building relationships across disciplines and the communities we serve. Collaboration reminds us we won't thrive without recognizing one another's strengths. Collaboration promotes communication that is open, honest, and non-judgmental to support students' and faculty to reach their full potential and evolve together.
- **Integrity** - Practicing open and truthful communication, fair and consistent treatment of others while staying committed to our word and values.
- **Compassion** - Teaching from the heart. Embracing student diversity. Understand various student needs as a result of their different backgrounds and situations. Exhibit kindness. Guide students to explore. Demonstrate empathy for peers and colleagues, especially in difficult times.
- **Leadership** - Empowering students and faculty to be successful leaders in a diverse healthcare community.
- **Sustainability** – Striving for Department infrastructure that meets the needs of present and future students. Teaching and research from a base of industry knowledge and advancement that helps us maintain a high value workforce pipeline of health care professionals.
- **Trust** - Nurturing Department relationships that are consistent, emphatic, reliable, and truthful. We build trust through the following behaviors as examples; Admitting weakness, being honest, valuing each other's experience and expertise, keeping your word, following through, accountability, being a team player, having each other backs.
- **Professionalism** - Building, demonstrating, and acknowledging professionalism (being accountable, reliable, setting high standard of conduct, teamwork, respect of others) and ethical practices in our teaching, research and services. Demonstrating we care about our students learning experience, conducting and disseminating high quality research, preparing our students as competitive candidates in the job market
- **Innovation** - Supporting, fostering, and rewarding creative thinking, cutting edge ideas, problem solving, and advancement in our teaching, research and services toward improvement of health care delivery

Governing Documents

1.4.1 In concurrence with College RTP Policy, the department “*adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) 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.*”

1.4.2 The standards adopted at the Department level shall be equivalent to or higher than college-level standards.

1.4.3 In concurrence with College RTP policy, “[c]ollectively, the RTP policies of the university, college, and academic unit shall be used to assess candidates’ performance through the stages of their academic progress.”

1.5. Obligations

In concurrence with College RTP Policy, “*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.*”

1.6 Standards

In concurrence with College RTP Policy, “*recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or directors of academic units 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 excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.*”

1.7 Profiles of Academic Ranks

Candidates shall be evaluated by specific criteria established in this Department RTP Policy and commensurate with academic rank. This Department RTP Policy applies these criteria for each academic rank.

1.8 Narrative

Candidates must include a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories evaluated: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and

engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. This narrative provides reviewers with an understanding of the candidate's achievements. Submitting evidence and/or documentation alone, without narrative context or justification, impedes the reviewers' ability to adequately evaluate the candidate's achievements. Candidates shall therefore narrate their accomplishments in addition to providing evidence and/or documentation.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

This Department RTP Policy outlines the standards of excellence and criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the Department's vision, mission, values, and needs, as well as those of the College and University. In concordance with both University and College RTP policy, these standards articulate expectations for 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.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Effective instruction and instructionally-related activities encompass a wide range of tasks and responsibilities, such as *teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom*. Specific instruction and instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to: *curriculum and course development; academic and academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and any other related activities involving student learning and student engagement, such as mentoring students and taking students abroad for academic and cultural study*.

In concordance with University RTP policy, the HCM Department employs multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and must not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching (SPOT) forms as evidence. The following subsections (2.1.1 – 2.1.8) specify the criteria for the evaluation of a faculty member's instruction and instructionally-related activities. Further, this section delineates the type and amount of documentation required and/or recommended regarding a candidate's instructional effectiveness. In addition, candidates shall clearly articulate all instructional activities that are compensated by assigned time or additional compensation.

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

In concordance with University RTP Policy, “*[e]ffective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.*

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) what they have invested in their own learning and growth as instructors.

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.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Effective instruction and instructionally-related activities encompass a wide range of tasks and responsibilities, such as *teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom*. Specific instruction and instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to: *curriculum and course development; academic and academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and any other related activities involving student learning and student engagement, such as mentoring students and taking students abroad for academic and cultural study.*

In concordance with University RTP policy, the HCM Department employs multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and must not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms as evidence. The following subsections (2.1.1 – 2.1.8) specify the criteria for the evaluation of a faculty member’s instruction and instructionally-related activities. Further, this section delineates the type and amount of documentation required and/or recommended regarding a candidate’s instructional effectiveness.

