Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy

1 INTRODUCTION

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics establishes the following criteria and procedures to be used as guidelines for decisions concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Should any part of this document conflict with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) or relevant policies of the university or college, then the CBA, university, college, and department policies shall be applied in that order of precedence.

2 PREPARATION OF THE RTP FILE

It is the candidate's responsibility to collect and present evidence of accomplishments to the department RTP Committee, hereafter referred to as the RTP Committee, by the published deadline. This evidence must be in the form of an RTP file prepared according to the format endorsed by CSULB Faculty Affairs. The content of the file must align with the requirements of the department policy as well as superseding policies and guidelines (i.e., RTP policies of the university and CNSM, as well as guidelines published by Faculty Affairs). The file must be well organized to allow those reviewing it to locate pertinent information easily.

3 CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

There are three areas of evaluation:

    I.   instruction and instructionally related activities;
   II.   research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and
  III.   service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

For all three areas, the candidate must provide clear and detailed descriptions in their narrative or Professional Data Sheet (PDS) of their major achievements; current activity; plans for growth and continued activity; and ongoing professional development. It is highly encouraged that the candidate, in their narrative and PDS, classify each of their activities into one of these three areas. An alternative to the PDS (e.g., an expanded CV) may be used if it is comparably well-organized and informative. Specific guidance for classifying activities is provided in the CNSM RTP policy. Section 5.4 of this document and the CNSM policy address categorization of activities that may reasonably be included in more than one area of evaluation.

The RTP Committee assigns a rating of excellent, competent, or deficient in each area of evaluation for a candidate's application for tenure or promotion. No such ratings are assigned for mini reviews or applications for reappointment.

To be recommended for reappointment, a candidate must demonstrate significant and ongoing progress towards a favorable tenure decision in all three areas.

36 To be recommended for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must (1) be rated as
37 excellent in at least one of areas I (instruction) or II (RSCA) and (2) be rated as competent or excellent in
38 all three areas. Promotion to associate professor normally accompanies a favorable tenure decision.

39 To be recommended for promotion to professor, a candidate must (1) be rated as excellent in at least
40 one area of evaluation and (2) be rated as competent or excellent in all three areas.

41 Department-specific standards for ratings of excellent, competent, and deficient are described in the
42 remainder of this section. The candidate must also meet standards set in CNSM and university RTP
43 policies. The candidate must consult university, CNSM, and department policies to ensure that (1) their
44 file includes all required materials and (2) their narrative and PDS address all required topics. Evaluation
45 by the RTP Committee is based on evidence in the candidate's file, including materials not contributed
46 by the candidate (e.g., class visit reports, Open Period letters).

3.1 INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES

3.1.1 Principles

49 Effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome. There is not just one "right way to teach," but
50 an instructor's pedagogical approach should be guided by an instructional philosophy and be responsive
51 to the needs of students.

52 An effective instructor in the CSULB Department of Mathematics and Statistics must accomplish each of
53 the following:

54   1. Make efforts to create classroom environments in which all students are treated respectfully.
55   This includes, but is not limited to:
56   a. compassion for academic and nonacademic challenges faced by students, and
57   b. structuring of the course and course materials (e.g., syllabus and assignments) in such a
58   way that all students are treated respectfully and have the opportunity to succeed.
59   2. Plan, structure, and implement courses in which all students have the opportunity to attain
60   learning outcomes that align with catalog descriptions. In particular,
61   a. planning should be guided by instructional philosophy, the needs of students, and the
62   content-related goals of the course. For example, there is a difference between (1) a
63   candidate who merely conceives of a teaching assignment as covering certain sections in
64   a textbook, and (2) a candidate who is guided by ideas about how students learn
65   (instructional philosophy), takes actions to create environments that are conducive to
66   learning (attends to the needs of students), and structures the course so that there is a
67   cohesive and meaningful treatment of essential content.
68   b. the structure of the course should be aligned with the intended student learning
69   outcomes. Course structure includes, but is not limited to, the way that class time is
70   used, pacing, usage of tasks and assessments, and grading schemes.
71   c. the results of grading practices (e.g., GPAs and DFW rates) should be reasonable.
72   3. Design and implement tasks and assessments that align to student learning outcomes and that
73   respect the academic needs of students. In particular,
74   a. task selection and implementation should be guided by a theory of how students learn
75   the essential content of the course, and

76   b. tasks and assessments should respect both the goals of the course and the needs of
77   students.
78 4. Take actions to assess and modify their own teaching. See Section 2.1.2 of the University RTP
79   Policy for guidelines. This includes, but is not limited to:
80   a. productive and formative reflection on feedback from colleagues and from students,
81   including feedback from official CSULB mechanisms for student feedback (e.g., SPOT),
82   b. ongoing professional development, and
83   c. maintaining currency in relevant content areas.

