

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

Department of Physical Therapy, College of Health and Human Services

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY

9/24/2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Guiding Principles	
1.1	Mission and Vision.....	page 4
1.2	Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP).....	page 4
1.3	CHHS Values.....	page 5
1.4	Governing Documents.....	page 6
1.5	Obligations.....	page 6
1.6	Standards.....	page 7
1.7	Profiles of Academic Rank.....	page 9
1.8	Narrative.....	page 9
2.0	RTP Areas of Evaluation	
2.1	Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities.....	page 9
2.2	Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.....	page 15
2.3	Service.....	page 25
2.4	Evaluation of Service	page 30
3.0	Responsibilities in the RTP Process	
3.1	Candidate	page 30
3.2	The Department RTP Policy.....	page 31
3.3	The Department RTP Committee.....	page 31
3.4	Department Chair/Director.....	page 34
4.0	Timelines for the RTP Process	
4.1	Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment.....	page 35
4.2	Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion.....	page 36
4.3	Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion.....	page 36
5.0	Appointment and Promotional Level Criteria	
5.1	Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty.....	page 36
5.2	Awarding of Tenure.....	page 36
5.3	Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor	page 37
5.4	Appointment/Promotion to Professor	page 37
5.5	Early Tenure or Early Promotion.....	page 37
6.0	Steps in the RTP Process	
6.1	Academic Affairs Sets Dates.....	page 37
6.2	Academic Affairs Notifies Candidates of Eligibility.....	page 38
6.3	Posting of Notice of Open Period.....	page 38
6.4	Submission of RTP File.....	page 38
6.5	Preparation of RTP File.....	page 38
6.6	Review by Department RTP Committee.....	page 38
6.7	Review by Department Chair	page 38
6.8	Review College RTP Committee	page 38
6.9	Review by Dean	page 38
6.10	Review by President (or Designee)	page 38
7.0	Additional Processes	
7.1	Withdrawal	page 39
7.2	Missing Documentation.....	page 39
7.3	Adding Documentation.....	page 39
7.4	Rebuttal	page 39
7.5	External Review.....	page 39
7.6	Ratings.....	page 39
8.0	Approval of and Changes of this RTP Process	
8.1	Ratification.....	page 39
8.2	Amendments.....	page 39
	Guidelines for Mini-Evaluation	Appendix A

Preamble

California State University, Long Beach ("CSULB") aspires to be a national exemplar in public higher education. Towards this end, CSULB takes pride in its faculty of teacher-scholars. *The College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) and its faculty are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore, the CHHS promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the college establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Evaluation of faculty at all levels of review shall take into consideration the diversity of expertise within the CHHS and recognize this diversity as a source of strength that enables the college to grow in stature.*

The Department of Physical Therapy is committed to fostering the development of teacher-scholars so that they may, in turn, provide an instructional program of high quality that is responsive to the needs of its students, the community, and the Physical Therapy profession. Accordingly, this document sets forth expectations for faculty in the Department of Physical Therapy within the teacher-scholar model, focusing on excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. In doing so, it is intended to: (1) guide new faculty in their quest for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the framework of being a true teacher-scholar; (2) guide development of tenured faculty as teacher-scholars; (3) guide the Departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee ("RTP") in evaluating candidates for mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review; and (4) help create an environment that supports faculty working to achieve the missions of the Department, the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), and the University.

To provide candidates with a single, comprehensive *Department RTP Policy*, this document sets forth the requirements of our own academic unit within the framework set by the University and College RTP documents. In this Department RTP Policy, portions of the College RTP Policy and the University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) that are critical for clarity and emphasis are included. All CHHS and University RTP Policy insertions in the Department RTP Policy are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the University and College policies on one hand, and the language that is unique to the Department of Physical Therapy. Portions of the university and/or college RTP policies that have not been included in this document are referenced by the section number used in the original university and/or college policies.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world. In service to the university's mission, the CHHS aims to convene and partner with the communities we serve to transform lives and advance health and human services. The mission of the CHHS is to cultivate a supportive and inclusive environment that promotes the success of diverse students, faculty, and staff through high impact student-centered learning, innovative research and scholarship, and service that improve the quality of life and holistic wellbeing of all the communities. The mission of the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program at CSULB, is to advance physical therapy practice through high quality teaching, research engagement, and the cultivation of critical thinking skills. We aim to prepare patient-centered, highly competent clinicians who integrate the best scientific evidence and clinical reasoning into patient care to enhance the health, function, and quality of life of a diverse community.

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

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service is essential to accomplishing the articulated mission and vision of both the university and the college.