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

In concordance with University RTP Policy, “*[e]ffective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.*

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) what they have invested in their own learning and growth as instructors.

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.

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional 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. This could also include evidence generated from taking part in faculty development initiatives at the college or university level. CHHS values culturally responsive teaching and encourages faculty to undertake professional development to advance culturally relevant pedagogical strategies that focus on student-centered practices of setting high expectations, honoring different communication styles and practicing critical consciousness that values student agency and input.

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.

2.1.4 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.

2.1.5 Syllabi

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

made to syllabi.

At minimum, all course syllabi shall comply with the requirements of CSULB's official syllabi policy. Pursuant to that policy, all syllabi must set forth course meetings times and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information; required books and other resources; an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy; an explanation of how the instructor will interpret and apply the University's course withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or schedule. Excellent syllabi shall also contain other types of information. For example:

- The measurable learning goals of the course should be conveyed to students in measurable, behavioral terms. All courses should link learning outcomes to the accrediting agency competencies.
- Grading practices, standards, and criteria must be articulated clearly.
- Instructional methods must be appropriate to the courses taught, and materials should be up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and,
- Assigned readings must be up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and be selected to enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of the HCM Department, assigned readings that enhance the interdisciplinary and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.

The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence this Policy is designed to facilitate.

2.1.6 Grade Distributions

Grade distributions of all courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file. Candidates are expected to explain average course GPAs that are substantially different from department and/or college norms. *Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness and, as such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.*

2.1.7 Student Response to Instruction

All Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) evaluations including the summary sheets during the review period shall be included in the candidate's RTP file. Additionally, if a candidate chooses to include qualitative data such as student comments from the SPOT evaluations for a specific course, all qualitative data must be included for that course.

Candidates should demonstrate in their narrative deliberate efforts to improve instruction based on student course evaluations.

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.

Candidates may and are encouraged to provide an explanation of student course evaluation data that are substantially different in either direction from department and/or college norms relative to level or are otherwise anomalous. Candidates and RTP committee members should keep in mind that while SPOT Summary forms provide the mean averages for the candidate, department, and college, other measures of central tendency (i.e., median or mode) may be more appropriate and should be considered accordingly, when small sample sizes, either due to small class size or low response rate (i.e. <25% of class enrollment), or skewed distributions are applicable.

Extensive research has demonstrated that student evaluations are inherently flawed instruments that by their nature, do not accurately represent instructional effectiveness. Student evaluations demonstrate both environmental bias (bias based on course conditions, including but not limited to course difficulty, course modality, course meeting time, student interest level, and modality) and equity bias (bias towards the instructor because of aspect/s or perceived aspect/s of their identity, including but not limited to race/ethnicity, gender, ability, national origin, sexual orientation, and appearance). Candidates who believe that their student evaluations have been impacted by any of these factors may choose to use their narratives to address their student evaluation scores. Candidates should also be aware that Provision 11.2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that instructors may submit written rebuttals to student course evaluations when they believe that additional information is needed “or in the case of student bias.” If such a rebuttal is submitted, it is incumbent upon the evaluating committee to review it.

2.1.8 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations of the candidate's instruction are important sources of evidence. Candidates must obtain written feedback from higher-ranking faculty or the department chair based on their observations. Peer evaluations apply to all course modalities. For face-to-face courses, evaluations are conducted through physical classroom visitations. For synchronous online courses, evaluations are conducted through virtual classroom visitations. For asynchronous online courses, evaluations are conducted through visitations to the course site.

Candidates should reflect on and incorporate peer feedback, including providing evidence of instructional improvements where appropriate.

- Candidates for reappointment shall include documentation of at least two such peer evaluations, and must provide evidence of either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
- Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall submit at least four peer evaluations, up to two of which could be those from prior to reappointment, and must provide evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

- Candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to the rank of Full Professor shall submit at least one peer evaluation that occurred within the review period, and must provide evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

Candidates should plan ahead to schedule and secure peer evaluation visitations. If no suitable faculty members within the Department are available for a requested peer evaluation, despite the candidate's documented genuine and timely efforts, the candidate may opt for a higher-ranking faculty member from a different department who is familiar with the subject matter to conduct the evaluation. The Peer Evaluation Form in Appendix A should be used for the purpose of peer feedback, or an equivalent standardized form that allows the RTP committee to adequately assess peer evaluations.

