

1 Approved by Academic Affairs on August 29, 2025
2
3
4
5
6

California State University, Long Beach
College of Liberal Arts

7
8
9
10
11
12
**PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**

13 Revised January 28, 2025
14
15
16
17
18

19 Approved by CLA Faculty Council in Spring 2025
20 Approved by the Department via 5-Day Notice on February 3, 2025
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The purpose of this policy is to describe the process and standards that shall be used to evaluate
28 candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Psychology Department at California State
29 University, Long Beach. The standards and expectations this policy outlines are intended to affirm and
30 develop the principles expressed in the University and College RTP Policies. By setting clear standards,
31 the Psychology Department expects that each candidate will realize the high promise that is characteristic
32 of its faculty members.

33 It is expected that each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will have a unique profile
34 regarding accomplishments in (a) Instructional Activities, (b) Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities
35 (RSCA), and (c) Service. The standards in this document are intended to provide clear criteria for
36 evaluation while maintaining some flexibility for candidates to meet them, provided that candidates clearly
37 describe how their work fulfills those criteria. This document is not intended to provide a simple checklist
38 for success. Rather, candidates are expected to describe and demonstrate excellence relative to the
39 stated criteria. Psychology Department RTP committee members are expected to use their best
40 professional judgment in applying the criteria and evaluating all candidates consistently.

41 **I. RESPONSIBILITIES**

42 The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on this
43 campus. The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP Policy provides additional specificity for evaluating faculty
44 members in the College. This Psychology Department RTP Policy provides further specificity as
45 appropriate for our discipline's standards and expectations.

46 **A. Candidate**

47 The candidate is responsible for reviewing and addressing RTP policies and standards
48 established in the University, College, and Department RTP Policies. The candidate is also
49 primarily responsible for collecting, presenting, and describing the evidence of accomplishments.
50 Candidates should take special care to prepare a succinct and clear Narrative that presents the
51 best case for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Further context and description may be
52 provided in the Professional Data Sheet (PDS). It is recommended that candidates also review the
53 RTP committee evaluation form to ensure they address all relevant areas that are to be evaluated.
54 In addition, candidates should make every effort to participate in the mentoring process and seek
55 guidance from a variety of sources, including the Department Chair, the Department RTP
56 committee, the College Dean, and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs to fully
57 understand the process and standards. Candidates are responsible for knowing the timelines for
58 the annual period review, including submission of the optional professional development plan
59 (PDP), periodic mini evaluation (a.k.a., mini review), reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This
60 information can be found on the Faculty Affairs website.

61 **B. Department Chair**

62 The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring candidates receive effective mentoring and
63 support in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
community. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the RTP procedures
established by the university (e.g., Office of Academic Affairs) and the Collective Bargaining
Agreement (CBA) regarding the evaluation of candidates are followed. The Department Chair is
encouraged to submit either a letter of support during the open period or an independent
evaluation of each candidate undergoing tenure and/or promotion except where prohibited by the
College or University RTP documents. The Department Chair is responsible for reviewing RTP
policies with candidates during their first three years and before being evaluated for tenure and
promotion.

58 C. Department RTP Committee

59 The Department RTP committee has primary responsibility for evaluating the candidates'
60 materials and makes the initial recommendation to the College and University regarding
61 reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department RTP committee shall consider both
62 expectations and other highly valued activities specified in this document by the candidate when
63 deriving a recommendation. The candidate is responsible for adequately describing their activities
64 and accomplishments so that the RTP committee can accurately evaluate their materials.

65 1. *Formation of Department RTP Committees.* Typically, two committees composed of five
66 voting members will be formed, which may have overlapping members.

67 a. The committee considering actions of (a) reappointment of an Assistant Professor
68 or (b) tenure and/or promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
69 shall be restricted to tenured faculty with the rank of at least Associate Professor
70 who are themselves not being evaluated in the RTP process that year.
71 b. The committee considering actions of promotion of an Associate Professor to
72 Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor.
73 If obtaining a five-member committee of Psychology Department faculty members
74 is not possible, the committee shall consist of at least three members. In all cases,
75 the committee is responsible for forming a majority decision.

