

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

I. (This document is a departmental supplement to the CLA and University Policies)

PREAMBLE

A. Mission Statements

Department Mission Statement

The Linguistics Department at CSULB is committed to analyzing the structure, function, and social significance of spoken and sign languages and working with the communities that use them. Guided by our view of language as a cultural, social, and psychological phenomenon, as well as by principles of equity, inclusion, and accessibility, we mentor students as they examine universal and unique properties across languages and modalities, engage critically with linguistic diversity, and apply their knowledge to empower communities. We do so by analyzing the structure and function of language, the teaching and acquisition of language, and the use of languages in different contexts.

ASLD Program Mission statement

The ASLD Program values and respects diverse heritage deaf cultures and languages, signing communities, and pluralism. We engage global perspectives through a linguistic lens toward social justice empowerment.

B. Joint Appointments

The Linguistics Department recognizes the importance to the university of having joint appointments when appropriate. The Linguistics Department will follow current Academic Senate policy regarding joint appointments. The department recognizes and values interdisciplinary work conducted by joint appointees and is committed to a mentoring process that recognizes their unique circumstances and establishes clear expectations for each level of review.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Preparation of materials to be evaluated

Candidates are responsible for preparing files that present evidence of their accomplishments in each of the areas to be evaluated. Candidates may seek mentoring from Chair or designated mentor (per section 3.5 in CLA policy). Evidence of mentoring shall be included in the candidate's file and can include, but is not limited to, feedback provided on mini-review evaluations. This responsibility includes attending, when possible, workshops provided by the university and/or college designed to inform candidates about the RTP process and about the university's expectations. Candidates are always encouraged to provide any evidence that they find valuable in representing their

accomplishments. Candidates should focus on the work and evidence that best portrays their accomplishments in each area and should explain the significance of this work. This is seen as preferable to listing or including material that is of varying significance, and which is not explained or given context.

B. Creation of Department Committee

Procedures for election of the department RTP committee are laid out in the department constitution.

C. Activities of Department Committee

Members of the committee will independently review the candidate's file. The committee will not discuss the substance of the file until all members have reviewed it. The committee will meet in order to discuss the overall evaluation and recommendation to be made.

If the committee finds missing required documentation to evaluate the file, the committee chair shall seek such clarification in writing, and the candidate shall provide the information in a timely manner. Such communication shall be shared with all members of the committee. All discussions by the committee shall be held in confidence.

Additionally, all evaluators are encouraged to attend RTP workshops to ensure familiarity with department, college, and university policies.

III. CRITERIA

The following document details departmental requirements that add specificity to areas of evaluation outlined by the College RTP document. Each is identified by the section number which it modifies.

2.1.4 Peer Observation of Instruction in the Linguistics Department

Faculty undergoing review may request that the RTP committee arrange a classroom visit from a tenured member of the departmental faculty. The visit will be arranged by mutual consent between the candidate and the faculty member, with at least 5 instructional days' notice or otherwise as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The faculty member's report can be included in the RTP dossier, at the candidate's discretion, as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.5. Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

University RTP policy states, "student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction." However, utilization of the university standard evaluation SPOT form is only one method of presenting student responses to learning and teaching effectiveness.

Candidates may submit other optional evaluation criteria to support their teaching effectiveness. These include, but are not limited to: class observations, examples of

completed student work, and informal mid-semester evaluations administered directly by the faculty member.

2.1.6. Grade Distributions

Teaching narratives should also address, as appropriate, student course evaluations that are substantially below department and/or college norms, relative to level, as well as grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

2.1.7. Additional evidence

The following activities may also be considered as evidence of a candidate's contribution, engagement, and effectiveness in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities:

1. Use of the candidate's scholarly and creative activities, especially peer-reviewed publications, by faculty in courses at CSULB and elsewhere.
2. Publications of textbooks.
3. Peer-reviewed publications on teaching outcomes and processes.
4. Peer-reviewed publications jointly authored with students.
5. Reference or citation to the candidate's publications in widely adopted textbooks.
6. Supervision of students leading to peer-reviewed publications or conference presentations by the students.
7. Research projects with students and supervision of student research, MA comprehensive papers or theses.
8. Academic advising, student mentoring, recruitment and retention activities, and field trips.
8. New curriculum and courses.
9. Innovative approaches to teaching, and exemplary ways of fostering student learning.
10. Organizing teaching colloquia or pedagogical workshops.
11. Innovative teaching practices promoting diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility (DEIA) to support diverse learners
12. Screenshots of courses designed in Learning Management Systems (e.g., Canvas, Beachboard, etc.).

Candidates are encouraged to consult CLA Policy on "multi-faceted activities" (1.1.12) to avoid duplication of materials in more than one area of evaluation.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The Department of Linguistics expects faculty to maintain an ongoing program of primary research leading to peer-reviewed publications in linguistics, its sub-disciplines, and/or other related fields (such as education, anthropology, or Deaf-related research). It is recognized that, during a given evaluation period, faculty may have varied publication profiles that include a mix of peer-reviewed publications and other publication types (whether in the areas of the scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of teaching and learning, and scholarship of application or engagement).

