

**California State University, Long Beach
Graduate Center for Public Policy and Administration**

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

The Graduate Center for Public Policy and Administration (GCPPA) and its faculty are committed to high quality instruction, research, and service to its constituents and stakeholders. As such, the GCPPA is committed to the growth and development of its faculty. This policy is established to provide for the fair and supportive evaluation of faculty across the three areas of teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly creative activities, and service to the university, college, profession, or community. This policy applies to tenure-track faculty hired Fall 2025 or later.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE GCPAA

Mission

The mission of the Master of Public Administration (MPA) Program at the Graduate Center for Public Policy and Administration is to graduate a diverse, ethically, and equity-minded student population with the professional competencies and analytical tools necessary for leadership, policy, and management roles in public service, nonprofit, and community-based organizations. Through the promotion of excellence in professional public service, research, and education, graduates will advance the public good and make a positive impact at all levels of governance and management.

Values

- *Professional Competence* – Demonstrate the competencies necessary for effective leadership and management.
- *Promoting the Public Interest* – Place the interest of the public above interest to oneself.
- *Diversity and Inclusion* – Promote diversity and inclusion in all aspects of the MPA program and curriculum.
- *Ethical Behavior* – Demonstrate a commitment to the principles of public service and exhibit a commitment to ethical practice.
- *Social Justice* – Commit to the promotion of social justice and equity.
- *Critical and Analytical Thinking* – Demonstrate the analytical skills necessary to identify problems and develop feasible, equitable, and effective solutions to problems.

DEIA Statement

The GCPPA celebrates the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students. This policy is intended to embody the department's commitment to amplifying diverse voices in our classrooms, research endeavors, and administrative decisions.

1.1 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

- 1.1.1** A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the mission and vision of the university, the CHHS, and the GCPPA. Faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and

enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the GCPPA, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession. Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in all three of the following areas:

- Instructional and instructionally related activities
- Research, scholarly, and creative activity (RSCA); and
- Service and engagement at the university, in the community, and the profession.

1.1.2 Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. RTP reviews must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.

1.1.3 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in the areas of: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.

1.1.4 As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. Service activities like these (whether academic or personal, supporting faculty or students), may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways. The GCPPA recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas and the department encourages candidates to discuss potential cultural and identity taxation costs with the Department Chair to recognize the presence of these potential costs and incorporate consideration of these costs into the retention, tenure, and promotion processes.

1.1.5 Adoption

The GCPPA adopts this policy pursuant to the mandates of Section 2.2 of the CHHS RTP Policy, Section 1.2 of the university RTP policy, and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university RTP policy, or the CHHS RTP policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

1.1.6 Specific Role of this Departmental Policy

This departmental-level policy serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the policies and procedures set forth in other RTP policies in a manner that provides concrete guidance to faculty in the GCPPA within the department's discipline-specific framework.

1.1.7 Obligation of the Candidate in the Process

To be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file. All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and department RTP policies. The only evidence that may be considered for review is that which is included in the candidate's RTP file and candidate's PAF.

Candidates must furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation (e.g., for teaching: student evaluations, course syllabi, sample(s) of course content, sample(s) of student work with feedback, peer evaluations, and grade distributions; etc.; for RSCA, copies of manuscripts under review and/or presented at conferences; preprints or reprints of articles; letters accepting manuscripts for publication; for service, letters documenting the candidate's service which assess the quality of the service contributions).

1.1.8 Obligation of the Department RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the GCPA are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which Department RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating the evidence to support its recommendations. The Department RTP Committee shall operate in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.3 of the CHHS RTP Policy.

1.2 Standards

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

1.2.1 Maintaining Currency in the Field

Faculty members must keep abreast of scholarly discourse and professional practice applicable to the faculty member's areas of teaching and research interest(s) through appropriate means and demonstrate their application of this knowledge.

1.2.2 Involvement in the Profession

Faculty members are encouraged to attend and participate in the annual meetings of professional organizations related to the fields of public policy and administration.

1.2.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing

Faculty members must actively pursue a research and publishing agenda relevant to one or more of the following types of data-based scholarship, all of which are highly valued regardless of reliance on quantitative, qualitative, or other discipline- appropriate methodologies (such as legal analysis, policy analysis, or case studies):

- Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.
- Scholarship of Integration: Building or expanding connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.