1.2.1 *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the academic unit (e.g., school, department, or program), college, university, community, and the profession¹. In concurrence with University RTP policy, the CHHS RTP policy provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing for flexibility to recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual disciplines. members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning.*

1.2.2 *RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels. Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. 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 department, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.*

1.2.3 *Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 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.*

1.2.4 *This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college needs; and university mission.*

1.2.5 *All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the Department of Physical Therapy, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior. These standards are articulated in Academic Senate policy.*

1.2.6 *The process of evaluating faculty members is holistic. All faculty members in the Department of Physical Therapy are expected to be familiar with the provisions of this policy and comport their professional development in accordance with its letter and spirit. While the provisions of this policy set forth in great detail the Department's RTP requirements, candidates are encouraged to consult the appendices for a shorter, user-friendly guide to assembling the materials they must submit for mini-reviews. It should be noted, however, that the appendices appear only for the sake of convenience. Nothing in the appendices shall be construed as superseding the contents or requirements of the body of this RTP Policy.*

1.3 CHHS Values

1.3.1 The criteria in this policy are intended to embody the following values of the college:

Integrity

Students, faculty, and staff in the College of Health and Human Services act with integrity. We adhere to policy, accept responsibility for actions, and promote inclusion, communication, respect for others and divergent views, honesty, and fairness.

Growth Mindset

Students, faculty, and staff in the College of Health and Human Services believe that individual and collective talents can be developed through hard work, persistence, good strategies, and input from others.

Collaboration

The College of Health and Human Services supports interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty, students, and our community to stimulate and foster excellence in education and research innovation, responsiveness to pressing health and human services problems, and the growth of existing partnerships and the development of new ones.

Innovation

The College of Health and Human Services conducts research to advance the education of our students and the multiple academic disciplines that comprise the college. We aim to increase understanding, discover scientific breakthroughs, and enhance the communities we serve.

DEIA Statement

In addition, the CHHS celebrates the diversity of students, faculty, and staff. This policy is intended to embody the college's commitment to amplifying diverse voices in our classrooms,

research endeavors, and administrative decisions. As a college, the CHHS believes in equal access and opportunity for all, and works tirelessly to eliminate barriers that hinder success, whether those barriers are related to race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, or any other aspect of identity. The college is therefore committed to providing an inclusive environment where everyone feels a sense of belonging, where everyone's perspectives are valued, and where we can all thrive academically, personally, and professionally.

1.3.2 Alignment with University Values

CSULB values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. This policy and all college and university RTP policies should reflect these values. CHHS values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. All college and department RTP policies should reflect these values. CSULB recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

1.4 Governing Documents

1.4.1 *In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file. The college adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA or the university RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.4.2 *Academic units (e.g., departments or schools) within the college shall adopt RTP policies that elaborate on discipline-specific standards in all areas of evaluation. The standards adopted at the academic-unit level shall not be lower than university-level or college-level standards. If any provision of an academic unit RTP Policy conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university RTP Policy, or the RTP policy of the CHHS, the specific conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of the academic unit's RTP Policy, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.4.3 *Collectively, the RTP policies of the university, college, and Department of Physical Therapy shall be used to assess candidates' performance through the stages of their academic progress.*

1.5 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and Department of Physical Therapy RTP policies.

1.5.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Start Process

In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.5.2 Completeness of Candidate's File

Candidates must furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation (e.g., for teaching, student evaluations, course syllabi, peer evaluations, and grade distributions; for

RSCA, copies of manuscripts under review and/or presented at conferences; preprints or reprints of articles; letters accepting manuscripts for publication; etc.; for service, letters documenting the candidate's service which assess the quality of the service contributions).

1.5.3 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the Department of Physical Therapy 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.

1.6 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 Department of Physical Therapy. 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:

1.6.1 Staying Current

Faculty members must keep abreast of scholarly and applied discourse in the relevant specialty area of Physical Therapy, applicable to the faculty member's areas of teaching and research interest(s) through appropriate means.

1.6.2 Involvement in the Profession

Faculty members are encouraged to attend and participate in the annual meetings of professional organizations such as the American Physical Therapy Association.

1.6.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing

Faculty members must actively pursue a research and publishing agenda relevant to one or more of the following types of scholarship.

- A. 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.
- B. Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand 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.
- C. Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of 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.

- D. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA 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.*

1.6.4 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:

- A. by their own examples of service to the Department of Physical Therapy; the College of Health and Human Services; the university; professional organizations; and in the community at large;
- B. through collaborative research that engages students in the processes of critical inquiry and discovery;
- C. through engaging students in service learning projects;
- D. through unique disciplinary interactions with students through directed readings and independent research projects;
- E. through the ongoing process of socializing students into a culture of intellectual discovery and professional communication via both group and one-on-one interactions in classes, at conferences, in co-curricular activities, the Physical Therapy Association... etc.), and through advising/mentoring; and
- F. 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.

1.6.5 Meaningful, Collegial Service

Faculty members are expected to serve the Department of Physical Therapy, the CHHS, the University, the community, and the profession as a meaningfully contributing citizen.

- A. 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 necessitate a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all faculty members in the Department of Physical Therapy are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in professional organizations.
- B. 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.