August 2025 LING

Peer-reviewed publications should be either double-anonymous or anonymous to the author, and may include journal articles, chapters in books and edited volumes, and other academic publications (e.g., archival deposits of language-documentation data, creation of and/or contribution to language corpora). Conference proceedings may count as peer-reviewed if conference acceptance decisions are made based on the full paper (not an abstract) and authors receive anonymous feedback with the possibility of required revisions.

Different subfields of linguistics have different patterns of publication frequency and co-authoring. For candidates who work primarily solo or in small groups, the expectation is that candidates will have a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications to which they made a substantial contribution (typically interpreted as being responsible for at least 50% of the effort) for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. This may vary, however, depending on the quality and type of scholarship. For example, one full-length peer-reviewed monograph and one additional peer-reviewed work could be considered sufficient evidence of scholarly productivity.

Candidates who do research with larger teams, as is common in some lab-oriented subfields, may not have the opportunity to publish papers to which they made a 50% contribution. In this case, the candidate should either a) present a larger number of publications, proportional to the size of the teams, and/or b) demonstrate that a given individual publication is substantially larger in scope than a typical single-authored or double-authored publication, such that the

candidate's total workload in the project is comparable to the 50% standard. Candidates should give evidence of having played a leadership role in at least one project.

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor shall show evidence of at least the same standard of productivity during the review period and in addition, should demonstrate that they have made substantial contributions to their field/subfield in nationally or internationally recognized publication venues. Candidates who wish to establish superior performance in the area of RSCA (e.g., for early tenure) will be expected to exceed these baseline targets and/or to publish in particularly high-impact venues.

Journal articles

Candidates should provide evidence of the selectivity of journals (acceptance and/or rejection rates; journal impact factor when available). This goes for both online and print journals.

Co-authorship

In the case of co- or multiple authorship (or editorship, for example of a special issue), the candidate should provide a clear description of the distribution of work by different authors. This description should be supported by a letter from the co-author(s), stating the contributions and subdisciplinary norms for co-authorship in the field of specialization. Co-authoring with CSULB students is encouraged in line with our valuing of research mentorship, as is co-authorship with members of the language communities

with whom we work.

Language of publication

If a candidate authors a publication that is republished in another language, only one of the publications may count for RTP, and it shall count for the period of review in which the first version is published. However, publications of translated works are considered evidence of scholarly impact. For original publications in languages other than English, candidates shall provide a 300–500-word summary in English. With prior arrangement, the department will pay for translation of any significant correspondence (e.g., acceptance letters, descriptions of editorial policy provided by editors, reviewer comments, etc.) relevant to RTP.

Books, book chapters, edited volumes

Monographs and edited volumes may make significant contributions to the field. For chapters in edited volumes, the candidate shall describe/provide evidence of the nature of the review process in edited volumes (inside or outside review; anonymous vs. non-anonymous review; editor review of individual chapters; outside review of whole volume).

Forewords, brief introductions and afterwords/commentaries, while not equivalent to a full research-based article, are evidence of the candidates' reputation in their field and may make theoretical contributions. Serving as editor of an edited volume (independent of contributing a chapter or other text to the book) is also evidence of scholarly reputation, organizational and editing skills, and ability to contribute to or define an area of scholarship. For both edited volumes and monographs, the selectivity of the publishing press should be indicated in the candidate's narrative.

Most influential linguistic research is published in journals. A book-length work is not a requirement for tenure. If a peer-reviewed book is submitted as evidence of scholarly productivity, at least one additional peer-reviewed work will be expected (or justified equivalency).

2.3. Service

Since faculty governance is an integral part of our university, all faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues. Thus, all faculty are expected to participate in departmental governance appropriate to their level and the terms of their appointment. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to the college and university through faculty committees and councils, appropriate to their level. Faculty are also encouraged to contribute to the wider community in ways appropriate to their areas of expertise.

Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment typically are expected to focus service activities at the department level. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, probationary faculty members typically are required to make substantial quality service contributions to their department, and to either the college or the university. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates

are expected to have a substantive service record that includes service at department, college, and university levels, a record of leadership at the University and a record of service in the community and/or the profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g., active participation in accreditation or policy-writing processes).

Cultural and identity taxation

Evaluators should consider tenure and promotion cases within the context of the cultural and identity taxation experienced by the faculty member, as defined in Section 2.3.1 of the CLA RTP policy.

Student advising

The Department of Linguistics values faculty labor in advising undergraduate and graduate students and involving students in scholarship within linguistics. Examples include, but are not limited to, advising student organizations, serving on thesis or comprehensive exams, and supervising student research such as comps projects, M.A. portfolios, and independent studies. Candidates' tenure and promotion cases should be evaluated within the context of the overall degree of student advising they have taken on.

IV. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

The following provides clarification to Section 8.0 on the College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy in the area of changes and amendments to this policy.

Voting on any amendments to this policy shall be by secret ballot by the tenured and probationary faculty. To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require approval by two-thirds of the ballots cast by eligible voters and subsequent approval by the Faculty Council, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and the Provost.

The approved amendment(s) shall go into effect at the beginning of the following academic year.