CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE, GERMAN, RUSSIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES (RGRLL)
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
POLICY EFFECTIVE FALL 2025

The Department of RGRLL houses language, literature, and translation programs that value diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. As a multilingual and multicultural department, we recognize and celebrate academic and creative activities in all languages. The department has adopted the College RTP Policy. In addition, our policy includes what is specified below. Candidates and evaluators therefore should follow the department policy within the context of the College RTP policy and the University RTP policy.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES
All College guiding principles are the same.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION
The following categories of evaluation are required by the University and College RTP policies.

2.1 INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES
The RGRLL department holds its faculty to the highest standards, expecting them to be engaged and effective teachers. Following the University and CLA policies, RTP candidates must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness and a commitment to continuous professional development. Reflecting on and adapting best instructional practices as well as fostering student learning and achieving course goals all constitute important tenets of excellence in teaching.

Recommended professional development opportunities may include foreign language teaching workshops organized by the RGRLL department or local chapters of language-specific professional associations (AATF, AATG, AATI, AATSP, etc.). Faculty learning communities and workshops offered through the Faculty Center, Academic Technology Services (ATS) or the CSU Office of the Chancellor are also good choices to demonstrate ongoing commitment to teaching excellence and student success. For faculty teaching in RGRLL's lower-division language programs, close collaboration with the department's lower-division language coordinator is highly encouraged.

2.1.1 Requirements: In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy, the department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

a.   Reappointment: Only candidates who demonstrate an effective performance in teaching and clear potential for improvement shall be recommended for reappointment.

b.   Tenure and/or promotion: Only candidates who demonstrate sustained, high-quality teaching in the overall record shall be recommended for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

c. Promotion to Rank of Professor: Only candidates who demonstrate excellent, highly effective teaching shall be recommended for promotion to Professor. Candidates are encouraged to take these minimal department standards into account when constructing their RTP files and writing their narratives.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)
CLA and the University RTP Policies value different types of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, the

scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, the scholarship of application and practice, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

According to University Policy, departments and colleges should not limit candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments. Faculty in the RGRLL Department engage in a variety of RSCA activities, including pedagogy, translation, and relevant fields of scholarly and creative endeavor, and all are equally valued. As a globally engaged department, we accept peer-reviewed work that is published in any language by different prestigious venues e.g., having high impact factor, selective acceptance rates, rigorous peer reviewed process and an overall strong reputation. Candidates are responsible for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. The following two examples articulate paradigmatic considerations regarding journal articles/collaborative research and publications in languages other than English for candidates at all levels of review.

Journal articles

Candidates should provide evidence of the selectivity of journals (e.g. acceptance and/or rejection rates, journal impact factor when available). In many sub-disciplines of literary studies, single-authored works are the norm, while co-authoring implies substantial contributions from all authors. Faculty are expected to have co-authorship relations appropriate to their sub-discipline, which in most cases means that some single-authored work is expected as evidence of an independent research program. Exceptions may be made for highly successful collaborations and for disciplines in which collaborative publications are the norm, such as some sub-fields of linguistics, translation and interpreting studies, provided that the candidate documents their personal contributions. In the case of co- or multiple authorship (or editorship, for example of a special issue or volume of essays), the candidate should provide a clear description of the distribution of work by different authors and evidence such as memoranda, emails, working drafts with sufficient detail and accuracy to allow evaluators to gauge individual input, and/or public disclosure statements identifying individual contributions submitted to the journal in question.

Foreign language publications

As a department that teaches several world languages, we value publications in candidates' languages of expertise as well as in English. In the case of foreign language publications, candidates should indicate whether they authored in a foreign language or had an English-language article or chapter translated. Candidates should expect to provide the same information about all foreign language publications that they provide for publications in English and shall include English translations of any significant correspondence in their files (acceptance letters, descriptions of editorial policy provided by editors, reader reports, etc.).