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. Examples of RSCA may include but are not limited to: peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly book chapters, authored or edited textbooks, externally validated software and electronically published documents, presentations at academic and professional conferences, and grants and contracts submitted and awarded. Recognizing the diverse ways in which research, scholarly, and creative activities contribute to the advancement and application of knowledge. Faculty scholarship may also encompass interdisciplinary collaborations, applied research projects, policy briefs, program evaluations, and other scholarly contributions that create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities. In addition, candidates shall clearly articulate all RSCA activities that are compensated by assigned time or additional compensation.

2.2.1a Variability Across Disciplines

This Department RTP policy addresses CHHS RTP policy section 2.2.1. by articulating the discipline-specific criteria for research and scholarly/creative activities in Health Care Management.

2.2.1b Variations Due to Service Roles

The Department recognizes that there may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in teaching or service, such as serving as the department chair, associate chair, graduate advisor, undergraduate advisor, or in a position of leadership with college-wide and/or university-wide significance. 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 exhibits a clear trajectory for full

resumption once service responsibilities return to normal levels.

2.2.2 Research

Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to engage in a sustained program of RSCA that aligns with discipline-specific research standards and contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the field. Faculty RSCA may take various forms, including, but not limited to, the Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application or Engagement, and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

- Scholarship of Discovery: Original research, scholarship, or creative work, such as peer-reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances, exhibitions, or patents.
- Scholarship of Integration: Synthesizing and expanding knowledge across disciplines, including literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.
- Scholarship of Application or Engagement: Applying disciplinary expertise to practical problems, including technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or student research mentorship.
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Advancing teaching knowledge through systematic study, including educational research, new instructional methods, or grants supporting instructional activities.

Additional Considerations

- Other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, and article reviews) are valued and strengthen the candidate's portfolio. However, these activities alone are insufficient to meet the college RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of investigative research conducted by the candidate.
- Securing external funds to support scholarly research is a valued contribution to the scholarly process. Faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite or sufficient evidence for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank. Scholarly outcomes should accompany grant activity, and these outcomes should align with the publications and research expectations noted below in 2.2.3.
- Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, and

awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA

Consistent with the 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.

HCM Department Publication Criteria

Faculty are expected to make ongoing, substantive RSCA contributions. Candidates should articulate their scholarly vision, guiding questions, expected outcomes, and impact. The narrative should emphasize quality, relevance, and significance rather than merely listing accomplishments. Candidates should discuss the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work, the expected outcomes, and the impact of their RSCA contributions. Supporting documents should be referenced without repetition.

Publication and Research Expectations

HCM faculty are expected to publish peer-reviewed (i.e., referred) scholarly articles (or justified substitutions; see below). Specific requirements at each review level are noted below:

For Initial Reappointment (Third Probationary Year):

Candidates for reappointment should have published at least one scholarly article (or justified substitution) in a refereed venue, in print or formally accepted, by the third probationary year.

- Exceeding this baseline expectation is considered strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- Candidates must clearly describe their role and contributions when publishing as co-authors.
- Candidates should provide evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of the publication outlets.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

- Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least five scholarly articles (or justified substitutions) in refereed venues (roughly one publication per year).

- A large number of low-impact publications is not sufficient.
- Quality is more important than quantity. It is incumbent upon candidates to provide objective and verifiable measures of journals, such as the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), to assess its quality. Having many publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing three or four articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner, and as the first or corresponding author, may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
- Candidates must clearly describe their role and contributions when publishing as co-authors.
- Candidates should provide evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of the publication outlets.

For Promotion to Professor:

- Candidates must demonstrate consistent scholarly activity since their last promotion.
- Candidates for tenure and promotion to Professor should have published at least six scholarly articles (or justified substitutions) in refereed venues since their last promotion.
- Quality remains more important than quantity. It is incumbent upon candidates to provide objective and verifiable measures of journals, such as the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), to assess quality. Having many publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing three or four articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner, and as the first or corresponding author, may warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor.
- Candidates must clearly describe their role and contributions when publishing as co-authors.
- Candidates should provide evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of the publication outlets.