- **Scholarship of Application or Engagement:** Applying disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.
- **Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:** Advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.

1.2.4 High-Quality Instruction

Faculty members must involve students in active learning through excellence not only in their "in-classroom" teaching, but also in their mentoring of students in the following ways:

- 1.2.4.1** by their own examples of service to the GCPA; the College of Health and Human Services; the university; professional organizations; and within the region at large;
- 1.2.4.2** through collaborative research that engages students in the processes of critical inquiry and discovery;
- 1.2.4.3** through assigning meaningful work in the discipline, and by interacting with students both in and out of class in a manner that fosters the development of broadly applicable intellectual habits necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship.
- 1.2.4.4** through service to the GCPA, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession as a meaningfully contributing citizen.

1.2.5 Contributions to Service

CSULB depends on faculty contributions to ensure that it achieves its educational mission through effective and efficient operations. The university's commitment to participatory governance and the needs of academic programs and units require a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all faculty members in the GCPA are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in professional organizations.

- 1.2.5.1** Faculty service contributions are expected to increase concomitantly with the institution's commitment to the individual. This means that faculty members are expected to accept more significant service responsibilities over time during the probationary period, and then even more at each higher rank.

1.3 Profiles of Academic Ranks

The GCPA comprises a community of teacher-scholars and learners who are dedicated to free inquiry and open exchange. In accordance with the CSULB mission, the Department's faculty is dedicated "to providing highly-valued educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity, and service for the people of California and the world." Section 1.7 of the college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank.

1.4 Candidate's Narrative

To present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements. Within their narratives candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) their scholarly vision or program--the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work and aims or expected outcomes of their work. They should discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities are high quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. The narrative is not meant to be merely a list of activities and candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment. Candidates are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their fields. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As Section 2.0 of the CHHS RTP policy and Academic Senate Policy 23-24 make clear, academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university, the college, and the academic unit. The subsections of Section 2.0 in this policy were crafted in fulfillment of that obligation. Accordingly, the provisions in Section 2.0 and its subsections articulate the standards for faculty accomplishments and the criteria for evaluation of those accomplishments in three areas of evaluation: instruction and instructionally related activities, research, scholarly and creative activities, and serve and engagement.

2.1 Continuous Professional Learning

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 that 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.

2.2 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

While all the expectations set forth above in Sections 1.2.1 through 1.2.5 are highly valued, above all, GCPA faculty members are expected to serve the missions of the department, college, and university through high-quality teaching that successfully integrates both discipline-specific and broad learning goals and objectives. The goal of higher education is to help develop educated, ethical, and productive citizens, as well as capable professionals in a variety of careers. In a rapidly changing world, a university education must provide students with more than the knowledge needed for success in a specific profession. It also must provide them with skills and attitudes that facilitate adaptation and constructive response to societal needs and changes. Candidates shall clearly articulate all instructional activities that are compensated by assigned time or additional compensation.

2.2.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall

accommodate student differences.

To help evaluate a candidate's instructional philosophy and teaching effectiveness, candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit indicators of teaching effectiveness including student evaluations; peer evaluations; course syllabi; examples of instructional materials and methods; examples of student work with the instructor's feedback; and grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy. Additionally, candidates may (but are not required to) submit any additional documentation that demonstrates high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as an instructor.