2.2.1 Requirements: In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy, the department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

2.2.1.a. <u>Reappointment</u>: Candidates for reappointment must demonstrate an ongoing effort to build a RSCA portfolio. By the time candidates turn in their files for reappointment, they are expected to have at least one high-quality, original, substantive, peer-reviewed, article-length publication, book chapter or equivalent published, forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress) —in a prestigious venue. Translation of a creative or scholarly monograph also meets the criterion of one article accepted and a second article under consideration. Translation of a creative or scholarly monograph plus a substantive preface and/or translator's note in addition to the translation may count as the equivalent of two, substantive, original articles, and thus would exceed expectations for reappointment. Candidates whose RSCA falls outside these parameters for reappointment need to make the case that their records meet the requirements for quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy.

Other supporting professional activities or enhancing categories of assessment might include activities suc as book reviews, peer-reviewed conference presentations, and external research grant proposals, but these activities should not be prioritized over the goal of publication and do not receive the same weight.

To meet these requirements, recent PhDs, in their first three (3) years of appointment, are strongly encouraged to use their dissertations as a base to fulfill their reappointment minimum requirements: one published article (or justified equivalent).

2.2.1.b. <u>**Tenure and/or promotion**</u>: Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate an increasingly strong record of publications. The department values sustained quality over quantity. A record of multiple publications that are original and advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way, are required in order to receive a positive recommendation for tenure.

Publications (or their RSCA equivalent) may be published, forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress) as per the definitions and allowances provided in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.4). Given the diversity of possible RSCA records a candidate may develop, the department has articulated various possible scenarios representing the department's expectations for positive tenure and/or promotion recommendation. These scenarios involve peer-reviewed publications in various venues yet may not be comprehensive, given the constantly evolving fields of research in languages, literatures and cultures.

To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, candidates must meet either of the following scenarios:

- Publications that fall under categories 1a or 1b.
- A combination of one publication from 1a plus at least one publication from scenarios 1c through 1f.

Candidates also must demonstrate ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed RSCA; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and/or qualifying non peer-reviewed/invited lectures or presentations).

Candidates are encouraged to consult with the department chair and/or the chair of the RGRLL RTP committee for guidance on this process.

1. A record of peer-reviewed RSCA aligned with one of the following scenarios. In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate quality and impact of RSCA. Candidates whose research is conducted together with others and whose research outcomes are therefore co- or multi-authored shall offer a detailed description of their role in the collaborative work, (e.g., conceptualization, writing, and data analysis) in co- and multi- authored RSCA. The magnitude of the candidate's contribution is weighed.

a. High-quality, original, substantive, peer-reviewed articles or book chapters–published, in press/forthcoming, or accepted (thus not in progress) —in different prestigious venues (as defined in 2.2). Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way, including literary and cultural studies, translation, and/or pedagogy. In this scenario, the candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the prestige of the venue (e.g., based on acceptance rates, rankings, or other similar data), and originality of the RSCA to make the case for quality over quantity.

b. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.

c. Publication of an edited volume, anthology, textbook, or co-authored monograph in which the candidate played a significant, demonstrable role in the authorship. Textbooks related to the candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's contribution to the textbook and extent to which the textbook can be shown to advance scholarship or integrate scholarship into innovative pedagogical practice in the discipline.

d. Publication of an academic translation closely related to the candidate's area of expertise.

e. Externally funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships that support the candidate's research agenda may also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements.

f. Publication of peer-reviewed creative works such as a collection of poetry, short stories, novels, or essays, etc. particularly if they are relevant to the candidate's scholarly and pedagogical areas of specialization. The department is using the definition of peer-review for creative material as stipulated in the CLA RTP policy

2.2.1.c. <u>Promotion to Professor</u>: Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate evidence of sustained and consistent RSCA that has resulted in publications in high- quality, peer-reviewed venues for the review period. Candidates for promotion to full professor should have made additional substantial contributions that have had a significant impact in the field beyond the contribution that earned tenure.