Equivalencies for Scholarly Publications:

While all candidates are expected to publish peer-reviewed (i.e., referred) scholarly articles, candidates may substitute articles for equivalent peer-reviewed scholarly work. It is incumbent

upon candidates to provide justification for these equivalencies in the form of evidence of peer-review. For the purposes of determining the threshold of scholarly work, a peer-reviewed book is equivalent to two peer-reviewed journal articles, while two peer-reviewed book chapters count as one peer-reviewed article. If co-authored, candidates must provide justification and clearly document and specify the extent of their contributions. Books and book chapters must be peer-reviewed and published by top-tier publishers to be considered for tenure or promotion to Full Professor.

Equivalency for Scholarly Publications	
1 peer-reviewed book ¹	2 peer-reviewed publications
2 peer-reviewed book chapters ¹	1 peer-reviewed publication

Collaborative Research Contributions: Candidates should clearly articulate their individual contributions to collaborative works beyond listing authorship.

Student Research Mentoring: Student co-authors are highly valued and strongly encouraged. If students are involved in research, candidates are required to document research outcomes highlighting students' contributions.

Conference Presentations: Candidates may strengthen their scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank with conference proceedings and presentations. However, candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments in this domain use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.

In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. 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. External reviewer process would count as evaluation for such dissemination of products or findings.

2.3 Service

Aligned with University RTP Policy, the Department of HCM concurs that “*service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators.*” The Department further recognizes that service is vital to ensuring shared governance processes on campus. All HCM Faculty are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance.

In the Department, expectations for service vary depending on rank, with probationary faculty expected to concentrate on department-level service primarily, but not exclusively. At the time of Reappointment, expectations for college-level service may increase, as may the quality of service contributions. Tenured faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor are expected to maintain active engagement at all levels of campus service (department, college, and university) and

¹ Must adhere to the indicated quality criteria.

demonstrative high-quality service contributions. Furthermore, all faculty are expected to contribute to the professional community.

The Department of HCM recognizes that service can take a variety of forms, and need not be limited solely to serving on committees at department, college and/or university levels. Examples include supervising student clubs, mentoring students, coaching students for competitions, maintaining accreditation and corresponding activities, and planning and facilitating department events. Furthermore, service can include activities that might otherwise go unrecognized or disproportionately fall on faculty as a result of cultural and identity taxation. Because of this, and aligned with University RTP Policy, “*[i]t is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation.*” In addition, departmental evaluation of candidates should consider the role cultural and identity taxation can play in service loads.

All candidates must discuss and document in their materials any service activities they wish to be considered in their evaluation. For instance, committee work could be documented by outlining the number or frequency of meetings, the duration of time served, the candidate’s role and contributions of work accomplished, and the outcome or impact of the work. Service that falls outside of formal committee work could be documented by describing the nature of activities and goals, how such activities leveraged the candidate’s expertise, the number of students or stakeholders worked with, the extent of the work, and its impact. Candidates should discuss their service in detail and, when possible, including documentation (e.g., agendas, committee rosters, letters from committee chairs or other stakeholders, work samples, outcome artifacts, and email correspondence).

All candidates must disclose within their narratives and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.

2.3.1. Service at the Department Level

All faculty members are expected to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance. During the first three years of appointment, candidates are not required to participate in college or university services. However, candidates are expected to perform quality service within HCM. In evaluating the quality of departmental service, initiatives that improve the department’s alignment with the mission of the college and university will be most highly valued.

Service to the department includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Advising student and alumni organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;
- Participating actively and meaningfully in either planning or attending departmental

events, such as graduation and advisory board meetings;

- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the Department;
- Attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;
- Attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the Department, the College, the University, and professional organizations;
- Actively serving as Course Coordinator;
- Actively participating in accreditation efforts.

Specific expectations at each review level are noted below:

For Initial Reappointment (Third Probationary Year):

Probationary faculty in the first two years of appointment are expected, but not limited to:

- Concentrate on department-level service primarily.
- Service could include any of the above examples in 2.3.1, with an effort demonstrated to gradually take on more active roles in department-level service.
- Attend and participate in faculty meetings and take part in any required accreditation activities.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to the Department. Specifically, candidates are expected, but not limited to:

- Demonstrate a gradual progression in department-level service roles that indicates increased responsibilities and leadership over time.
- Demonstrate consistent willingness and effort to seek out service opportunities in the Department.