- A. Indicators of High-Quality Teaching – Although high quality teaching is to be assessed holistically, hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and practice include, but are not limited to:
- 1) subject mastery, currency, and ongoing growth in one's discipline;
 - 2) teaching skills that arouse student interest, curiosity, motivation and participation; rigor and transparency in evaluating student work;
 - 3) timeliness and professionalism in meeting classes and evaluating student work;
 - 4) the creation and/or revision of courses and curricula in ways that foster a vibrant, intellectual community that is built around a shared commitment to scholarly inquiry;
- B. Indicators of Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher – Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness can be evidenced by teaching innovations based upon, but not limited to:
- 1) Purposeful experimentation with one's own pedagogy leading to improvements in ways to foster engaging educational environments that are characterized by academic freedom, creative expressions, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and community engagement;
 - 2) Deliberate efforts to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to:
 - a. Regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development; or
 - b. A sustained record of involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for Faculty Development; or
 - c. A sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or professional organizations; or
 - 3) Significant contribution to the Department's curricular and assessment efforts.
- C. Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey to students—in measurable, behavioral terms—expected student learning outcomes. Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices, standards, and criteria).
- D. Careful preparation and clear organization of lessons and pedagogical/andragogical materials that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.
- E. Evaluation by RTP Committee— Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs. In accordance with Section 2.1.7 of the CHHS RTP Policy, the Center recognizes that 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. Importantly, any single item on this form— or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. For this reason, candidates must submit other supporting documentation such as syllabi, grade distribution, sample course content, samples of student work with instructor feedback, and peer evaluations of instructional effectiveness. These additional materials serve to help the Department RTP Committee contextualize student ratings.

- 1) While, on occasion, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the GCPPA and/or the CHHS for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative (e.g., when teaching a new course for the first time; when teaching under-enrolled courses or when SPOT response rate was low which could result in skewed evaluations; when teaching courses that traditionally result in lower than average evaluations), overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages.
- 2) Student ratings of instruction are "consistently favorable" when both of following criteria are met:
 - a) the mean for students' responses to questions on standardized teaching evaluation forms are no lower than one standard deviation below the departmental mean; and
 - b) student evaluations submitted by candidates provide evidence of the following trends:
 - (1) For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching *must* evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
 - (2) Student evaluations of teaching submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
 - (3) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.2.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning that should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials.

2.2.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

All student course evaluations conducted during the period of evaluation should be submitted in accordance with Section 2.1.7 of the CHHS RTP policy. Candidates should demonstrate in their narrative deliberate efforts to improve instruction based on student course evaluations.

Required Documentation – In order to allow for complete consideration of student evaluations, candidates must submit copies of student evaluations – both quantitative and qualitative – in accordance with the following requirements:

- 1) Candidates should submit all student evaluations conducted during the review period (excluding S-factor courses).
- 2) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should submit all student evaluations conducted within the previous five years or since their last promotion

review, if this has been within the last five years (excluding S-factor courses).

2.2.4 Syllabi and Course Content

In accordance with Section 2.1.5 of the CHHS RTP policy, syllabi from all courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's file along with a narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to the syllabi. At minimum, all course syllabi shall comply with the requirements of CSULB's official syllabi policy. Candidates should familiarize themselves with the syllabus requirements contained in this policy. Pursuant to that policy, all syllabi must include the following:

- A. Instructor's name, office number, office telephone number and/or e-mail address, and office hours;
- B. Class term, meeting times, and location;
- C. Course goals and/or objectives and/or expected student learning outcomes;
- D. Required text(s) and/or materials and information on any course fee;
- E. Types and sequence of assignments and basis for assigning course grade;
- F. How the instructor will interpret the University withdrawal policy in this class;
- G. A statement of, or reference to where students may find attendance policies and provision for makeup of assignments when there is an excused absence;
- H. A reminder that it is the student's responsibility to notify the instructor in advance of the need for accommodation of a university verified disability;
- I. Other information essential to the course, for example safety information, information about accessing online resources, information about assignments that must be accomplished at off-campus locations (e. g., field trips or service learning). Instructors should also refer students to the "General Regulations and Procedures" in the Catalog and are encouraged to discuss their interpretation of these General Regulations and Procedures, especially with regard to cheating and plagiarism.
- J. Any course that uses hybrid, local online, or distance education course delivery shall explain the following issues in the course syllabus:
 - 1) How the instructor will communicate with the students and how the students will communicate with each other;
 - 2) How online participation will be assessed and graded;
 - 3) How the instructor will monitor the online activities of the students;
 - 4) How the standards of appropriate online behavior will be maintained;
 - 5) The level of technical competence required of the students;
 - 6) What the minimum computer hardware and software requirements are for the class, and what department, college, or University facilities are available to support these requirements for students who cannot afford to buy the technology;
 - 7) The alternative procedures for submitting work in the event of technical breakdowns; the on-campus meeting requirements, if any; how academic honesty will be enforced. If some of the information is subject to change, that fact should be noted in the syllabus (e.g., due dates and exam dates).