76 2. *Eligibility.* All eligible faculty members, as described above, in the Collective Bargaining
77 Agreement and in the Academic Senate Policy are candidates for RTP committees with
78 the option that a faculty member who serves one year at the Departmental RTP committee
79 level may choose not to be listed on the ballot for the same level at which they served for
80 the following year. Faculty who served on the College RTP committee may choose to opt
81 out of being listed on any Departmental RTP committee the following year. Faculty
82 members on sabbatical during the time of review may choose not to serve but should
83 normally be listed on the ballot the following year. As stated in the University RTP
84 document, faculty members participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP)
85 are eligible for service on the department RTP committee if requested by the majority vote
86 of tenured and probationary faculty members of the department and approved by the
87 President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in
88 the FERP.

89 3. *Election Procedure.* The election of each RTP committee shall be by a majority vote of
90 eligible faculty members as determined by the CBA. The election procedure will be as
91 follows: On all ballots, all nominees shall be listed in random order. There will be two parts
92 on all ballots. In the first part, voters will vote for all those nominees that they consider
93 acceptable for membership on the committee. In the second part, eligible faculty members
94 will vote for up to five that they would most prefer. If five or more nominees receive a vote
95 of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, the five receiving the greatest number
96 of votes in the second part of the ballot shall be elected. If a vacancy occurs prior to the
97 commencement of the RTP process, the person receiving the next highest number of votes
98 (in addition to at least 50% acceptance) shall serve as a replacement. If less than five
99 nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, then the

100 committee will comprise of the three receiving the greatest number of votes in the second
101 part of the ballot. If less than three nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more
102 of the ballots cast, then the Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate(s), shall
103 identify qualified faculty members from outside the department to stand for election to the
104 Psychology RTP committee(s). Once the outside candidates have been identified, the
105 normal election procedure shall occur.

106 Any exceptions to the eligibility and election procedures must be brought to the Advisory
107 Committee by the Department Chair and passed with a majority vote.

108 **D. Department Faculty**

109 All Department tenured and probationary faculty members are encouraged to provide effective
110 support and mentoring to candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and
111 members of the University community. Candidates are encouraged to request multiple examples
112 of Professional Data Sheets and Narratives from faculty members who have recently completed
113 the same action (candidates can consult with the Department Chair for a list of faculty).

114 **II. VALUES**

115 Psychology upholds the values expressed in section 1.3 of the CLA RTP Policy (see sections 1.3.1-
116 1.3.5). Candidates should ensure that their Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service reflect these
117 values. It is the candidate's responsibility to articulate in their narrative and/or PDS how these values are
118 reflected in their activities. Notably, as stated in the CLA Policy, our Department recognizes that cultural
119 and identity taxation have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. Candidates
120 who experience such inequities in any area of evaluation due to cultural and identity taxation should feel
121 free to discuss this in the narrative and/or PDS.

122 **III. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES**

123 Faculty members are expected to provide effective instruction in their discipline. Consistent with the
124 University and College RTP Policies, the Psychology Department recognizes that effective instruction
125 occurs both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting as specified below and in the CLA RTP
126 Policy.

127 **A. File Requirements**

128 Below is the list of required and optional materials specified in section 2.1.1 of the CLA RTP Policy
129 to demonstrate effective teaching as defined in section 2.1.3 of the CLA RTP Policy.

130 **1. *Required Materials***

- 131 a. A teaching narrative written on the fillable form.
- 132 b. Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal student
133 course evaluations were required during the period of review.
- 134 c. Grade distributions relative to course level.
- 135 d. One (1) representative course syllabus for each course taught during the period of
136 review.
- 137 e. If applicable, an academic advisor report. Candidates who have received assigned
138 time to provide formal student academic advising shall report on their activities per
139 a consistent procedure approved by the Dean or designee.
- 140 f. Evidence of effective teaching in support of 1) Continuous Professional Learning,
141 2) thoughtful Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction, and 3) the use of
142 instructional practices Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course
143 Goals. Suggestions for supporting evidence are outlined in section 2.1.3 of the
144 CLA RTP Policy. This evidence should be included in the candidate's Professional
145 Data Sheet and listed in their index.

146 **2. *Optional Materials***

147 a. Teaching observation. Candidates may submit a formal teaching evaluation
148 conducted by a trained observer or request a peer observation to the Department
149 Chair. In the latter case, the Department Chair will designate a tenured faculty
150 member in the department who is familiar with the content of the course to be
151 observed as a peer observer. A written observation report by a trained or peer
152 observer must be included.
153 b. Written remarks on student course evaluations. If candidates opt to include
154 remarks from a course, all remarks (whether positive or negative) from written
155 evaluations for that course must be included.