To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, candidates must meet either of the following scenarios:

- Publications that fall under categories 1a or 1b.
- A combination of one publication from 1a plus at least one publication from scenarios 1c through 1f.

Candidates also must demonstrate ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed RSCA; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and/or qualifying non peer-reviewed/invited lectures or presentations).

Candidates are encouraged to consult with the department chair and/or the chair of the RGRLL RTP committee for guidance on this process.

1. Candidates must have substantive, original article-length, peer-reviewed publications or their equivalent to be eligible for promotion to Professor. These publications need to appear in a variety of prestigious venues (see 2.2). They may be published, forthcoming, or accepted as per the definitions and allowances provided in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.4).

Since the department values sustained quality over quantity, a record of multiple publications that are original and advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way are required in order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion.

The following examples represent the possible scenarios that merit a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor. In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate equality and impact of RSCA. The following list might not be comprehensive, as the fields of RGRLL faculty are constantly evolving.

a. High-quality, original, substantive peer-reviewed articles in different high-quality, prestigious publication

venues. Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way. In this scenario, the candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the prestige of the venues, and originality of RSCA to make the case for quality over quantity.

b. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.

c. Externally funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships that support the candidate's research agenda may also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements.

d. Publication of an academic translation closely related to the candidate's area of expertise.

e. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored monograph in which the candidate played a significant, demonstrable role in the authorship. Textbooks related to the candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can be shown to advance scholarship in the discipline. As with all RSCA, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate quality and impact on the field.

f. Publication of high-quality peer-reviewed creative works such as a collection of poetry, short stories, novel, or essays, particularly if they are relevant to the candidate's scholarly and pedagogical areas of specialization. The department is using the definition of peer review for creative material as stipulated in the CLA RTP policy 2.2.3.1.e.

2.2.2 Departmental Definitions
All definitions stated in the CLA RTP Policy apply. For the purposes of the Department RTP Policy, the following additional definitions apply:

a. 'Substantive' is defined as an article-length publication. Such publications often range from 7,000-10,000 words. Regardless of length, candidates need to articulate impact and substance of RSCA in the narrative. Review or state-of-the-field articles meeting these criteria are considered substantive.

b. 'Original' is defined as RSCA that makes an argument that is not reiterative of other research published by the candidate or other scholars.

c. Peer-reviewed conferences are those for which abstracts are reviewed by a selection committee.

d. Non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations usually are those given by invitation, but also might include a lecture given in a colleague's class or lecture series.

e. A funded external grant refers to a funded external grant proposal, not to an application for such a grant.

f. Pedagogical contributions are defined as textbooks, peer-reviewed e-books and published materials that advance teaching and learning in the area of expertise and/or explore how people teach and learn in the discipline.

g. Translations and creative work submitted for consideration in the tenure and promotion process must be contextualized and documented by the candidate: whether the publication was conducted upon invitation (due to disciplinary expertise), by submitting a proposal to a publishing house, etc.

2.3 Service

According to the CLA RTP Policy, high-quality, sustained service contributions to the Department, college and the University as well as to the profession and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts.

2.3.1 Service requirements and opportunities.
In addition to file requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy (2.3.1), the department has the following minimum requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

2.3.1.a Minimum service requirements
Actively participating in faculty governance requires working collaboratively and productively with colleagues at all levels of the university. At the departmental level, the Department of RGRLL generally expects faculty to attend and contribute to department and section meetings, participate in Languages Other Than English (LOTE) interviews for the Single Subject Credential Program (SSCP), and in program assessment. Examples of opportunities that contribute to meeting minimum service requirements are outlined below:

2.3.1.b Department service opportunities
For RTP purposes, there are many ways to provide service to the department. These include, but are not limited to, service on department standing and ad-hoc committees (e.g., Curriculum and Assessment, Personnel, LOTE Advisory, Scholarship, Grade Appeals Committees, Committees, Textbook Selection Committees); curriculum development; professional development workshops for graduate and undergraduate students; acting as official advisor to student organizations and clubs; and organizing cultural events. As per the CLA RTP Policy, all activities for which assigned time is given must be listed under Instruction and Instructional Activities and not under Service.