84 Likewise, instructionally related activities that happen outside the classroom should be motivated by a
85 philosophy of how students thrive and learn. Instructionally related activities may be in support of
86 students (e.g., mentorship or advising), in support of the department (e.g., program or course
87 development), or in broader support of students at CSULB or in the community (e.g., projects that
88 benefit CSULB students outside the department or non-CSULB students in the community).

89 3.1.2 Evidence

90 The CNSM policy (1) requires that the most recent syllabus from each different course taught during the
91 period under review be included and (2) recommends that candidates' narratives address courses which
92 have high DFW rates (>20%) and describe efforts to reduce these rates. University policy requires that
93 candidates disclose and describe any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time; this
94 should be included in the narrative.

95 In addition to all evidence required by CNSM and university policies, the department requires that the
96 supplemental materials include at least two examples of assessments (e.g., assignments, tests, projects,
97 or homework) from each of the most recent version of each different course taught during the period
98 under review. The sample assessments should demonstrate alignment with the principles outlined in
99 section 3.1.1 with supporting discussion in the narrative.

100 The candidate is encouraged to provide more than the minimum if it serves to support discussion in the
101 narrative of the development of course(s) over time.

102 3.1.3 Evaluation

103 *3.1.3.1 Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor*
104 To be rated as competent or higher, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must, in
105 the judgment of the RTP Committee, meet or exceed all the following criteria:

106 • The candidate's file aligns with the principles outlined in Section 3.1.1.
107 • The candidate's file does not establish patterns of activity or behavior that (1) amount to
108   negligence of teaching duties or (2) conflict with the principles outlined in Section 3.1.1.

109 A candidate who does not meet these criteria will be rated as deficient.

110 To be rated as excellent, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must, in the
111 judgment of the RTP Committee, substantially exceed the criteria to be rated competent. Evidence of
112 this must be provided by the candidate and may include, but is not limited to, substantial work in the
113 following:

114 • Narrative that describes (1) a well-thought teaching philosophy and actions to implement that
115 philosophy and (2) practices that have led to significant improvement of instruction or
116 consistently high levels of student success. Evidence is present to support the narrative.
117 • Instructionally related activity (e.g., curriculum or program development, advising, mentorship)
118 or products/activities (see Section 2.2.8 of the CNSM RTP Policy for examples) with potential
119 for high impact on student success.

120 In the preceding list, and all following lists which have criteria for excellence, the phrase "may
121 include" indicates that the list is neither exhaustive nor mandatory. Furthermore, completion of any
122 or all of the list items is not a guarantee of a rating of excellent.

123 ### 3.1.3.2 *Promotion to Professor*
124 To be rated as competent or higher, a candidate for promotion to full professor must, in the judgment
125 of the RTP Committee, meet or exceed all the following criteria:

126 • The candidate's narrative describes their development as an instructor since their appointment
127 to associate professor.
128 • The candidate participates in at least two enhancing instructional activities beyond assigned
129 teaching duties. Such instructional activities may include, but are not limited to, activity of the
130 following types: mentorship of a student; professional development activity (either as recipient
131 or presenter); curricular innovation; advising; course coordination or other leadership. In their
132 narrative, the candidate should discuss how these enhancing instructional activities have
133 impacted their teaching or students.
134 • The candidate's file aligns with the principles outlined in Section 3.1.1.
135 • The candidate's file does not establish patterns of activity or behavior which (1) amount to
136 negligence of teaching duties, or (2) conflict with the principles outlined in Section 3.1.1.