1.7 Profiles of Academic Ranks

RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by each department (academic unit). The university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The RTP policy of each department (academic unit) applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria. The specific criteria applicable to each academic rank are integrated throughout Section 2.0 of this Policy and its subsections.

1.8 Narrative

In order 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. As explained in section 3.1 of this policy (which mirrors the language used in the RTP Policy of the CHHS), the narrative may range from between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As indicated in the University (Policy Statement 23-24) and CHHS RTP policies, departments and other academic units are responsible for defining further 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 and the college. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college- level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Faculty members in CHHS are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to: curriculum and course development; academic and academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to: mentoring students; taking students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences. Departments should make clear where faculty members must disclose and describe any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time.

CSULB recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CSULB also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:

- *continuous professional learning,*
- *thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction (formative assessment), and*
- *the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals (summative assessment).*

Department RTP policies should further delineate or specify instructional activities, the kinds and amount of supporting evidence candidates may submit, as well as include other examples of supporting evidence.

Departments should employ multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and must not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms as evidence.

Physical Therapy faculty members are expected, above all, 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. 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. Accordingly, faculty at all ranks should aspire to excellence in teaching.

Evidence of Excellence in Teaching – Although “excellence in 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. timeliness, organization, and professionalism in conducting classes and evaluating student work;
3. 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;
4. incorporation of one's scholarship into teaching, when appropriate, including the effective supervision of student research and the incorporation of students into one's own scholarly research, when appropriate.

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.

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

Within their supporting documentation, candidates should provide evidence documenting this professional learning. Evidence supporting the narrative could include, but is not limited to, participation in on or off campus professional development activities, conferences, and lessons learned observing or discussing the instruction of peers.

Evidence of Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher

1. Staying current in discipline developments through participation in discipline-specific conferences and professional education activities.
2. Actively participating in the Department's curricular assessment efforts.
3. Creating and/or assessing doctoral students' competency examination questions.
4. Mentoring doctoral students through active participation on committees that supervise doctoral student research projects.
5. Actively engaging in the activities summarized in Section 2.1.4 (below) in a manner which evidences continuous efforts to improve student learning outcomes through the constant evolution of one's teaching.

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective instruction requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning. Effective teaching is thoughtful teaching. Deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and change their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate the need to do so.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and the committees should consider) their formative assessment practices, including: (1) discussion of one or more course goals, aims, or practices the candidate decided to change, (2) the evidence alerting the candidate something needed to change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided the course(s) would change.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes, and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes. This could also include evidence generated from taking part in the Faculty Formative Feedback project.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

Effective instruction engages and helps students learn the desired course outcomes. Instructional methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) effective instructional strategies for student learning.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), assessments, syllabi, peer observations, a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, support letters, qualitative or quantitative student perception data, and other supporting documentation.

2.1.4 Student Learning Outcomes

Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. Where candidates have made improvements to outcomes, goals, and/or assessments, these should be discussed in the narrative by the candidate with corresponding evidence.

Supporting evidence of student learning that should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials, include, but are not limited to:

- A. Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey to students—in measurable, behavioral terms—expected student learning outcomes.
- B. Syllabi that clearly convey student learning outcomes and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements, as well as the purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic responsibilities and/or individual personal growth).
- C. Careful preparation and clear organization of lessons and pedagogical materials that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.
- D. Thoughtful, deliberate effort to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness is expected of all candidates, including but not limited to:
 1. Regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development; or
 2. A sustained record of involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for Faculty Development; or
 3. A sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or professional organizations; or
 4. A sustained record of giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.5 Syllabi

Course syllabi shall be included in the candidate's RTP file and align with academic unit RTP Policy. Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file, along with narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to syllabi.

Pursuant in the RTP policy, all syllabi must set forth course meetings, times and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information; required books and other resources; an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy; an explanation of how the

instructor will apply the University's course withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or schedule. Excellent syllabi, however, also contain other types of information, such as:

- A. the measurable learning outcomes of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
- B. clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
- C. instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and
- D. readings and assignments that are up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning.

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

2.1.6 Grade Distributions

Grade distributions of 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. Moreover, grade distributions need not approximate a normal curve. As such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.

The RTP Committee should evaluate a candidate's grade distributions within the context of how the candidate himself or herself commented upon them. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be expected in larger undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques might justify a grading distribution of all "A"s and "B"s in small, upper-level or graduate seminars. Thus, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor's teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices.

2.1.7 Student Responses to Instruction

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. Nevertheless, student course evaluations shall be used by the College RTP committee to evaluate student response to instruction, among other evidence. Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with academic unit expectations. All student course evaluations during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file. Candidates should demonstrate in their narrative deliberate efforts to improve instruction based on student course evaluations.

- A. Required Documentation – In order to allow for complete consideration of student evaluations, candidates for review at all levels, including mini-review, retention, tenure, or promotion must submit Summaries of Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT). All candidates, regardless of rank, must submit the evaluation summary sheets for all the courses in which university administered SPOT evaluations were given. Submission of student qualitative comments is optional but if submitted, all forms from all students and all classes must be included.