Provide evidence of serving on department committees to attest to their role and contribution, including (but not limited to) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department.

- Attend and participate in faculty meetings and take part in any required accreditation activities.

For Promotion to Professor:

Candidates in consideration for promotion to Full Professor should demonstrate sustained leadership in department-level service. This could include, but is not limited to:

- Serving as the Graduate Advisor.
- Directing the Department's certificate or distance-learning degree programs.
- Chairing major departmental committees.
- Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the Department.
- Creating or significantly revising entire department/program curricula.

2.3.2a Service to the College

Service at the college-level is integral to the functioning of shared governance. Probationary faculty during the first two years of appointment may, but are not required to participate in college service activities. Participation in college committees is encouraged later in the probationary period, in consultation with the department chair, and taking into account other faculty commitments in teaching and research.

For Initial Reappointment (Third Probationary Year):

Given that probationary faculty in the first two years are expected to concentrate primarily on department-level service, there is no expectation for college-level service during this time. Evidence of college-level service during the first two years is considered exceptional service. Probationary faculty are encouraged to talk with the Department Chair and senior faculty to determine service load.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

After reappointment, expectations for college-level service increase, as do the quality of service contributions. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to the college. This may include:

- Self-nominating and being elected to serving on college committees that contribute to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS. A consistent demonstrating of willingness to serve at the college-level, even if not elected, is important to demonstrate a commitment to shared governance.
- Within college committees, taking up initiative by volunteering for sub-committees, and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the College.

For Promotion to Professor:

For promotion to the rank of Full Professor, faculty members are required to demonstrate a sustained pattern of service at the college-level that includes leadership roles. Candidates should demonstrate consistent dedication to college-level service, making significant contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, including, but not limited to:

- Chairing College-level committees;
- Chairing or leading major College initiatives;
- Volunteering for college-level search committees;
- Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing College-wide and/or University-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
- Leading the authoring of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the College.

2.3.2b Service to the University

For Initial Reappointment (Third Probationary Year):

Within the first two years of a probationary appointment, service to the university is not required.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, University-level service is desirable, but not required. This could include:

- Self-nominating and serving on various university-wide committees;
- Serving on university-wide search committees.

For Promotion to Professor:

For promotion to the rank of Full Professor, faculty members are required to demonstrate a sustained pattern of service to the University. At the University-level, candidates must demonstrate contributions to the effective operation and growth of the institution, including, but not limited to:

- Consistent pattern of seeking out membership on university-level committees;
- Serving in active role on university-wide search committees;
- Chairing or leading major university initiatives;
- Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
- Authoring of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university.

2.3.3 Service to the Community and/or the Profession

Faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the Profession.

Community Service: If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member such that they apply academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional, national, or international problems.

Professional Service: If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member. Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; and/or elected offices in a health care management, administrative, policy or other related professional organization. Specific examples of service to the community and/or profession at each review level are noted below:

For Initial Reappointment (Third Probationary Year):

Within the first two years of a probationary appointment, service to the community and/or profession is not required.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, community and/or professional service is highly desirable, and may include but is not limited to:

- Consulting with healthcare organizations or other healthcare management university programs; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.
- Helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise; and/or
- Acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.

For Promotion to Professor:

For promotion to the rank of full Professor, professional and/or community service is expected to include a record of meaningful contributions, such as, but not limited to:

- Taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of local, national, or international problems);
- Holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations or professional associations related to the candidate's professional expertise;
- Serving in an editorial role for a major journal or publishing outlet in the field.
- Consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
- Serving on governing boards;
- Engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to Health Care Management; serving as a media consultant (by giving interviews or otherwise) for health care related events or news stories; writing editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.

2.3.4 Evaluating the Quality of Service Commitments and Participation

The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in section 2.3.1-2.3.3. Accordingly, the RTP committee must not merely summarize the breadth and/or quantity of a candidate's service contributions, but rather evaluate the depth, quality and significance of service activities. In doing so, the Committee should consider:

- A. the nature of the service commitment in terms of the time, energy, and dedication it takes to

participate meaningfully in the particular service activities;

B. the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, the College, and/or to the Department of Health Care Management;

C. the role cultural and/or identity taxation plays in the taking up of service, particularly the time commitment involved and its importance to advancing the mission of the University, the College, and/or to the Department of Health Care Management. It is important to note that faculty may elect to take on service that nevertheless carries taxation and leads to disproportionate service loads.