137 A candidate who does not meet these criteria will be rated as deficient.

138 To be rated as excellent, a candidate for promotion to professor must, in the judgment of the RTP
139 Committee, substantially exceed the criteria to be rated competent. Evidence of this must be provided
140 by the candidate and may include, but is not limited to, substantial work in the following:

141 • Narrative that describes (1) a well-thought teaching philosophy and actions to implement that
142 philosophy, and (2) practices that have led to significant improvement of instruction or
143 consistently high levels of student success. Evidence is present to support the narrative.
144 • Instructionally related activity (e.g., curriculum or program development, advising, mentorship)
145 or products/activities (see Section 2.2.8 of the CNSM RTP Policy for examples) with
146 demonstrated high impact on student success.

3.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

3.2.1 Principles, Definitions, and Standards

3.2.1.1 Principles

RSCA in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics derives value not just from the dissemination of new knowledge or applications. RSCA also helps faculty maintain currency in their fields so that they may better provide instruction, mentorship, and research opportunities to students.

The university RTP policy lists four equally valued types of scholarship in Section 2.2: Scholarship of (1) Discovery; (2) Integration; (3) Application or Engagement; and (4) Teaching & Learning. These comprise the definition of RSCA for the purposes of this document. Contributions may be in one type or across multiple types of scholarship. In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings.

Specific examples of these four types of scholarship may be found in Section 2.2 of the university policy and Section 2.3.2 of the CNSM policy.

3.2.2 RSCA Fields

For the purposes of evaluation, RSCA may fall within three fields of inquiry:

- RSCA in the Disciplinary Group: RSCA that matches the disciplinary group(s) into which the candidate was hired (i.e., applied, mathematics education, statistics, theoretical/pure). Generally, faculty are expected to conduct RSCA in their specialization(s).
- RSCA in Mathematical Sciences: RSCA in any of the broadly defined mathematical sciences, including statistics, mathematics education, and history of mathematics. RSCA in the Disciplinary Group is a subset of RSCA in the Mathematical Sciences.
- RSCA outside of Mathematical Sciences.

For interdisciplinary research, the RSCA field is determined by the candidate's contribution. For example, if a candidate who was hired as a statistician makes statistical contributions to a medical research paper, then their contribution is RSCA in the Disciplinary Group.

For potentially ambiguous cases, the candidate should take care to justify categorization of RSCA products. For example, a candidate hired into a Mathematics Education position may reasonably present a case that a general education publication is RSCA in the Disciplinary Group if there is an application to mathematics education.

3.2.3 Types of Publications

For the purposes of this document, we define the following types of publications:

- *Core publications* are based on original research or applications in Mathematical Sciences that are generally published in respected peer-reviewed journals or equivalent.
- *Enhancing publications* are all other RSCA publications. These may include, but are not limited to, invited book chapters, book reviews published in journals, conference proceedings, and textbooks.

It is possible for core publications to be published in a venue that is not a journal, but that venue must be equivalent to a respected peer-reviewed journal. For example, in some rapidly changing fields, major results may be published in conference proceedings rather than in journals. In such cases, it is the

185 candidate's responsibility to provide evidence and justification that the publication qualifies as a core
186 publication. Such evidence could include acceptance rates, citation statistics, and lack of alternative
187 venues.

3.2.4 Evidence

189 University policy requires that candidates disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for
190 which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation; this should be included in the narrative.
191 In addition to all evidence required by CNSM and university policies, the department requires the
192 following:

193 1. A description, in the narrative, of the candidate's research program that is suitable for a CNSM
194   general audience.
195 2. For each publication during the review period, the candidate must:
196   a. categorize the publication venue (e.g., conference proceedings, chapter, conference
197   working group).
198   b. categorize the publication as research, application, or other (e.g., opinion, book review);
199   and provide justification in potentially ambiguous cases.
200   c. describe the peer-review process for each publication. For example: If a publication was
201   invited or came out of a working group, it should be noted.
202   d. for co-authored papers, describe the type and extent of contribution.
203   e. describe the extent to which the publication is a result of work done during the review
204   period.
205   f. If applicable, note the nature of collaboration with CSULB students.
206 3. Additionally, for each core publication during the review period, the candidate must:
207   a. label the publication as core.
208   b. justify that the publication qualifies as core. This includes, but is not limited to, providing
209   evidence that the publication venue is respected. Examples of such evidence may
210   include, but are not limited to acceptance rates, impact factors (or similar metrics),
211   venue reviews by 3rd parties, or citation statistics.