- B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – Ratings by students should reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.
1. While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the Department 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, especially if offered at the graduate-level; when teaching under-enrolled courses which could easily result in skewed 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:
 - i. the mean for students' responses to questions on standardized teaching evaluation forms are no lower than a mean of 3.0 and are no more than one standard deviation below the departmental mean; and
 - ii. student evaluations submitted by candidates provide evidence of the following trends:
 - a. For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of quality teaching.
 - b. For tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, student evaluations of teaching submitted by candidates must evidence a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
 - c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, student evaluations submitted by candidates must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.1.8 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations of the candidate's instruction should be included in the candidate's RTP file, and candidates should reflect on and incorporate peer feedback, including providing evidence of instructional improvements where appropriate. The quantity of peer evaluations, as well as the rank of evaluators, shall be determined by the candidate's academic unit RTP policy and followed accordingly. Evidence demonstrating peer evaluations could include (but are not limited to) formative feedback activities, peer evaluations of different types of courses and their modalities (e.g., face-to-face or online), and the completion of evaluation forms or rubrics approved by the candidate's academic unit RTP policy.

Required Documentation – Candidates must submit *at least* two (2) peer evaluations conducted within the three years prior to the applications for reappointment and for tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Ideally, a candidate will ask for peer evaluations for each course topic they teach and such evaluations will be conducted by different full-time colleagues. Moreover, to show growth in response to feedback from peers, candidates are encouraged to seek a second peer evaluation from the same full-time colleague in a subsequent semester.

Evaluation by RTP Committee – Peer evaluations must be based on observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. Peer

evaluations must document whether: instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; content is up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and overall effectiveness of ways in which information is communicated to students in the classroom. To the maximum extent possible, peer evaluators should endeavor to learn as much as possible to be able to comment from an informed perspective about as many of the items listed as evidence in teaching listed in Section 2.1 of this Policy. Peer evaluators should also evaluate and comment upon the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials.

2.2 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 of the professorial role 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 bring prestige and visibility to the University and the Department. The most respected and successful universities support and encourage the acquisition of knowledge. 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 enhance teaching effectiveness and enrich the education of students. Fourth, RSCA, especially when funded, bring equipment, technology, and professional development opportunities to the Department and its students. This, in turn, increases the likelihood that students will be well-trained and competitive when seeking employment. Fifth, professional survival requires that members generate a large portion of the knowledge upon which their profession is based. 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 Department of Physical Therapy 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 Physical Therapy, and/or related fields.

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines

Evaluation criteria should recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and values discussed in Section 1, including the importance of involving students in RSCA.

The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Consistent with University and CHHS expectations of all faculty members, RTP candidates must demonstrate achievements in research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in this Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in the RTP policies of Physical Therapy departments. When developing such policies, departments shall incorporate the standards specified below in subsections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

Variations Due to Intense Service Roles – There may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in teaching or service, such as serving as the department chair, associate chair, graduate advisor, undergraduate advisor, or in a position of leadership with college-wide and/or university-wide significance. In such cases the reduction in scholarship should not be counted against the candidate, but there should be evidence that the candidate's scholarly activity has been maintained to some degree and has promise for full resumption when the other activities return to normal levels.

2.2.2 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:
1. high-quality work as judged by one's peers;
 2. scope of recognition at *various levels: professional, local, state, national and international*;
 3. sustained effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment; and
 4. the impact of one's research and scholarly activities.
- B. Types of RSCA – All faculty members in the Department of Physical Therapy are *expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies, as well as other scholarly and creative activities consistent with the provisions of this Policy.* Copies of all such scholarly work must be submitted so that the Department RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.

*RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Examples below **should not** be construed as exhaustive or recommended:*

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: *RSCA that seeks to build or expand 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: RSCA involving the application of 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: RSCA 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.

Academic units should not limit candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments, but may develop equivalencies for RSCA activities in accordance with disciplinary norms and expectations. Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills based on requirements delineated the department.

The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

1. Required Types of RSCA

- a. Peer-reviewed publication of scholarly and creative work of *scholarly and creative works* is required of all candidates. Specific publication requirements are set forth below in subsections C(2), D(1), and D(2).
 - i. Research involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as policy analysis or legal analysis) that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment, scoping review, systematic review, or meta-analysis.
 - ii. Under appropriate circumstances, such as publication of articles or original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully advance the discipline of physical therapy may also constitute “research,” depending on the candidate’s area of expertise. Under no circumstances, however, shall this provision be interpreted as allowing literature reviews, book reviews, serving as a journal

reviewer, or encyclopedia entries to satisfy the departmental requirement for “scholarly research.”