D. the significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the university, college, and/or department, including participation on committees and/or with student organizations;

E. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional, and prospective students;

F. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;

G. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers his/her services; and

H. the degree of leadership exhibited by the candidate. The RTP committee must be mindful of the fact that leadership is not exclusively defined by one's position in a hierarchical structure, but rather is something that can be demonstrated at all levels by influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the group in which they serve.

2.3.5 Candidate Responsibilities for the Evaluation of Service

The candidate must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative criteria in his/her narrative.

A. Candidates shall narrate, with sufficient documentation when available, their contributions to committees and other forms of service.

B. Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.

C. Candidates are encouraged to discuss and document in their materials any service activities they feel may have been disproportionately completed in light of cultural and identity taxation.

2.4 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

Aligned with College RTP Policy, “[s]tandards 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.”

Please note: this Department RTP Policy outlines the requirements for promotion to Full Professor in the respective sections above (2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, 2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), and 2.3 Service).

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

The University RTP policy states that “[p]articipants 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

The Candidate must submit a narrative covering the period of review that addresses the three areas of instruction, RSCA, and service. The candidate shall make every effort to seek guidance from the Department Chair and Faculty mentors, as well as make use of University resources, trainings, and workshops. Candidates have the primary responsibility of submitting documentation of their accomplishments, and candidates should clearly reference and explain this documentation in the narrative. The candidate must also ensure that the required information and documentation are submitted for review. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and evaluations, including candidate rebuttals, if any.

The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The University RTP Policy states that “*[d]epartment 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 University RTP Policy states that “*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.”

3.3.1a Election of Department RTP committee

The tenured and probationary faculty members of an academic unit elect representatives to the Department RTP committee.

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 application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor must be comprised of tenured Full Professors.

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

A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP committee (one-year term at a time) if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President. However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of whom, are FERP participants.

3.3.1b Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

A faculty member shall not serve on more than one (1) committee level of peer review.

3.3.1c Responsibility and Accountability

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

Candidates have a contractual right to respond in writing to committee recommendations before they are forwarded from the Department committee to the College-level RTP committee and/or the Dean.

3.3.2 Ad Hoc Committees

As noted by College RTP Policy, “*[i]f 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. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members in a department will be eligible to vote.

3.3.3 Joint Appointments

As noted by College RTP Policy, “*[j]oint 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.*

3.4 Department Chair

As noted by University RTP Policy, “[t]he 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.

Furthermore, “[d]epartment 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.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The Department RTP Policy follows the timeline designated by the University Policy (see sections 4.0-4.3 of Policy Statement 23-24).

4.1.1 Periodic Review

As noted by University RTP Policy, “[a]ll tenure-track and tenured undergo performance review and evaluation. Tenure-track 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 Tenure-track Faculty for Reappointment

As noted by University RTP Policy, “In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP

committee, the department chair, and the college dean. The periodic evaluation in the first year may just be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean. 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.”

4.1.2 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. If reappointed for three years, probationary faculty shall continue to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process. If, however, candidates are reappointed for a shorter period of time, then they are to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process until such time as they undergo another formal reappointment review.

4.2 Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

In the sixth year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure and promotion review. Successful candidates are granted tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.

As noted by University RTP Policy, “*A tenure-track 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

As noted by University RTP Policy, “*An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 5.5. 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.*”

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

Section 5.0-5.5.2 of University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) outlines the general standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The current Department RTP Policy elaborates on these standards by providing the specific criteria under which RTP candidates from the Department of Health Care Management will be reviewed.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

As noted by University RTP Policy, “*A potential candidate should 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. 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.*”

In addition to University and College level criteria, the Department has specific metrics for determining excellence in each of three areas of evaluation that are required for early tenure and early promotion, as indicated below. Candidates are strongly encouraged to consult with the Department Chair and other faculty mentors prior to applying for early tenure.