212 Requirements 2 and 3 above- may be documented in the PDS or a supplemental table.

3.2.5 Evaluation

3.2.5.1 Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor
215 To be rated as competent or higher, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must, in
216 the judgment of the RTP Committee, meet or exceed all the following criteria:

217 • Acceptance for publication of at least two core publications (or equivalent) in the disciplinary
218   group based on work that was mostly conducted during the review period.
219 • Narrative and PDS demonstrate a sustained and ongoing research program at CSULB.
220 • File aligns with the principles outlined in Section 3.2.1.1.

221 A candidate who does not meet these criteria will be rated as deficient.

222 To be rated as excellent, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must, in the
223 judgment of the RTP Committee, substantially exceed the criteria to be rated competent. Evidence of

224 this must be provided by the candidate and may include, but is not limited to, substantial work in the
225 following (or equivalent):

226 • Core publications of exceptional quality,
227 • Core publications in an especially competitive or prestigious publication venue(s),
228 • Core and enhancing publications beyond the quantity required for a rating of competent,
229 • Activity as PI or Co-PI on research grants, and
230 • Research collaboration with students that leads to dissemination.

231 *3.2.5.2 Promotion to Professor*
232 For promotion to professor, candidates who were promoted to associate professor at CSULB will be
233 evaluated on RSCA publications during their period of review (typically since submission of file for
234 promotion.

235 To be rated as competent or higher, a candidate for promotion to professor must submit a file that
236 demonstrates the following during the review period:

237 • The acceptance for publication of at least two core publications (or equivalent) in mathematical
238 sciences.
239 • At least two other RSCA activities or products in the Mathematical Sciences that align with the
240 forms of RSCA described in section 2.3.2.3 of the CNSM policy. These include Scholarship of 1.
241 Discovery, 2. Integration, 3. Application or Engagement, and 4. Teaching and Learning. The
242 department includes invited research presentations and recognition of RSCA impact outside of
243 CSULB as RSCA activities or products.
244 • A sustained and ongoing research program at CSULB.
245 • Alignment with the principles outlined in Section 3.2.1.1.

246 A candidate who does not meet these criteria will be rated as deficient.

247 To be rated as excellent, a candidate for promotion to professor must, in the judgment of the RTP
248 Committee substantially exceed the criteria to be rated competent. Evidence of this must be provided
249 by the candidate and may include, but is not limited to, substantial work on the following (or
250 equivalent):

251 • Core publications of exceptional quality,
252 • Core publications in an especially competitive publication venue(s),
253 • Core and enhancing publications beyond the quantity required for a rating of competent,
254 • Activity as PI or Co-PI on research grants, and
255 • Research collaboration with students that leads to dissemination.

256 **3.3 SERVICE**

257 **3.3.1 Principles**
258 Service is broadly defined in the CNSM and university policies, both of which provide specific examples.
259 Service may be categorized based on its impact on campus, community, or profession, though these
260 designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Service to the community or the profession

261 must connect to the candidate's academic expertise and professional goals. All faculty are expected to
262 contribute to shared governance activities on campus.

263 Service is essential to accomplishing the university's mission and the functioning of the department.
264 Moreover, service enriches a candidate's professional life as a CSULB community member. For example,
265 it can advance careers, create opportunities for students, and strengthen ties within the university and
266 in the community. An insufficient contribution to service can disrupt departmental operation and
267 harmony, burdening colleagues with extra service.

268 The amount and duration of service are important, though it is the quality of service that matters most.
269 For instance, merely being included on the membership roster of a committee has limited value if the
270 candidate is not making meaningful contributions.

271 Service contributions are expected to evolve throughout a candidate's career. It is appropriate for newly
272 hired assistant professors to focus their service contributions within the department. Following
273 reappointment, faculty must broaden their service activities to include college service to be
274 recommended for promotion to associate professor. To be rated as competent, a candidate for
275 promotion to professor must (1) do impactful service at the college, university, or CSU system level and
276 (2) serve in leadership role(s).