Samples of course content should be provided by the candidate as evidence of how the instructor addresses the course content described in the syllabi. Samples of course content can include, but are not limited to:

- A. PowerPoint lectures
- B. Classroom instructional activities
- C. Outlines of discussion questions to be addressed in a facilitated class discussion

2.2.5 Grade Distributions and Feedback on Student Work

Grade distributions of courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file along with narrative discussion of grading in accordance with academic unit expectations. 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.

2.2.6 Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above in Section 2.2 and/or ongoing professional development as an instructor.

2.3 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Research and scholarly/creative activities (RSCA) represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and beneficial components for several reasons. First, advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one's knowledge has the potential for improving the quality of education by keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline. Second, RSCA brings prestige and visibility to the University and the GCPPA. This increases not only the likelihood that the Department will attract high quality students and faculty, but also the likelihood of obtaining grants, equipment, and other financial support from the community, industry, and government agencies. Third, RSCA enhances teaching effectiveness and enriches the education of students.

Scholarly activities enable professions to shape their own destiny, rather than allowing others to dominate the course of events. For these reasons, faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. Accordingly, faculty members in the GCPPA must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research which demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of recreation, leisure, tourism, and/or related fields.

2.3.1 Standards for the Production of Scholarly Research and Creative Activities

- A. Standards – The following provide the foundation for delineating our discipline- specific standards for teacher-scholar excellence and, therefore, shall be used for evaluating candidates' RSCA:
- high-quality work as judged by one's peers;
 - scope of recognition for RSCA contributions at the international, national, regional, or local level;
 - sustained effort, involvement, and record of RSCA accomplishment; and
 - the impact of one's research and scholarly activities.

Types of RSCA – All faculty members in the GCPPA are required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, theoretical, and/or other discipline-appropriate scholarly research as well as other scholarly and creative activities consistent with the provisions of this Policy. Copies of all such scholarly work published or presented must be submitted so that the Department RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.

Required Types of RSCA

- (a) Publication of peer-reviewed research is required of all candidates at all levels of review. Specific publication requirements are set forth below.

- (1) “Research” involves scientific, social scientific, theoretical, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods. These types of data-based research are highly valued types of scholarly activity for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the GCPPA.
 - (2) Literature reviews, book reviews, scholarly article reviews, or encyclopedia entries alone typically do not satisfy the departmental requirement for “scholarly research.”

Conference proceedings and presentations may strengthen a candidate’s scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank. However, candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.”

- **RSCA Strengthening a Candidate’s file**

- a) Literature reviews, book reviews, article reviews, encyclopedia entries, etc.) are valued and may strengthen a candidate’s file. However, candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.
 - b) 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, awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.
 - c) Candidates may also strengthen their required program of RSCA by writing or editing books. Books strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio.

B. Evolution of RSCA – Although scholarly activities take many forms, faculty members shall develop a scholarly research agenda and a record of scholarly publication that flows from the pursuit of that research agenda.

- Scholarly Research Agenda – Teacher-scholars in the GCPPA are expected to establish and maintain an ongoing program of scholarship that is marked by continued scholarly research activity and dissemination. Teacher-scholars may concentrate on one type of research specified in Section 1.2.3, or may distribute their scholarship across the different types. Rates of dissemination may vary with specific scholarly goals.

An important element of all RTP reviews is the teacher-scholar’s explanation of the continuity and evolution of their scholarly agenda, including future plans and goals. While the primary focus is clearly on accomplished contributions during the probationary years, it is important to respect and support the continued vibrancy of scholarly activity after the award of tenure and promotion. While the focus of scholarly activity can be expected to change with the evolution of an academic career, continuity, reflection, and growth are expected to persist. As a community of vibrant teacher-scholars, we are committed to recognizing, valuing, and supporting each others’ unique paths of professional growth. Towards these ends:

- a) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to define and pursue a scholarly research agenda.
 - b) Reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require evidence that the candidate’s scholarly research has been productive as evidenced by publications in suitable, scholarly venues (see subsection 2 below). Moreover, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be able to demonstrate

how their research agenda is both continuing and evolving.