156 B. Instructional Activities and Evidence

157 Candidates are expected to describe their instructional activities and evidence of (1) Continuous
158 Professional Learning, (2) Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction, and (3) Fostering Student
159 Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals in the PDS and/or narrative as appropriate to
160 make the best case for instructional effectiveness. Expectations and Additional Highly Valued
161 Activities for each of the above categories are specified below.

162 1. *Continuous Professional Learning*

163 a. Expectations: Candidates are expected to participate in 1) one-half, full, or multi-
164 day professional development activity (e.g., workshops, attendance at professional
165 conferences, multiple peer observations of instruction); or 2) two shorter
166 professional development activities (e.g., one-hour workshops, discussions of
167 instruction with peers) each academic year. This evidence of participation is
168 described in section 2.1.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy.
169 b. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities: The Department also recognizes
170 the following activities as evidence of supporting Continuous Professional
171 Learning:
172 • Reading scholarly articles and books on pedagogy
173 • Attending Psychology Department colloquia
174 • Development of pedagogical and mentoring practices that are reflective of
175 the needs of the students

176 2. *Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction*

177 a. Expectations: Candidates are expected to reflect on the outcomes and feedback
178 of their classroom instruction each semester and make appropriate adjustments.
179 Examples of evidence of reflection are described below (candidates should also
180 refer to section 2.1.2.2 of the CLA RTP Policy for additional guidance).
181 • Candidates can describe the changes in instructional materials (e.g., class
182 handouts, lecture notes/slides, descriptions of class activities, and web
183 page printouts).
184 • Candidates may use individual SPOT items as evidence of their
185 instructional practices and deliberate efforts to improve student learning.
186 • Candidates may discuss in their narrative and/or PDS the use of mid-
187 semester evaluations as evidence of adaptation of instructional practices
188 and responsiveness to student feedback.
189 b. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities: The Department also recognizes
190 reflection on and adaptation of additional instructional activities, including but not
191 limited to:
192 • Master's thesis supervision practices
193 • Honor's thesis supervision practices
194 • Practices of individual student supervision for independent study, research,

internship, or student teaching

- Student mentoring and advising practices

3. Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals

a. Expectations: Candidates are expected to demonstrate their efforts to foster student learning and their achievement of course goals during the period of review. As stated in section 2.1.3.3 of the CLA RTP Policy, course syllabi, quantitative course evaluation summaries, and grade distributions are required as supporting evidence. In addition, evidence supporting the narrative could include the following:

- Student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback)
- Formative or summative assessments (e.g., discussion assignments, labs, quizzes, papers or project assignments, and comprehensive final assignments or exams)
- A short video clip of the candidate’s teaching together with a narrative description
- Qualitative student perception data
- Classroom observation reports submitted by trained or peer observers
- Support letters submitted during the open period.

If the SPOT quantitative course evaluation response rate is lower than departmental norms, candidates should address plans to increase future response rates. Candidates may request average departmental response rates from the Department Chair.

In addition, candidates may take into consideration the following factors to make the best case for their file. The Department does not make any *a priori* judgments about the value of each of these factors.

- Level of courses taught (i.e., 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600)
- Size of classes taught
- Intensity of writing in courses
- Number of new preparations during the period of review
- Number of different courses taught during the period of review
- Trends over time
- Day/time of class taught
- Cultural and identity taxation.

b. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities: The Department also values the candidate's efforts to foster student learning in other instructional activities, including but not limited to:

- Chairing master's thesis committees
- Supervising honors thesis students
- Supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study, research, internship, and student teaching
- Instructionally related mentoring and advising of students
- Curriculum and course development, including designing study abroad experiences

240 C. Additional Evaluation Criteria

241 In addition to the three areas described above in section III.B., the Psychology Department also
242 values the following instructional activities:

- 243 1. Presentations of teaching techniques at academic or professional venues
- 244 2. Teaching or mentoring awards
- 245 3. Innovations in teaching (e.g., service learning, team learning, and novel use of technology)
- 246 4. Creation or substantial revision of standard course outlines
- 247 5. Creation of new courses or other substantial curriculum development
- 248 6. Exceptional degree of student mentoring
- 249 7. Student accomplishments (e.g., awards, presentations, and graduate school admissions)
250 directly related to work supervised
- 251 8. Cultural and identity taxation, as detailed in sections 2.1 and 2.1.2 of the CLA RTP Policy

252 **IV. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)**

253 Faculty members are expected to remain engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship that
254 demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the Psychology discipline over time. The Psychology
255 Department recognizes and values the different forms of RSCA outlined in the University and CLA RTP
256 Policies (*Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application or Engagement,*
257 and *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*). All faculty members are expected to produce scholarly
258 achievements that contribute to the Psychology discipline's knowledge base, are disseminated to
259 appropriate audiences, and receive favorable reviews from professional peers before dissemination.