277 Leadership in service may take many forms and the RTP Committee should use a broad interpretation of
278 the word "leadership," as used in this and superseding documents. For the purposes of evaluation,
279 leadership includes both the leading of people (e.g., chairing a committee) and taking the lead on
280 service tasks (e.g., taking on a significant service project). It is the candidate's responsibility to document
281 the service done in a leadership role.

282 ### 3.3.2 Evidence
283 Examples of service activities are provided in CNSM and university policies. Service activities should be
284 documented in the narrative and/or PDS in alignment with the criteria in Section 2.3 of the university
285 policy and Section 2.4 of the CNSM policy. These documents include, but are not limited to, descriptions
286 of each of the following: the scope and purpose; the extent of participation; the outcomes and impacts;
287 the contributions of the service activities to the missions of the department, college, and university; and
288 the relationship to the candidate's academic expertise. Furthermore, university policy requires that,
289 within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned
290 time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity; this
291 should be included in the narrative.

292 In addition to documentation of service in the PDS and narrative, the candidate should provide evidence
293 of service when available (e.g., a letter of recognition for service on a committee). The RTP Committee
294 should be cognizant that some service activities are more difficult to document than others.

295 ### 3.3.3 Evaluation

296 #### 3.3.3.1 Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor
297 To be rated as competent or higher, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must, in
298 alignment with the principles outlined in section 3.3.1, participate in faculty governance through active
299 involvement in committees and other service activities at the department and college levels. Solely for

300 the purpose of evaluating this requirement, representing CNSM on university-level committees may
301 qualify as service at the college level.

302 A candidate who does not meet these criteria will be rated as deficient.

303 To be rated as excellent, a candidate for tenure or promotion to associate professor must, in the
304 judgment of the RTP Committee, substantially exceed the criteria to be rated competent. Evidence of
305 this must be provided by the candidate and may include, but is not limited to, substantial work in the
306 following:

307   i.   administrative or leadership positions,
308   ii.   service on committees with particularly heavy workloads during the year of service or with
309   traditionally heavy workloads (e.g., hiring committee, RTP Committee),
310   iii. service on committees at the university level, and
311   iv.   service to the discipline or community.

3.3.3.2   *Promotion to Professor*
313 To be rated as competent or higher, a candidate for promotion to professor must, in alignment with the
314 principles outlined in section 3.3.1,

315   i.   serve actively and regularly on such departmental committees as are appropriate to their level
316   of experience and expertise and contribute appropriately to the work of these committees,
317   ii.   assume a leadership role in some aspect of service, and
318   iii. demonstrate significant service (e.g., taking leadership roles in committees or other service
319   activities) at the college, university, or CSU system level.

320 A candidate who does not meet these criteria will be rated as deficient.

321 To be rated as excellent, a candidate for promotion to professor must, in the judgment of the RTP
322 Committee, substantially exceed the criteria to be rated competent. Evidence of this must be provided
323 by the candidate and may include, but is not limited to, substantial work in the following:

324   i.   administrative or leadership service position(s) that have a high impact on the university, the
325   community, or the profession, and
326   ii.   service on committees with particularly heavy workloads during the year of service or with
327   traditionally heavy workloads (e.g., hiring committee, RTP Committee).

4   TIMELINE

4.1   EARLY TENURE AND PROMOTION
330 Early promotion to either associate professor or professor and early tenure are granted only in
331 exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. The CNSM policy provides a non-exhaustive list
332 of examples of such circumstances and reasons. It also recommends that the candidate does the
333 following:

334   •   Seek (and receive) initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria
335   and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. The department further recommends
336   that this guidance begin early in the review period.
337   •   Participate in an external evaluation process for RSCA as described in section 5.5.4.1 of the
338   CNSM policy.

339 The candidate is responsible for (1) establishing, in their narratives, that they have met the standard of
340 exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons and (2) providing supporting evidence in their files.

341 The university policy requires that a candidate for early promotion or tenure "achieve a record of
342 distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department
343 policies."

344 To achieve such a record of distinction and be recommended for early tenure or promotion to associate
345 professor, the candidate must, in the judgment of the RTP Committee, meet or exceed all the following
346 criteria:

347   •   Be rated as excellent in all three areas of evaluation
348   •   Substantially exceed the requirements for excellence in at least one of area (I) instruction and
349   instructionally related activities or area (II) RSCA.