- b. All RTP candidates are expected to present their research at relevant academic conferences (see subsection 2.2.2 D(6), below), budget permitting. Conference proceedings and presentations strengthen a candidate’s scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank. Conference proceedings and presentations do not, however, substitute for the requirement that candidates publish scholarly research in peer reviewed journals as set forth in specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

2. Enhancing Types of RSCA

- a. *Although other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature and book reviews encyclopedia entries, op-ed pieces, etc.) are valued (and therefore are detailed below in subsection D) these types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the department or CHHS RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate.* In other words, these other forms of scholarly activity strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publication of scholarly and creative work as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
- b. *Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, methods or protocol papers, 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.* These forms of scholarly activity strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publication of scholarly and creative work as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
- c. Candidates may also strengthen their required program of RSCA by writing or editing books. Books strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publication of scholarly and creative work as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

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

- 1. Scholarly Research Agenda -Teacher-scholars in the Department of Physical Therapy 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 1.5.3, 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 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 seasons of an academic career, continuity, reflection, and growth are expected to persist. We recognize that sometimes staying involved and remaining vibrant means taking risks to change focus, adopt a new methodological approach, or develop a new application. As a community of vibrant teacher-scholars, we are committed to recognizing, valuing, and supporting each others' unique paths of professional growth. Toward these ends:

- a. In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to formulate 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 that are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms (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.
2. 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. Normally, this means that the finished works will be published and/or presented in venue consistent with accepted disciplinary standards (discussed in more detail below in subsection D of Section 2.2.2). 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 doing mini-reviews must be mindful of the fact in the early probationary years, faculty are likely to just be starting to advance a research agenda. Thus, in the first year, new faculty might be more likely to publish book reviews, encyclopedia entries, invited essays, monographs, grant proposals (submitted, funded, and unfunded), 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 for editorial consideration in their first two years. New faculty members are especially encouraged to try transforming their prior research into at least one or two peer-reviewed journal articles. 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, it is expected that the candidate will have at least one peer-reviewed journal article either in-print or

formally accepted for publication or justification for equivalency. The quality of the publication is more important than the number of publications. Exceeding these baseline expectations shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

- c. After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period (typically years four through six), faculty should be publishing in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least one additional scholarly article in a refereed venue and a third scholarly article in a refereed venue or an equivalent RSCA accomplishment or justification for equivalency. Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate 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.
 - 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 journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have produced, on average, at least four scholarly publications in a refereed journal in addition to those required for tenure or justification for equivalency. 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. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
3. Significance of Scholarly Engagement of Students and/or Community – In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, the Department of Physical Therapy 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. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends shall be considered evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement.
 4. Sponsored Research - *Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued 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 significant 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 entirety of the probationary period, merely applying for 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 journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
- 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 large-scale grant work is time-consuming and, therefore, publication of the results of such research may be delayed until after an extensive data-collection and analysis process.

D. 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. The most important of these criteria are contained in subsections (1) and (2), as such publications are a requirement for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as stated above in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a) and C(2); all other forms for RSCA listed below strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publication of scholarly and creative work as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2). Moreover, *candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.*

1. **Authorship** – Publications as the sole, first, or corresponding (as the primary research mentor) author are evaluated most positively. For multiple-authored works, the amount or nature of author contributions should be specified.
2. **Refereed Journal Articles** – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee's assessment of 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; status of the members of the journal editorial board within the subfield; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services (i.e., Hooked on Evidence); and/or citations to the article.
 - a. **Venues** – Refereed articles that are accepted and published in Physical Therapy journals, as well as journals from related basic sciences and/or health sciences disciplines are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The degree of value, however, depends on

the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published, the degree of the candidate's contribution to the publication, and the impact of the publication on the discipline must always be considered when assessing the significance of any publication.

b. Exceptional Scholarship

Publishing exceptionally high-quality scholarship, such as top-tier journals, constitutes the strongest evidence of scholarly achievement, as such work contributes to the meaningful advancement of the discipline. The impact of these publications on the field of Physical Therapy and its allied disciplines is critical, as they both shape practice and drive forward interdisciplinary knowledge. RTP Committee members, therefore, usually give significant, positive weight to such publications in their evaluation of a candidate's RSCA contributions for reappointment, tenure, and promotions decision purposes.

c. Faculty with a clinical specialization may submit scholarship activities listed under Professional Presentations and Writings – equivalent to 3 MOSC credits – as one piece of scholarship publication. This equivalency can be applied to once during the probationary period and once again when applying for promotion to Professor.

Examples for Professional Presentations and Professional Writings under MOSC category 3 include (<https://specialization.apta.org/maintain-certification/mosc-requirements>)

i. Professional Presentations

1) Peer-reviewed presentations (each worth 2 MOSC credits)

- Platform or poster presentation.
- Invited speaker.