260 Candidates are expected to describe their RSCA activities and evidence of scholarly impact on the
261 discipline in the PDS and/or narrative as appropriate to make the best case of RSCA productivity
262 (candidates should refer to section 2.2.2 of the CLA RTP Policy for additional guidance). Because the
263 field of Psychology is multi-disciplinary, the RTP committee is encouraged to pay careful attention to the
264 unique value of each candidate's accomplishments. Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities
265 are specified below.

266 A. Expectations

267 Within the discipline of Psychology, the *standard* and *expectation* of evidence of RSCA need to
268 be peer-reviewed in the forms listed as follows (adapted from section 2.2.3.1 of the CLA RTP
269 Policy).

- 270 1. *Peer-reviewed Publications in Academic Venues* (e.g., journal articles and authored
271 books) that fall within the different forms of RSCA (*Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration,*
272 *Scholarship of Application or Engagement*, and *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*)
 - 273 a. Candidates need to demonstrate evidence of the quality of their peer-reviewed
274 publications. Evidence of quality for journal articles is indicated by the significance
275 of the work, journal impact factors, journal acceptance/rejection rates, citation
276 indices, and/or research productivity indices (e.g., h-index). Evidence of quality for
277 authored books is indicated by the status of the publisher, adoptions, sales and/or
278 other indicators of impact (e.g., awards).
 - 279 b. Candidates need to address their role in each scholarly work. Evidence of role is
280 indicated by the candidate's responsibility in designing, planning, conducting,
281 analyzing, implementing, and/or writing the scholarly work.
 - 282 c. The following evaluative factors *shall not be considered* when evaluating the
283 quality of peer-reviewed publications in academic venues.
 - 284 • Involvement of former academic advisor(s)
 - 285 • The institution at which the research was conducted

287 • Order of authorship. Note: The magnitude of the candidate's contribution
288 (as described in PDS) is to be evaluated rather than the mere order of
289 authorship

290 2. *Funded Peer-reviewed Major External Grants or Cooperative Agreements* (comparable to
291 an NIH R03 grant or other external grants with substantial research components)

292 a. Candidates need to demonstrate evidence of quality. Evidence of quality is
293 indicated by a summary or description of the funded project, length of grant period,
294 granting agency (e.g., Federal, State, private foundation, etc.), amount of award,
295 and type of grant contract (e.g., primary award, subcontract). Additional evidence
296 of quality may include grant reviews and/or the competitiveness of the grant
297 process.

298 b. Candidates need to address the level of their contribution. A brief description of
299 the candidate's responsibility in authorship and implementation and the
300 candidate's role on each grant (e.g., principal investigator, co-investigator, or key
301 personnel) indicates the contribution level. Additional factors may include the
302 percent effort the candidate is listed on the grant (e.g., calendar months).

303 Candidates need a minimum of four RSCA accomplishments from the above list (sections IV.A.1
304 and IV.A.2) or justified equivalencies. At least three of the required RSCA accomplishments must
305 be peer-reviewed publications in academic venues (i.e., only one of the 4 required RSCA
306 accomplishments can be a funded peer-reviewed major external grant or cooperative agreement).

307 Candidates submitting materials for RTP have the option to include *accepted* or *in-press* RSCA
308 products for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it beneficial for future actions, they may
309 withhold such materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates decide to withhold these
310 materials, such items must be listed under Works in Progress on the PDS. In cases of promotion
311 to full professor, candidates may only include publications and all accepted or in-press RSCA
312 products that had not been previously claimed in a prior successful action.