350 To achieve such a record of distinction and be recommended for early promotion to professor, the
351 candidate must, in the judgment of the RTP Committee, meet or exceed all the following criteria:

352   •   Be rated as excellent in all three areas of evaluation
353   •   Substantially exceed the requirements for excellence in at least one of area (I) instruction and
354   instructionally related activities, area (II) RSCA, or area (III) service.

355 The candidate is responsible for (1) establishing, in their narratives, that they have substantially
356 exceeded requirements for excellence and (2) providing supporting evidence in their files.

357 Substantially exceeding the requirements for excellence in instruction and instructionally related
358 activities requires, but is not guaranteed by, the following:

359   •   A rating of excellent in instruction and instructionally related activities, and
360   •   Significant and impactful work that extends well beyond the candidate's classrooms.

361 Substantially exceeding the requirements for excellence in RSCA requires, but is not guaranteed by, the
362 following:

363   •   A rating of excellent in RSCA, and
364   •   Acceptance for publication of at least four core publications of high quality in competitive
365   journals based on work that was primarily conducted during the review period, and
366   •   National, State, or University-level validation that the candidate's RSCA agenda is valued highly.
367   Examples may include, but are not limited to, the following:
368   ○   awards in recognition of innovative or high-quality RSCA,
369   ○   a positively reviewed and significant RSCA grant application,
370   ○   an extremely prominent publication in a highly ranked journal,
371   ○   a significant invited or peer-reviewed comprehensive RSCA literature review,

372   o   a talk about the candidate's research agenda as a plenary speaker at a significant
373   conference.

374 Substantially exceeding the requirements for excellence in service requires, but is not guaranteed by, the
375 following:

376   •   A rating of excellent in service, and
377   •   Substantive involvement in and sustained leadership on a significant service project that has
378   potential for broad, sustained, and positive impact.

4.2 CLASS VISITS

380 Section 2.2.5 of the CNSM policy provides details on the timing of visits, the role of evaluators, and the
381 content of class visit reports. In addition to the evaluative goals that are documented in the CNSM
382 policy, class visits should provide formative feedback to the candidate. At the candidate's request, and
383 with the evaluator's concurrence, the parties may conduct after-visit debrief(s) that focus on the
384 candidate's growth as an educator.

385 The following are department-specific class visit guidelines for candidates who are teaching at CSULB
386 during the semester of review. If a candidate is not teaching during the semester of review, then the
387 timing of class visits will be guided by CNSM policy.

4.2.1   Class Visits for Reappointment

389 Class visits must be made by at least two members of the RTP Committee and to multiple class
390 meetings. Ideally, two class visits during the semester of review should be completed before the RTP
391 Committee's recommendation is made for reappointment.

4.2.2   Class Visits for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

393 Four class visits must be completed after reappointment and before the RTP Committee's
394 recommendation is made for promotion to Associate Professor. Class visits must be made by at least
395 two members of the RTP Committee and to multiple class meetings. Ideally, at least two visits should be
396 completed during the semester of review for tenure and promotion.

397 Ideally, these class visits will be made on the following schedule:

398   •   One class visit during each of the two mini reviews which follow reappointment.
399   •   Two class visits during the semester of review for promotion.

400 By not including the class visit reports in their file, the candidate may opt out of having reviews from
401 either (or both) of the two previous years considered by the RTP Committee. In this case, the RTP
402 Committee will conduct a sufficient number of visits during the semester of review to bring the total to
403 four visits.

4.2.3   Class Visits for Promotion to Professor

405 Class visits must be made by at least two members of the department RTP Committee and to multiple
406 class meetings. Ideally, two class visits should be completed during the semester of review.

5 GUIDANCE FOR CANDIDATES AND EVALUATORS

5.1 CULTURAL/IDENTITY TAXATION

The department uses the CNSM policy's definition of cultural/identity taxation from section 2.4.1:

> *The suggested or unstated expectation that faculty from marginalized or minoritized*
> *backgrounds or identities should provide representation on committees or service activities*
> *related to the groups and communities to which they belong.*

Cultural/identity taxation may have a significant and inequitable impact on a candidate's workload, their progress toward tenure or promotion, and their work-life balance. In their narrative, a candidate who has experienced cultural/identity taxation should describe how it has impacted their progress toward promotion or tenure. The RTP Committee must use this information as an important context in evaluating and rating the candidate's file. The department hopes that readers of the narrative in leadership roles (e.g., department chair, dean) will consider actions to support the candidate.