2.3.1.c University service opportunities
University service opportunities include but are not limited to: serving on Academic Senate or its numerous councils and committees; volunteering to serve on WASC or other university-level or CSU-level councils and taskforces, participating in student success efforts, and other similar initiatives.

2.3.2 Service expectations by rank
For all ranks, candidates for RTP actions are expected to be engaged in ongoing, substantive service that demonstrates an active engagement with the processes of faculty governance. As with the college policy (2.3.2), at all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be weighed more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates serve.

2.3.2.a Reappointment: Faculty in their first three years of appointment are expected to perform service above the baseline requirement in the department. Such service can include, but is not limited to, serving on department committees or performing other service as per 2.3.1b above.

2.3.2.b Tenure and/or promotion: Candidates coming up for tenure and/or promotion are expected to have diversified and increased their service profiles during the probationary period. In addition to active participation in department services activities delineated in 2.3.1b above, candidates for tenure and/or promotion also are expected to perform service at the college or university level as per the CLA RTP Policy (2.3.2.1).

2.3.2.c Promotion to rank of Professor: Successful candidates shall have, as per the CLA and University RTP Policies, a significant, substantive record of service at department, college, and university levels; a record of leadership at the university; and a record of service in the community and/or the profession. The only

additional requirement in the Department of RGRLL is that candidates also must have a sustained, ongoing record of meeting service requirements to the department as per 2.3.1a above.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PROCESS

3.1. Department RTP Committee
Procedures for elections of the Department RTP Committee are outlined in the CLA RTP Policy. As per the CLA RTP Policy (3.4.2), at least three (3) members of the department RTP committee or sub-committee must evaluate each candidate.

3.2. Mentoring
Both the University and the College RTP Policies emphasize the importance of mentoring for the RTP process.

3.2.1 Designation of a mentor
In the Department of RGRLL, newly hired untenured faculty shall work with the department chair as mentor.

3.2.2 Communication and Structure
Mentors and mentees shall have ongoing communication about progress toward success in the RTP process. Mentors and mentees shall have ongoing communication about progress toward success in the RTP process.

3.2.3 Tenured faculty and mentoring
All faculty are encouraged to seek input from a broad range of knowledgeable colleagues throughout their careers. Tenured faculty members are encouraged but not required to participate in the mentoring process. If tenured faculty members elect to participate in the mentoring process, they shall work with the department chair to identify their mentoring needs and to identify a mutually agreed-upon mentor.

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS
The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.

5. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA
The University and College RTP Policies delineate the criteria for appointment and promotion. Candidates are encouraged to read both policies for these important criteria.

6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS
The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the University RTP Policy. In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall prepare the index of open period materials.

7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES
The University and CLA policies delineate the additional processes applicable to RTP.

8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY
Changes to any RTP policy at CSULB may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA-CBA. In general, changes to procedure do not require a vote by the faculty. The University RTP Policy stipulates (3.2) that all department RTP policies are subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the Dean, and the Provost. The tenured and probationary faculty of the department, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy and

344 evaluation criteria section of this policy.
345
346 Amendments may be proposed by the following: A direct faculty action via petition from twenty-five percent
347 (25%) of the tenured and probationary faculty to the chair of the department. Amendments shall be
348 discussed in a faculty meeting before a vote is taken. Once a vote by secret ballot has been taken on the
349 proposed amendments to the policy and the amendments are recommended by a majority of those who cast a
350 vote, then the revised document shall be sent to Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost for final approval.
351 Amendments shall become effective in the academic year after the amendments are approved.
352
353 Approved by RGRLL Faculty on February 14, 2025
354 Effective: Fall 2025
355