2) Non-peer-reviewed presentations (each worth 1 MOSC credit)

- In-service presentations.
- Presentation to professional groups.
- Presentation to client-based groups.
- Presentation to community groups.
- Panelist at forum.
- Participation in a journal club.

ii. Professional Writing (Authorship/Editorship)

1) Peer-reviewed writing (each worth 3 MOSC credits):

- Book chapter, peer-reviewed journal article.
- Grant proposal, primary investigator or co-investigator.
- Book chapter, peer-reviewed journal article.
- Case study or case report.
- Home study module.
- Editor

2) Non-peer-reviewed writing (each worth 1 MOSC credit):

- Non-peer reviewed publication.
- Reviews or commentaries.
- Manuscript reviewer.
- Hooked on evidence.
- Professional meeting abstract reviewer.

d. Research Grants

- i. A federal grant, APTA Foundation grant or comparable grant in a related field are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

1) Securing a federal grant, APTA Foundation grant or comparable grant as one of the Principal Investigators may be considered equivalent to a peer-reviewed journal publication.

3. 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 significantly more weight than edited books.
4. Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.
5. 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., *professional, local, state, national, international*); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.
6. 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). Presentations at the conferences of the American Physical Therapy Association and similar nationally-recognized organizations are paramount. Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Rather, conference presentations represent a form of scholarly activity that enhances, but does not supplant, the requirement that candidate's produce peer-reviewed publications in discipline-appropriate venues.
7. 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 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.

8. Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports; and the frequency and range of clients for consulting activities. Professional consultation is considered scholarly when it involves the creation rather than the application of knowledge and it impacts significantly on the discipline of physical therapy. Examples include original research when consulting for a company, creating national standards for an accrediting organization, and designing curricula for national or regional use. Evidence includes the original work itself, written evaluations by peers or professional organizations, or other type of rigorous and formal assessment.
9. Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of activities supported by awards, sabbaticals, and other forms of support for scholarly research funded by CSULB.

Units should explicitly draw a distinction between internal assigned time, such as that provided by internal funds from the Office of Research and Economic Development, as either a faculty small grant, assigned time, or a summer stipend/mini grant, and assigned time provided by external grants and contracts. For any internal RSCA funding, the unit must provide details about what documentation is required for faculty accountability to count the RSCA product.

It is the candidate's responsibility to explicitly identify any internal and externally funded research activities and deliverables. In their narratives the candidates must disclose and describe the details of the RSCA activities and how they have demonstrated accountability to the funding entity, whether internal or external. For collaborative works, the candidate must articulate their contributions and how they are distinguished from the efforts of others on the research team. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

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

1. 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 journals. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).
2. Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students via improvement in instruction or improvement in evidence for

practice. The Department of Physical Therapy 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 graduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses).

Academic units should also explicitly identify how and to what extent or in what ways research mentoring of students is used to strengthen the candidate's file. Expectations for student mentoring, if any, need to be provided. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify research outcomes related to student research mentoring.

3. Community Impact – We recognize impact in various types of community (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at different levels of community effort (local, state, national, and international communities).
- F. Weighting of the Body of Work – The applicant's entire body of scholarly work provides evidence for the pattern of continuing scholarship in support of mini- reviews, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, but works finished since appointment at CSULB carry greater weight for mini-reviews, reappointment, and tenure.

2.3 Service

Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, and the academic profession and strengthens shared governance processes. Universities cannot and should not function without faculty service contributions. Therefore, service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators. It is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation.

2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments

All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of shared governance on campus and to maintain active engagement benefitting the university, community, and/or profession through high-quality service contributions and activities throughout their careers. 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.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles.

Department recognizes not only quantity of service activity but also its quality and duration. Evaluation criteria considers the value and impact of each candidate's service activities and emphasize balanced service across campus, community, and profession. All faculty, however, are expected to contribute to shared governance activities on campus.

Additionally, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are required to have made quality service contributions to the Department and to 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 Department, College, University, community or to the profession as described in this subsection.

A. Service within the University - *Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university, CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to CFA.*

1. *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 Department of Physical Therapy such as:*
 - a. *advising students, student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;*
 - b. *participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees;*
 - c. *authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department;*
 - d. *attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;*
 - e. *attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the department, the college, the university, and professional organizations; and*
 - f. *actively participating in student programs (e.g., commencement, research day presentations).*
2. *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to both the Department of Physical Therapy and to service contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, such as:*
 - a. *serving on college-wide committees*
 - b. *authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the college.*

University-level service is desirable, but not required.

3. *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, including, but not limited to:*

- a. Serving as the Department Chair, Graduate Advisor, or Director of Clinical Education;
 - b. chairing major departmental committees;
 - c. holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
 - d. authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university, college, or department;
 - e. creating or significantly revising department/program curricula.
- B. 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. Example, Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise.*
- 1. Community Service – *If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member such that he or she applies 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 community service may include:
 - i. *consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.*
 - ii. *helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise; and/or*
 - iii. *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:
 - i. *taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;*
 - ii. *holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to the candidate's professional expertise; consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;*
 - iii. *serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or*
 - iv. *engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to physical therapy; serving as a media consultant (by giving interviews or otherwise) for physical therapy related topics; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with health-related missions; writing physical therapy-relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.*
 - 2. Professional Service – *Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; external grant reviewer; performances and/or displays; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications;*

leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline, and/or elected offices in a physical therapy related professional organization. Such professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for the American Physical Therapy Association (including its academies and chapters).