- c) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained pattern of achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly record.

Scholarly Publications – The quality of work is defined by its significance in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to validate the work's significance. This level of accomplishment is required and is the most important evidence for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion within the RSCA area.

- a) RTP Committee members evaluating mini reviews must be mindful of the fact that in the early probationary years, faculty are likely to begin establishing a research agenda. Thus, in the first year or two, new faculty might be more likely to publish book reviews, invited essays, monographs, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. New faculty, however, are expected to be working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals or book chapters in their first two years.
Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- b) By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment in the third probationary year, it is expected that the candidate will have at least one (1) peer-reviewed journal article either in-print or formally accepted for publication consistent with accepted disciplinary standards or provide justification for equivalency. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- c) After initial reappointment in the latter half of the probationary period (years four through six), faculty should be regularly producing peer-reviewed scholarship. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least two (2) scholarly publications in refereed venues or provide justification for equivalency. Quality, however, is more important than quantity. The GCPA recognizes that single authored publications typically require more time and effort on the part of the candidate than a co-authored publication. Therefore, candidates with co-authored publications shall describe their specific role in the production of that research. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

Candidates are expected to maintain a continuing program of scholarship or creative activity that demonstrates, by favorable review of peers, intellectual and professional growth. For candidates for tenure and/or promotion, this generally is accomplished through meeting the following standards during the period subject to RTP review:

- 1. A publication record that includes one of the following (a, b, or c) or their equivalencies:
 - (a) authorship of two peer-reviewed articles in academic journals and/or peer-reviewed chapters in edited books published by academic or other quality presses.
 - (b) authorship of a stand-alone academic textbook and at least one peer-reviewed journal articles or peer-reviewed chapters in edited volumes published by

- academic or other quality presses.
- (c) editorship of an academic collection of essays, and at least one peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed chapters in edited volumes published by academic or other quality presses.

In all of the above scenarios, the status of the publications, “in press,” “forthcoming,” and “accepted” are counted as effective publications.

- d) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in high-quality, peer-reviewed venues. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have produced, at least three (3) scholarly publications in refereed venues since the last promotion action. As with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, however, quality is more important than quantity. Thus, multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner are not likely to result in a favorable recommendation for promotion. Conversely, multiple publications in high-quality journals, or a book with a well-respected scholarly press or leading publishing house may warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

Significance of Scholarly Engagement of Students and/or Community – In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, the GCPA values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to our role in serving the communities in which we work and live through collection and analysis of data from these communities. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends shall be considered evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement.

Sponsored Research – Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support 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 for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank. Securing such sponsored research opportunities, though, shall constitute a criterion that is given extremely positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.

- a) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the probationary period, merely applying for externally sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills. However, applying for sponsored research opportunities does not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly venues as specified in subsections 2.3.1.
- b) During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related scholarly activities, allowances should be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly journal articles. Such allowances must recognize that managing grant work is time-consuming and,

therefore, publication of the results of such research may be delayed until after extensive data-collection and analysis processes.

Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of Specific Forms of RSCA - The following tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality can be used to guide choices of scholarship dissemination outlets.

Refereed Articles and Book Chapters – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee’s assessment of journal articles: peer-review; acceptance/rejection rates for the journal; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal; status of the journal within the subfield; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and/or citations to the article. Similar criteria should guide refereed book chapters including the nature of the peer-review process, status of the academic publisher or reputable publishing house, and/or citations of the book chapter.

- a) Venues – Refereed articles that are accepted and published in discipline-related journals; journals from related social sciences and/or cognate disciplines; refereed book chapters in edited volumes, and relevant electronic media are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
- b) Exceptional Scholarship – Publishing exceptionally high-quality scholarship in peer-reviewed outlets constitutes the strongest evidence of scholarly achievement that contributes to the meaningful advancement of the discipline.

Books – The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.

- (a) Both scholarly books and textbooks are valued for RTP purposes.
- (b) Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given more weight than edited books.

Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.

Invited Publications and/or Presentations – The stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.

Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – A peer review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local). While regular conference participation is expected at all levels of candidate review, nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Although conference presentations represent a form of scholarly activity, conference presentations and published proceedings do not supplant the requirement that candidates produce peer-reviewed publications in discipline-appropriate venues.

Editorial Roles – Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing

editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer on journal submissions; membership on a grant- review panel; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications. Such roles augment faculty members' required program of RSCA, but alone are insufficient to meet the Department RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.

Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports; and the frequency and range of clients, partners, and collaborators for consulting activities.

Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of activities supported by internal grants, reassigned time, sabbaticals, and other forms of support for scholarly research funded by CSULB. Such activities augment faculty members' required program of RSCA, but are insufficient alone to meet the Department RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.

Professional Honors, Awards, and Other Forms of Recognition – Recognition of RSCA through fellowship status in a professional organization, including consideration of the scope of the organization; awards, prizes, and other forms of recognition, including consideration of the scope of the organization presenting the award.

C. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of the Impact of RSCA

Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary venues. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).

Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. The GCPPA evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first- person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses). Publications and presentations that include student co-authors are highly valued.

Community Impact – The Center recognizes that RSCA impacts a variety of communities, including but not limited to professional and public (e.g. local, state, national, and international).

D. Weighting of the Body of Work – The applicant's entire body of scholarly work provides evidence for the pattern of continuing and evolving scholarship in support of mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, and initial promotion, but only works finished since appointment at CSULB and within years of service credit granted at the time of appointment are evaluated for mini-reviews, reappointment, and tenure.

2.4 Service

Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The GCPPA is committed to an

equitable system of shared governance.

2.4.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments

All faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance through service to their academic units, the college, and the university. The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience. Additionally, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are required to have made quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection.

Service within the University

During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in university or college service; however, they are expected to perform quality service within the GCPPA. 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. Departmental service may be demonstrated by:

- (a) attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;
- (b) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department;
- (c) participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees, (especially by chairing a department committee such as Grade Appeals, Admissions, Curriculum, etc.);
- (d) attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the department, the college, the university, and professional organizations; and advising student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;

For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to both the GCPPA (as discussed above) service contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, such as serving on college-wide committees and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the college. University-level service is also expected. Service to the CHHS may be evidenced by leadership and/or membership on college standing or ad hoc committees. The Department RTP Committee will assess the extent of the candidate's participation as evidenced by the candidate's RTP documentation. For example, service on a committee that meets once per semester is not equivalent to leadership roles on standing committees that meet more frequently. It is the candidate's responsibility to document their efforts in each service endeavor. Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.

For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership at the department, college, and university levels. In doing so, they must contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution.

Illustrative examples of service may include, but are not limited to:

- (a) chairing the department, serving as the Graduate Advisor or directing the Department's certificate or distance-learning degree programs.
- (b) holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
- (c) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university,

college, or department;

Service to the Community and/or the Profession – All 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, state, and/or local agencies 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.

- (a) For reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, such service may include:
 - (1) consulting with schools; agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.
 - (2) helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise; and/or
 - (3) acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.
- (b) For promotion to the rank of full Professor, such community service is expected to include a record of meaningful service in the community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international problems), such as:
 - (1) taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;
 - (2) serving on a board of a nonprofit organization, voluntary association, foundation, or other public and nonprofit sector organizations.
 - (3) holding elective office in local, state, or federal government;
 - (4) consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
 - (5) serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or

Service to the Profession – Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected offices in a discipline-related professional organization. Such professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for national, state, or international associations.

2.4.2 Quality of Service Commitments and Participation

The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion. Accordingly, the RTP Committee must not merely summarize the breadth and/or quantity of a candidate's service contributions, but rather must evaluate the depth, quality, and significance of service activities. In doing so, the Committee should consider:

- A. the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, college, and/or to the GCPA;
- B. 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;
- C. 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;

- D. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;
- E. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers their services; and
- F. most, importantly, the degree of leadership exhibited by the candidate. In evaluating this criterion, 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.

2.4.3 Evaluation of Service

Candidate's Responsibility

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

1. Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance.
2. 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.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the academic unit, GCPPA RTP committee, the chair of the GCPPA, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process.