5.5.1 Teaching Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion

Faculty seeking early tenure and/or promotion are expected to demonstrate an outstanding and exceptional record of teaching that substantially exceeds the standard expectations for their rank and time in service. Meeting the minimum teaching requirements ahead of schedule does not constitute sufficient justification for early tenure or promotion. The evaluation process will consider the quality, depth, and reach of the candidate’s teaching, ensuring that their body of work reflects a distinguished teaching profile that justifies an accelerated advancement. While candidates may meet these standards, the ultimate decision for early tenure and promotion is made by the provost.

Teaching Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

- SPOT evaluations for every course taught during the period of the review. SPOT scores should be consistently higher than the averages within both the Department and College.
- Considerable effort in advancing instructional innovation that substantially exceeds the standard expectations for their rank and time in service. This could include creating new courses, significantly revamping an existing course, or substantially revising curricula based on best-practices, new knowledge, and peer and student feedback.
- Substantially exceeding the baseline requirements for peer observations. Candidates for early tenure are required to show evidence of seeking out and incorporating peer feedback to improve their teaching that is both formative and summative.
- Substantially exceeding the baseline requirements for ongoing professional development. Candidates for early tenure are required to show evidence of seeking out and incorporating professional development in teaching, whether through attending workshops, trainings, or conferences.

Teaching Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor:

- SPOT evaluations for every course taught during the period of the review. SPOT scores should be consistently higher than the averages within both the Department and College.
- Consistent evidence of advancing instructional innovation that substantially exceeds the standard expectations for their rank and time in service. This could include creating new concentrations, new degree pathways, and new courses.
- Substantially exceeding the baseline requirements for peer observations. Candidates for early tenure are required to show evidence of seeking out and incorporating peer feedback to improve their teaching that is both formative and summative.
- Substantially exceeding the baseline requirements for ongoing professional development. Candidates for early tenure are required to show evidence of seeking out and incorporating professional development in teaching, whether through attending workshops, trainings, or conferences.

5.5.2 RSCA Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion

Faculty seeking early tenure and/or promotion are expected to demonstrate an outstanding and exceptional record of research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) that substantially exceeds the standard expectations for their rank and time in service. Meeting the minimum RSCA requirements ahead of schedule does not constitute sufficient justification for early tenure or promotion. The evaluation process will consider the quality, depth, and reach of the candidate's RSCA, ensuring that their body of work reflects a distinguished scholarly profile that justifies an accelerated advancement. While candidates may meet these standards, the ultimate decision for early tenure and promotion is made by the provost.

Baseline Publication Requirement: Faculty are expected to publish in peer-reviewed journals, as noted in section 2.2.3 above.

RSCA Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

- Candidates should have at least 8 peer-reviewed journal articles in print or formally accepted (or justification for equivalency).
- A large number of low-impact publications is not sufficient.
- Quality is more important than quantity. It is incumbent upon candidates to provide objective and verifiable measures of journals, such as the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), to assess its quality. Having many publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in

a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing 6 articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner, and as the first or corresponding author, may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

- Candidates must clearly describe their role and contributions when publishing as co-authors.
- Candidates should provide evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of the publication outlets.

RSCA Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor:

- Candidates must demonstrate outstanding scholarly activity since their last promotion.
- Associate Professors should produce, at least 8 peer-reviewed journal articles in print or formally accepted (or justification for equivalency).
 -
- Quality is more important than quantity. It is incumbent upon candidates to provide objective and verifiable measures of journals, such as the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), to assess its quality. Having many publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing 6 articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner, and as the first or corresponding author, may warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor.
 -
- Candidates must clearly describe their role and contributions when publishing as co-authors.
- Candidates should provide evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of the publication outlets.

5.5.3 Service Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion

Faculty seeking early tenure and/or promotion are expected to demonstrate an outstanding and exceptional record of service that substantially exceeds the standard expectations for their rank and time in service. Meeting the minimum service requirements ahead of schedule does not constitute sufficient justification for early tenure or promotion. The evaluation process will consider the quality, depth, and reach of the candidate's service, ensuring that their body of service activities reflects a distinguished service profile that justifies an accelerated advancement. While candidates may meet these standards, the ultimate decision for early tenure and promotion is made by the provost.