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments and Participation

The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in section 2.3.1. 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 nature of the service commitment in terms of the time, energy, and dedication it takes to participate meaningfully in the particular service activities;*
- B. the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, the college, and/or to the Department of Physical Therapy;*
- C. 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;*
- D. 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;*
- E. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;*
- F. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers his/her services; and*
- G. 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. Effective leaders create results, attain goals, realize vision, and guide others by modeling more quickly and at a higher level of quality than do ineffective leaders.*

2.4 Evaluation of Service

Academic units must also specify how service activities that receive assigned time are evaluated and what service is required by candidates at all levels in addition to service activities for which assigned time is provided.

2.4.1 Candidate's Responsibility

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

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. In general, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or actions (for instance, what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and then describe outcomes or impact of the work. Student mentoring or advising (when being considered as service) could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g., numbers of students, extent of work) and impact of the candidate's work, highlighting student success.

Candidates can describe off-campus or profession-linked work in terms of what the work is, how it utilizes the candidate's academic expertise, and how it impacts the profession or wider community. In general, candidates should discuss and (when possible) document the importance, scope, and length of their service accomplishments, noting the time, effort, and amount of work involved in the activities as well as (when possible) the overall impact of the service and the number of individuals impacted.

- A.** Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance.
- B.** Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.

As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), 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 department recognizes their importance and encourages candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.

The department recognizes that service to the community or profession should connect to candidates' academic expertise and professional goals. The department is encouraged to outline criteria that acknowledge work done in support of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, on campus and off campus as well as in support of racial and social justice, including for instance the elimination of anti-Blackness more broadly. Candidates, in turn, are encouraged to document work done in this regard.

Insofar as the University and CHHS recognize that cultural and identity taxation have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas, service done on behalf of students or on behalf of the department, college and university that might otherwise go unrecognized or disproportionately fall on faculty should be considered in the evaluation process. While all tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in shared governance and maintain active engagement, evaluation

committees at the academic unit and college levels should consider the role cultural and identity taxation plays in the service activities of faculty. These activities could include, but are not limited to, mentoring students or supervising student clubs that might not constitute formal committee work, but still take up considerable time. Candidates are encouraged to discuss and document in their materials any service activities they feel may have been disproportionately completed in light of cultural and identity taxation.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional trainings and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes 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 to the university, community, and/or profession. 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

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her 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 narrative should range from between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins. 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.

3.2 The Department RTP Policy

The content of this RTP policy, belonging to the Department of Physical Therapy, 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.

The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.

3.3 The Department RTP Committee

The Department of Physical Therapy RTP Committee *has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for evaluating the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.*

The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

No single individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

Within each academic unit (e.g., department or school), all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with

the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

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.

3.3.1 Election of Committee

The RTP Committee of the Department of Physical Therapy is composed 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: *The Committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be comprised of tenured Associate and full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be comprised of tenured full Professors.*
- B. *Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on the RTP Committee.*
- C. *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.*
- D. *The Department Chair may serve as a member of the RTP Committee, if elected, subject to the provisions of section 3.3.2(B).*

3.3.2 Committee Composition

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

- A. Membership Rank – *Members of the Department of Physical Therapy 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 Department of Physical Therapy may or may not 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 Department of Physical Therapy. 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 Department of Physical Therapy 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. Department of Physical Therapy RTP Committee

1. 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 be 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. See Appendix A for the streamlined procedures to be used for mini-reviews.
2. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews – RTP reviews shall be conducted by the Department of Physical Therapy RTP Committee on the schedule set by the University. The Department of Physical Therapy 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:*

- A. *Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.*

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

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 Department of Physical Therapy 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 Department of Physical Therapy 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

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

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

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

4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the college dean. The periodic evaluation in the first year may just be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean.

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

4.1.1 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 Physical Therapy Department RTP committee, the chair of the Physical Therapy Department, 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 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. See Appendix A for the streamlined procedures to be used for mini-reviews.

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.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An associate professor becomes eligible for promotion review to full professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured associate professor may seek early promotion to full professor prior to the fifth year in rank. This process is discussed further under Section 5.5.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

The CHHS RTP Policy and Department RTP Policy follow the criteria designated by the University Policy (see sections 4.0-4.3 of Policy Statement 23-24). Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that they are making significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in their program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the departmental or program level and consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high-quality work over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive in all three areas. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.