5.2 EVIDENCE

5.2.1 Student Perceptions of Teaching

Section 2.1.2 of the CNSM policy provides guidelines for the inclusion of Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) surveys and framing for how the RTP Committee should interpret SPOT scores. In particular, CNSM policy notes that "a variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence SPOT scores".

Despite these potential biases, the candidate must still address SPOT reports in their narratives. This need not be an in-depth analysis but should contextualize patterns in student perceptions. If actions were taken to improve student perceptions, these actions should be described in the narrative.

5.2.2 Sources of Evidence

RTP Committee members should only consult materials contained or referenced in the candidate's RTP file and materials provided as a part of official procedure (e.g., course statistics) in their evaluations. Committee members should not do their own investigative work that extends beyond accessing public information that is not opinion-based. For example, the committee should not contact co-authors, talk to former students, or consult professor ratings or reviews on non-CSU websites. Fact-finding activities such as visiting a journal's website to investigate review practices are acceptable. If essential materials or evidence are believed to be missing from a candidate's file, then the RTP Committee should promptly seek the advice of the department chair.

5.3 PREPARATION OF THE NARRATIVE AND PDS

CNSM policy limits the narrative to 10,000 words. To respect this limit while also addressing the requirements of this and superseding policies, the following is advised:

- The narrative should discuss, with examples drawn from multiple courses, how the candidate's instruction and instructionally related activity align with the principles outlined in section 3.1.1. The candidate need not separately write about each course taught nor address the principles from section 3.1.1 one-by-one. The candidate should strive for a cohesive description of their teaching philosophy and practices that both provides evidence and demonstrates alignment with the principles.
- The narrative should provide an overview of the candidate's RSCA program that is suitable for a CNSM general audience and discuss the program's alignment with the principles outlined in section 3.2.1. The candidate need not provide technical details about their RSCA.
- The narrative should focus discussion of service on alignment with the principles outlined in section 3.3.1. There need not be separate descriptions of each service activity.
- For all three areas of evaluation, the candidate should use the narrative to discuss their growth during the review period and their plans for continued productivity and growth.

The PDS should be used as more than just a list of accomplishments. It may include brief descriptive content to help evaluators contextualize and understand a candidate's work during the review period.

5.4 CATEGORIZING ACTIVITIES

An academic activity may not be "double counted" in multiple areas of evaluation (i.e., teaching, research, service), though a candidate may choose to parse some activities in such a way that the pieces are categorized differently. In general, the RTP Committee should value synergistic efforts that span multiple areas of evaluation. The candidate should take efforts to clarify the categorization of activities and to justify categorizations in ambiguous cases.

5.5 CATEGORIZING PUBLICATIONS

As described in section 3.2.4, the candidate is responsible for categorizing publications as core or enhancing and for justifying those categorizations. If the department RTP committee disagrees with any of the candidate's categorizations, then the committee's review must include a justified recategorization.

A department RTP committee may not recategorize a publication from core to enhancing if it was previously endorsed as a core publication by all levels of review during the candidate's reappointment.

A candidate who disagrees with a committee's recategorization may write a formal rebuttal or may address the publication's categorization in a future evaluation file.

5.6 SUPPORT FOR PREPARATION OF THE RTP FILE

The department may produce templates, checklists, rubrics, and other support documents for candidates and evaluators. Such documents must be approved by the Executive Committee, department chair, and union before distribution.

Candidates are advised to attend RTP-related workshops offered at CSULB and to seek advice from mentors and the department chair.

6 AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this document may be proposed by submitting them to the department chair with the signatures of 20% of tenured and probationary members of the department. Pro and con arguments may be submitted within seven academic days following the chair's notification of the department. After that period, a referendum will be held with tenured and probationary faculty being eligible to vote. The amendment will be adopted if it is approved by a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty members voting and then approved by the CNSM Council, dean, and provost.

Non-substantive amendments (e.g., updating references to section numbers in CNSM policy) may be approved by a unanimous vote of the department Executive Committee and approval of department chair, without a petition process or a department vote.