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 RTP committee of the academic unit, the chair or director of the academic unit, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP shall seek advice and guidance from the Department Chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all information and supporting materials specified in all applicable RTP policies. The candidate must clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes their goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or

rebuttals, if any.

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

3.2 The Department RTP Policy

The content of this RTP policy, belonging to the GCPPA, specifies in writing the standards and criteria to be applied in evaluating teaching performance, RSCA, and service. As administered by the Department, the standards are equal to or in excess of both university and CHHS standards. These standards are derived from and support the mission of the university, the college, and the department. This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the GCPPA and to approval by the college Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost. Additionally, this Policy shall be subject to regular review by the Department's tenured and probationary faculty.

3.3 The Department RTP Committee

The GCPPA RTP Committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee.

3.3.1 Election of Committee

The RTP Committee of the GCPPA consists of at least three (3) tenured members elected by majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the department.

- A. Election – Membership on the RTP Committee reflects, at a minimum, all requirements specified in the university and college RTP policies. To wit:
 - 1) The Committee must be composed 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 composed of tenured Associate and full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be tenured full Professors.
 - 2) Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the President. However, the RTP Committee may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
 - 3) The Department Chair may serve as a member of the RTP Committee, if elected, subject to the provisions of section 3.3.2(B).
- B. Single vs. Multiple Committees – Subject to the exception provided in subsection 3.3.6 governing joint appointments, all recommendations for advancement (promotion) to a given rank, for tenure, or for reappointment *shall* be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee composed of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the Department who are eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. A second committee of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3.2 Committee Composition

The following provisions shall govern the composition of the Department RTP Committee.

- A. Membership Rank – Members of the GCPPA RTP Committee who participate in promotion recommendations must be tenured and must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. They must not themselves be candidates for promotion.
- B. Department Chair – The Chair of the GCPPA generally does not serve as a member of the Department RTP Committee so that he or she may write an independent evaluation of the candidate pursuant to the provisions of Section 3.4.2 of this document. However, in the event that there are an insufficient number of faculty members qualified to serve on the Department RTP Committee (or other unusual circumstances that so warrant), the Department Chair may serve as a member of the Department RTP Committee, if elected. If elected to such service, though, the Chair may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this policy. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, the Department Chair may not sit with the Department RTP Committee during the time that the Committee is considering his or her own materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
- C. Vacancies – In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the Department RTP Committee, either a meeting of the department faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the Chair of the GCPPA. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).
- D. Chair of the Department RTP Committee – The GCPPA RTP Committee shall elect a chair from among its own members.

3.3.3. Responsibility and Accountability

A. Candidates

- 1) The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.
- 2) Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations.

B. GCPPA RTP Committee

Mini-Reviews – The Department RTP shall conduct an assessment of all probationary faculty members at least once per year during probationary years in which the candidate is not scheduled for a formal RTP review. While such mini-reviews do not result in any job actions (e.g., reappointment, tenure, or promotion), they must provide guidance for professional development. Thus, mini-reviews shall commend probationary faculty member for meeting or exceeding expectations for instruction and instructionally-related activities, RSCA, and service, while providing written guidance for making improvements in areas which need strengthening.

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews – RTP reviews shall be conducted by the GCPPA on the schedule set by the University. The GCPPA RTP Committee is accountable for its recommendations by (a) supplying the College RTP Committee with a substantive evaluation to support its recommendations; and (b) submitting candidates' RTP portfolios and supporting documents on-time in accordance with established deadlines.

3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members of the Department, as specified in this policy, are eligible to serve on the Department RTP Committee, then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

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.

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

3.3.6 Joint Appointments

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

3.4 Department Chair/Director

The Chair of the GCPPA 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 mentors from department and/or the college, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

3.4.1 Meeting with Committee

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.

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by the Chair

The Department Chair may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the Chair is elected to the GCPPA RTP Committee. In promotion considerations, however, the 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 the Department Chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4.3 Candidate's Rights

At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the candidate's file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members undergo performance review and evaluation. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years.

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

4.1 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment

4.1.1 Periodic Review (“Mini-Review”)

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

4.1.2 Reappointment Review

In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years. 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 Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

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

A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy.