The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

An associate professor is expected to teach well, foster quality learning experiences, and be responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and the university's educational mission. At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA. The candidate is expected to have produced high-quality peer-reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have made high quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development. Successful candidates will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. Candidates are expected to have disseminated a substantial body of professionally and/or peer-reviewed work at the local, national and/or international levels. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

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

6.1 *The Office of Faculty 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 *The Office of Faculty Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.*

- 6.3** *Departments must post 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 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** *A copy of all statements submitted during the open period shall be provided to the candidate by the department RTP committee chair or department chair. The department RTP committee chair or department chair collects, prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file, and submits the materials via the university approved process.*
- 6.5** *Candidates prepare materials for review and submit them via the university-approved process by the deadline.*
- 6.6** *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** *The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee, reviews the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.*
- 6.8** *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.*
- 6.9** *The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President (or designee) by the deadline.*
- 6.10** *The President (or 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

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

- 7.1** *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 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 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 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 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.*
- 7.6 When ratings (e.g., excellent, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) are used in evaluation reports, the definition and scales of rating must be provided to the candidate.*

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

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

8.1 Ratification

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

8.2 Amendments

Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the entire full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Physical Therapy. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Dean of the College (either directly or through the Department Chair as the Dean's designee) shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the faculty members in the Department of Physical Therapy at least two weeks (i.e., 14 calendar days) prior to voting.

8.2.1 Voting on Amendments

Voting on amendments shall be by ballot prior to the close of the preceding academic year of adoption and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

8.2.2 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, Faculty Council and the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8.2.3 Voting Rights

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

APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MINI-EVALUATIONS

Mini-Evaluations of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the Department of Physical Therapy RTP Committee, the Department Chair (optional), and the College Dean. The standard form for evaluation must be used. Pursuant to that form, a candidate's activities are to be evaluated under the categories of: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. The dossier, however, for a mini-evaluation is not a full RTP evaluation file. Accordingly, candidates for mini-reviews are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini-evaluation or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).¹

To assist the Department RTP Committee in conducting a mini-evaluation of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit an updated PDS which addresses: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. These updates are to be supported with the following documentation:

1. Narrative – The narrative for a mini-review should be in the form of a short letter (*two to three pages*) that reflects on a candidate's accomplishments in all three areas either since initial appointment (for new probation faculty), since the last mini-review (for candidates in their second or fifth years), or since formal reappointment (for candidates in their fourth year).

In terms of the content of the narrative, two or three paragraphs should be devoted to reflection on one's teaching. Two or three paragraphs should discuss the candidate's scholarly activities; in these paragraphs, in accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy (and its subsections), candidates must identify their program of scholarly research. It is important that specific goals and plans – both current and future – be clearly articulated and documented because mere claims of intent are insufficient. This should include not only a written plan of research activity, but also some indication of how data for empirically-based research may be derived or obtained. Finally, a paragraph or two should explain the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period.

2. Student Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.3(A)(1) of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review are strongly encouraged to submit all student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, from all sections of all courses they have taught; however, candidates for mini-review are only required to submit all quantitative and qualitative copies of student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses taught each semester. In addition, candidates must submit a summary table of their student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses that are subsequently evaluated by students. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 1: Summary of Quantitative Anonymous Feedback on Teaching

Academic semester	Course no.	No. students enrolled	No. students respond	Candidate mean	Candidate SD	Dept mean	Dept SD	School mean	School SD

3. Peer-Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.4 of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review must submit peer evaluations of teaching that were conducted within the year prior to the application. Candidates should have at least one peer-evaluation each year they teach from tenured faculty. Ideally, candidates should ask for a peer evaluation each semester that he/she teaches a course to show that growth, development, or consistency exists in the candidate's teaching.
4. Syllabi – In accordance with Section 2.1.5 of the Department RTP Policy, syllabi from all courses taught in the relevant review period must be submitted. Only one syllabus per discrete course should be submitted, not multiple copies of syllabi used in different sections or semesters. An exception to this rule, however, is if the candidate has made substantial changes to a syllabus in response to suggestions from students or peers. In such an event, candidates should submit "before" and "after" copies as evidence of efforts to improve courses. Candidates should make sure that their syllabi conform to all university requirements.
5. Table of Grade Distributions – In accordance with Section 2.1.6 of the Department RTP Policy, candidates must submit their grade distributions *in summary tabular form* from all sections of all courses taught since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses taught. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 2: Summary of Grade Distributions

Academic semester	Course no.	Class GPA	Department GPA

6. Scholarly Publications – In accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy and its subsections, candidates must document their scholarly publication record. During mini-evaluations, candidates should therefore including copies of papers presented at conferences; manuscripts under review; preprints of articles accepted for publication along with the letter of acceptance; reprints of articles that have been published; proposals for funded research; and letters documenting service as an editor or peer-reviewer. *Only those scholarly activities that have occurred since the last review need to be submitted.*
7. Documenting Service – Candidates during mini-reviews need not submit any documentation of service; simply listing such service on their updated curriculum vitae is sufficient. Candidates are well advised, however, to be careful to keep such documentation since it is required to be submitted as part of a candidate's RTP file for formal reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

¹ New probationary faculty should therefore submit materials from the date of appointment. However, if service credit was given at the time of appointment, candidates should also include materials for the credited years.