Service Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

- For early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a willingness to seek out service opportunities in shared governance that not just exceeds the minimum standard of department and college-level service for tenure, but demonstrates an outstanding and exceptional record of service for their rank and time in service.
- Within department-level and college-level service, candidates must demonstrate clear leadership in service roles. This could include, but is not limited to, chairing committees, convening ad-hoc committees and search committees, and lead authoring reports.
- Candidates must also have university-level service to be considered for early tenure.

Service Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor:

- For early promotion to Full Professor, candidates must demonstrate an outstanding and exceptional record of service at all levels—department, college, and university—that substantially exceeds the standard expectations for their rank and time in service.
- A distinguished service profile at all levels—department, college, and university—is required, and that demonstrates sustained quality, depth, and reach. This could include, but is not limited to, serving as chair across several committees, and across multiple levels (department, college, university), and demonstrating within these roles exceptional service achievements that considerably advance campus shared governance.
- Candidates must also document a sustained commitment to serving the community and/or profession, with service roles aligning with scholarly expertise and demonstrating leadership in the community and/or profession.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The Department RTP Policy follows the steps in the RTP process designated by the University Policy (see sections 6.0-6.10 of Policy Statement 23-24).

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The Department RTP Policy follows the additional processes designated by the University Policy (see sections 7.0-7.6 of Policy Statement 23-24).

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

The Department Policy follows the changes and amendments procedures designated by the University Policy (see sections 8.0 of Policy Statement 23-24).

Effective: Fall 2025

APPENDIX A: PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM



COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

EVALUATION REPORT FROM
PEER-OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME					
INSTRUCTOR'S RANK					
COURSE OBSERVED					
OBSERVATION DATE					
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PRESENT					
TIMEBASE	<input type="checkbox"/>	PART-TIME	<input type="checkbox"/>	FULL-TIME	Number of WTUs

A. Summary of Key Teaching Performance Indicators

The class session began with an overview of the lesson's objectives and then proceeded to meet those objectives through the delivery of instruction.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The lesson was well-organized.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The methods used to deliver the lesson during the observed class session were appropriate for meeting the learning objectives.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The instructor was well-prepared for class.

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The instructor integrated content from sufficiently varied sources to add both breadth and

depth to the lesson.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
Information communicated by the instructor was accurate and up-to-date (i.e., the instructor's subject mastery and currency were evident).				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The instructor was effective in presenting subject content and materials in the class session.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The instructor was enthusiastic and/or was able to arouse student interest, curiosity, motivation, and/or participation.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The instructor fostered an effective educational environment that facilitated creative expression, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and/or student engagement.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
B. Course Syllabus Construction				
1. Consistent with CSULB policy, the syllabus adequately sets forth:				
course meeting times and location the instructor's office location and office hours the instructor's contact information required books and resources an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy an explanation of how the instructor will enforce the university's withdrawal policy course requirements that form the basis of the assessment of student performance a statement on academic integrity a course outline or schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		

2. Other syllabus evaluation criteria:

<p>The learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education are clearly conveyed to students in behavioral terms.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not at all</td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all						
<p>Grading practices, standards, and criteria are clearly articulated.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not at all</td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all						
<p>Instructional methods used in the course are explained and are appropriate to the course taught.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not at all</td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all						
<p>Course assignments are explained and are appropriate to/for the course taught.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not at all</td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all						
<p>Course content appears to be up-to-date, appropriate to the course topic, and enhancing of student learning.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not at all</td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all						
<p>The course appears to integrate materials that are interdisciplinary and/or comparative.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not at all</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable					

C. Qualitative Feedback on Teaching

1. *Describe the lesson taught, including the subject, objectives, and methods used.*
2. *Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, currency, breadth, and depth.*
3. *How well organized and clear was the presentation?*
4. *How effective were the methods of instruction used for this presentation?*
5. *Describe the level of student interest and participation.*
6. *What were the instructor's major strengths? Weaknesses?*
7. *What specific and constructive recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's teaching in this class?*

D. Overall Rating of Teaching

On the basis of the evidence provided in Sections A, B, and C, I rate the instructor's overall teaching as:

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Excellent	Proficient	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory

SIGNATURE OF PEER-EVALUATOR:

NAME OF PEER EVALUATOR	TITLE OF PEER EVALUATOR	DATE

SIGNATURE OF EMPLOYEE

I have read the above evaluation. My signature indicates neither agreement nor disagreement with it.

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE	DATE