4.2.1 Early Promotion

To qualify for early promotion, a candidate must be markedly exceptional in all three areas of evaluation (instruction, RSCA, and service). The GCPA defines “markedly exceptional” as performance that noticeably and clearly exceeds normal standards for promotion. In the area of instruction and instructionally related activities, markedly exceptional performance would

include all of the standards established for promotion under the normal promotion schedule. For example, candidates for early promotion should provide documentation of student evaluations that consistently exceed departmental and college standards. In addition, candidates for early promotion should provide evidence of the creation of new pedagogical/andragogical approaches that advance teaching practices in the discipline. In the area of RSCA, markedly exceptional performance is defined as research productivity that significantly exceeds the standard expectations for promotion. For example, a candidate for early promotion to Associate Professor should expect to present at least four (4) refereed publications. A candidate for early promotion to Professor should expect to present at least five (5) refereed publications since their promotion to Associate Professor. In the areas of service, markedly exceptional performance should include evidence of leadership in important committees and decision-making bodies and/or evidence of leadership in community and professional organizations. Candidates shall detail the contributions they have made to the department, college, university, community, and profession through these leadership roles.

4.2.2 Early Tenure

To qualify for early tenure, a candidate must be markedly exceptional in all three areas of evaluation and meet the requirements stipulated in Section 4.2.1. In addition, candidates must demonstrate confidence that this pattern of markedly exceptional performance will continue in the future. For example, candidates must provide evidence of an ongoing research agenda that is highly likely to result in a continuation of their markedly exceptional performance in RSCA. Likewise, candidates shall provide evidence that they will continue to exceed expectations in the areas of instruction and service.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to the rank of Professor in the fifth year at the rank of Associate Professor. A tenured Associate Professor, however, may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.5 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy. A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in relevant Academic Senate policy documents.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

Section 5 of the university and CHHS RTP policies outline the general standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This RTP Policy elaborates on those policies by providing the specific criteria under which RTP candidates from the GCPPA will be reviewed.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

6.1 Academic Affairs Sets Dates

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

6.2 Academic Affairs Notifies Candidates of Eligibility

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

6.3 Posting of Notice of Open Period

Departments shall post in outside the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic Faculty Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. Departments must also disseminate this list to department faculty unit employees, staff, and students electronically. The announcements shall invite statements about qualifications and work of the candidate and its impact. These submissions may be electronic but cannot be anonymous.

6.4 Preparation and Submission of RTP File

Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the academic unit RTP committee by the deadline. All files must be submitted using *Interfolio*.

6.5 Review by Department RTP Committee

The RTP Committee of the GCPPA reviews the candidate's materials and provides a written evaluation and recommendation using standard university form to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.6 Review by Department Chair

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

6.7 Review College RTP Committee

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

6.8 Review by Dean

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

6.9 Review by President

The President (or Provost as designee) reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation. The President (or designee) makes final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or designee) notifies the candidate (and all levels of review) in writing of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline. The decision letter shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 Withdrawal

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

7.2 Missing Documentation

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

7.3 New Materials

Either the candidate or evaluators may ask to have new materials placed in the file after the deadline. Such additions shall be limited to items that became available after the file was submitted as verified by the College RTP Committee. Copies of the added material shall be provided to the faculty unit employee. When material has been added to the file in this manner, the file shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee (the Department RTP Committee) for review, evaluation, and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review.

7.4 Rebuttal

At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the evaluation and recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before it is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days (as defined in the CBA) following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP file as it advances and shall also be sent to any previous review levels.

7.5 External Review

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

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

8.1 Ratification

This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the GCPPA and to approval by the CHHS Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.

8.1.1 Date of Effect

This RTP policy will go into effect after approval by all approval entities. However, faculty members hired prior to the approval of this policy may elect to utilize the CHHS RTP policy as the guiding policy for their review. Candidates should inform the GCPPA Chair and the Chair of the GCPPA RTP Committee of their choice of policies prior to submission of the evaluation file.

8.2 Majority Needed to Adopt

To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the Dean and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8.3 Voting Rights

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the GCPPA – including those on leave, sabbatical, and FERP – are eligible to vote on RTP policy matters.