313 B. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities.

314 1. Other peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters, proceedings, abstracts, etc.)
315 2. Non-peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters, book reviews, editorials, etc.)
316 3. Edited books
317 4. Conference presentations (both oral and poster presentations)
318 5. Invited presentations
319 6. Manuscripts and/or external grant proposals currently in the peer review process
320 7. Submitted major external grant proposals
321 8. Unfunded major external grant proposals
322 9. Minor external research grants
323 10. Internal grants awarded
324 11. Technical reports/Program evaluation reports
325 12. Policy/Amicus briefs
326 13. Scholarship-related awards
327 14. Scholarship-related professional development (e.g., participation in grant-writing
328 workshops or scholarly writing institutes, etc.)

329 The following factors will be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate's additional highly
330 valued activities. Candidates must address the following factors for each highly valued activity as
331 appropriate.

332 1. The magnitude of the candidate's contribution to each scholarly work
333 2. Status of outlet (i.e., provide one indicator of status, such as rejection rates, impact factor,
334 prestige of publisher, type of conference presentation, etc.)

336 3. For external and/or internal grants (submitted and/or unfunded):
337 a. Title and summary of the project
338 b. Length of the grant period
339 c. Granting agency (e.g., Federal, State, private foundation, CSULB, etc.)
340 d. Amount of award
341 e. Type of grant contract (e.g., primary award, subcontract)

342 C. Additional Evaluation Criteria

343 The Department RTP committee will evaluate the quality of both individual scholarly
344 accomplishments and the overall body of work in determining whether to recommend a positive
345 or negative RTP action. The following factors may be utilized in evaluating the quality of a
346 candidate's overall RSCA accomplishments:

- 347 1. Scope of research (e.g., amount of time and effort required)
- 348 2. Programmatic nature of research
- 349 3. Impact of RSCA to the field
- 350 4. Level of involvement of student co-authors, if any
- 351 5. Cultural and identity taxation, as detailed in section 1.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy

352 V. SERVICE

353 The Psychology Department recognizes that meaningful service by a faculty member varies by rank and
354 can be manifested in a variety of ways. All faculty members are expected to actively engage in service
355 activities and describe their contributions and responsibilities in the PDS and/or narrative as appropriate
356 to make the best case for their service contributions and types of activities. See section 2.3.1.a and
357 2.3.1.b of the CLA RTP Policy for details. Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities are
358 specified below. Candidates should also refer to section 2.3.2.1 of the CLA RTP Policy for minimum
359 expectations by rank.

360 A. Expectations

361 Candidates are expected to actively engage in service as evidenced by:

- 362 1. Participation in faculty governance and/or advising student organizations
- 363 2. Participation in one of the following
 - 364 a. academic and/or professional service (e.g., ad hoc reviews, editorial board
365 participation, professional association governance, and external evaluations)
 - 366 b. community service (RSCA-related or instruction-related)

367 Candidates going up for promotion to Professor are expected to have a record of leadership (see
368 section VII.D).

369 B. Examples of Additional Highly Valued Activities

- 370 1. Committee leadership
- 371 2. University citizenship (e.g., participating in Department, College, or University-sponsored
372 events, judging student research competitions)
- 373 3. Service-related awards
- 374 4. Writing a substantial number of letters of recommendation for students, defined as 50 or
375 more letters per year or letters for 10 or more students per year
- 376 5. Performing peer observations of teaching of others
- 377 6. Serving as an external reviewer for tenure and promotion of candidates at other institutions

378 C. Additional Evaluation Criteria

379 The following factors may be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate's contributions.

- 380 1. Nature of the service assignment
 - 381 a. Frequency of activity
 - 382 b. Number of different activities

- c. Length of service
- d. Personal contributions

2. Organizational level of service (Department, College, University, Professional, or Community)

3. Selection procedure (voluntary, assigned, elected)

4. Additional support for service role/activity (reassigned time or compensation)

5. Cultural and identity taxation, as detailed in section 2.3.1 of the CLA RTP Policy

VI. MULTI-FACETED ACTIVITIES

Candidates for RTP actions in the Psychology Department frequently complete important activities that combine aspects of Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service. Candidates shall not repetitively list such activities in different sections of their materials. Instead, different components of a particular activity should be separated and listed in different sections as applicable. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department Chair or members of the RTP committee in such cases and then use their judgment to make the most persuasive case for their application.

VII. EXPECTATIONS BY RANK

A. Expectations for all Ranks

The Expectations specified in sections III, IV, and V are used for decisions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In recognition of the divergent academic profiles among excellent faculty members, candidates for tenure and/or promotion to any rank are further expected to provide evidence of engagement in at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities in at least one area of evaluation (Instructional Activities, RSCA, or Service). These Additional Highly Valued Activities cannot substitute for Expectations but can provide evidence that the candidate maintains a productive instructional, scholarly, or service profile. Specific factors that provide context for the evaluation of Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities are listed in sections III, IV, and V.

B. Reappointment of Assistant Professor

For reappointment of Assistant Professor, the Psychology Department accepts the standards articulated in the College and University RTP documents. Specifically, a candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure and promotion. Regarding service expectations of pre-tenure faculty, most service activities are expected to be at the department level, and the overall service load should be appropriate for a new faculty member who is acclimating to the university. Evidence for achievement of Additional Highly Valued Activities is not required.

C. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, sections III, IV and V specify the Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities. Additionally, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP policy specifies that in order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must make high-quality service contributions to the department and to either the college or the university.

D. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, sections III, IV and V specify the Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities. The Psychology Department notes that the University RTP document calls for higher performance standards than those used for decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In the area of Instructional Activities, candidates must sustain a high level of performance as specified in section III. The Psychology Department adopts the standards for RSCA and Service specified in the CLA RTP policy regarding promotion to Professor. The CLA RTP policy specifies that successful candidates for promotion to Professor will demonstrate high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or

430 interdisciplinary fields of study. Moreover, the candidate is expected to have a substantial record
431 of peer-reviewed work at the national and/or international levels. The CLA RTP document
432 specifies that a successful candidate for promotion to Professor will have a substantive record of
433 service that includes: (a) service at the department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of
434 leadership in the university and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

435 **VIII. EARLY TENURE AND/OR EARLY PROMOTION DECISIONS**

436 For early tenure and/or early promotion, the Psychology Department acknowledges that the University
437 RTP document calls for higher standards than those for decisions of tenure and/or promotion conducted
438 following the standard time interval. In addition, for cases of early tenure, the record of distinction must
439 inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

440 Candidates within the Psychology Department seeking early tenure and/or early promotion are
441 encouraged to initially seek guidance from the Dean, Department Chair, and Department RTP committee.
442 With regard to the Psychology Department Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities outlined
443 in sections III, IV, and V, candidates must provide compelling evidence of distinction in the areas of
444 Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service that clearly exceeds, in substantial ways, the requirements for
445 tenure and/or promotion to Associate or Full Professor. The criteria for each area are as follows:

446 **A. Instructional Activities**

447 Any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must have at least two Additional Highly
448 Valued Activities in each of the three areas of instructional activities during the period of review:
449 1) Continuous Professional Learning, 2) Reflection on and Adaptation of Instruction, and 3)
450 Fostering Student Learning and the Achievement of Course Goals.

451 **B. RSCA**

452 Any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must achieve seven or more RSCA
453 accomplishments listed under the expectations. Of the minimum seven accomplishments
454 expected, at least six must be peer-reviewed publications in academic venues or justified
455 equivalencies. In addition, candidates should also have at least two Additional Highly Valued
456 Activities.

457 **C. Service**

458 Any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must demonstrate a substantial record of
459 service engagement at the department, college/university, and professional levels. In addition,
460 candidates should also have at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities. Candidates going up
461 for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must also demonstrate leadership in the
462 department and college/university, whereas candidates going up for early promotion to Professor
463 must demonstrate leadership in the department, college/university, and profession/community.

464 **IX. AMENDMENTS TO THIS POLICY**

465 Amendments may be proposed by petition of at least three tenure-line faculty members of the Department.
466 Proposals shall be presented to the Department Chair (presentation to any office staff shall constitute
467 notification of and presentation to the Chair). Proposals shall be submitted to the faculty for discussion
468 within three weeks, excluding holidays, following presentation to the Chair. Amendments may not be
469 considered between the end of the Spring semester and the beginning of the subsequent Fall semester.
470 Proposed amendments shall be distributed in writing to the tenure-line faculty members of the department
471 at least five working days, excluding holidays, prior to a Departmental forum to discuss any proposed
472 amendments. Amendments to this Policy shall become effective at the beginning of the next academic
473 year if they receive a favorable secret ballot vote of two-thirds of tenure-line and probationary Psychology
474 department faculty members and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.