

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
EFFECTIVE FALL 2025

The Department of Speech-Language Pathology is committed to the education of research-based clinicians who will respond to the needs of individuals with communication, language and speech disorders while serving the community and their families. Accordingly, this policy outlines expectations for faculty in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology with a focus on excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The policy is intended to: (1) guide new faculty in their applications for reappointment, tenure, and promotion; (2) guide development of tenured faculty as research-based clinicians; (3) guide the Departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (RTP) in evaluating candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion; 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. These evaluative policies and procedures recognize the diversity of expertise within the department and incorporate a model that balances theory, evidence-based practice (EBP), and clinical expertise.

The Department of Speech-Language Pathology has integrated its disciplinary standards within the framework of the RTP policies of both the university and the college. As a result, the language used in the RTP policies of the university and the college that are critical for clarity and emphasis have been inserted throughout this policy. All University and CHHS RTP Policy insertions in this policy document are presented in italics to distinguish between the language of the university and college policies and the language that is unique to the Department of Speech-Language Pathology. 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 missions 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 Department of Speech-Language Pathology is committed to the pursuit of excellence in the academic and clinical preparation of students in speech-language pathology, in conducting research, and in the provision of services to the University and to the community-at-large.

The Department of Speech-Language Pathology strives to:

- 1) Provide effective and evidence-based instruction and clinical education in speech-language pathology,
- 2) Contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field through research and professional development, and
- 3) Serve the community by offering pro bono speech and language services.

The Department of Speech-Language Pathology aims to facilitate our students' knowledge development and skill acquisition for solving clinical problems, conducting comprehensive speech and language assessments, and implementing evidence-based interventions for a diverse client population in various clinical settings.

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

1.2.1 *SLP Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the SLP department, CHHS, university, community, and the profession. In concurrence with University RTP policy, the SLP 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.*

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 *SLP 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; academic unit and college needs; and university mission.*

1.2.5 *CSULB values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. This policy and all college and department 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 is intended to embody the college's commitment to amplifying diverse voices in our classrooms, research endeavors, and administrative decisions. The Department of Speech-Language Pathology believes in equal access and opportunity for all whether those barriers are related to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, or any other aspect of identity. The Department of Speech-Language Pathology is 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.

1.2.6 All SLP faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the department, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior. These standards are also articulated in the Academic Senate policy.

1.2.7 All SLP faculty members are expected to be familiar with university, college, and departmental RTP policies and procedures that must be followed for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

1.3 Governing Documents

1.3.1 The SLP Department adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24), CHHS RTP policy (24-25) and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university or CHHS RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

1.3.2 The standards adopted at the department 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.

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

1.4 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and SLP Department RTP policies. In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.5 Standards

Recommendations from the SLP RTP committee and the Department Chair (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 Speech-Language Pathology. 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.

1.5.1 Advancing High-Quality Instruction

SLP Faculty members are expected to engage in *continuous professional learning*, reflect on instructionally related activities, use a variety of effective evaluation methods, and foster learning inside and outside the traditional classroom.

1.5.2 Staying Current

Faculty members are expected to be current in their understanding and use of current research and clinical trends in the areas of speech and language pathology and related fields as appropriate for their particular areas of expertise.

1.5.3 Involvement in the Profession

SLP faculty members are expected to attend and participate in various national, international, state and local organizations in the profession

1.5.4 Engaging in scholarly Activities

SLP Faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly and creative activities that include the publication and presentation of research and/or other clinically-relevant materials that contribute to advancing knowledge in the field.

1.5.5. Meaning and impactful service contribution

All faculty members in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology are required to actively and consistently contribute to department, college and university operations depending on the rank.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by the SLP Department. Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank.

1.7 Narrative

In order to present the candidate's 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. *The narrative should be no more than 25 single-spaced, in 12-point font with one-inch margins.*

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As indicated in the University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24), *college, 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 both 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

Teaching undergraduate and graduate students in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology is one of the department's priorities. Effective teaching of both basic and applied information prepares undergraduate students for graduate school or professional practice. The instructional process prepares graduates to enter their chosen professions as well-trained clinicians who are capable of skilled assessment and treatment of communicative disorders across the life span and across linguistic and cultural boundaries represented in society. Instruction has as one of its major goals the teaching and demonstration of problem-solving strategies to the assessment and management of communicative disorders.

Instructional activities could include but are not limited to classroom instruction; chairing thesis committees; supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study, research, internships, honors, student teaching; and instructionally-related mentoring and advising students and other faculty. Curriculum and course development may also be instructional activities. Candidates must disclose and describe any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve

instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student differences.

Candidates in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology who are up for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion are **required to present a minimum of four types of documentation of teaching effectiveness:**

- 1) student evaluations,
- 2) course syllabi,
- 3) samples of tests and assignments, and grade distributions.
- 4) a statement regarding Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility (DEIA) with specific details on how the candidate supports DEIA in teaching and revises approaches as appropriate to better serve student needs. The statement may include issues of equity, social justice, disability rights, and/or other topics related to ethical practices in speech-language pathology.

All of these materials shall be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this document. Candidates are encouraged to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher. In addition to the four required items above, evidence of at least one of each of the areas below must be included for review:

A. Evidence of teaching excellence

- 1) content area knowledge and ongoing contribution of knowledge in one's discipline;
- 2) balance between objective and subjective requirements in evaluating student work;
- 3) continued evaluation and re-evaluation of teaching methods to foster critical-thinking clinicians who have both theoretical and practical knowledge and who are engaged in the professional expression of their views in both spoken and written form;
- 4) creation and/or revision of courses and curricula in ways that foster a passion for the field and that build a community of learners who have a shared commitment to excellence in service to their clients, families and the community;
- 5) thoughtful mentorship and advising that contribute to students' appreciation of individuals needs across disordered and culturally and linguistically different populations;
- 6) incorporation of one's scholarship and clinical expertise into teaching, including the effective supervision of student research and the incorporation of students into one's own scholarly research

B. Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher and Member of a Discipline

- 1) Active participation in the Department's curricular modification efforts;
- 2) Creation and/or evaluation of graduate students' comprehensive examination questions;
- 3) Mentoring students through active participation on committees that supervise graduate student theses and research and/or participation in ongoing continuing education which impacts instructor as a teacher, including, but not limited to, conferences, workshops, ongoing interactions with colleagues;
- 4) Ongoing professional development (PD) in the discipline is, perhaps, one of the most important indicators of effective teaching because it addresses the instructor's knowledge and skills as a professional. All candidates are expected to have ongoing PD, which will help assure that the instructor is current in discipline developments. A sustained record of participation in seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or professional organizations that relate to both content knowledge in the discipline and teaching methodology.
- 5) Participation in peer evaluation/classroom evaluation is recommended but not required. The evaluations are not restricted to department faculty so long as the review is formally documented and includes constructive, meaningful suggestions for improvement.
- 6) A sustained record of integrating new materials (e.g., clinical videos) and required readings that reflect the evolution of the discipline of speech-language pathology

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning that is explicitly addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials, including, but not limited to:

- A. Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey—in measurable, behavioral terms—expected student learning outcomes.
- B. Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices, standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students, such as ASHA, CAA, CFCC, and CCTC standards. For more information on syllabi, see current Senate policy.
- C. Careful preparation and clear organization and sequence of classes and pedagogical materials that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

- A. Required Documentation: Candidates must submit all copies of quantitative student evaluations, and may also submit qualitative student evaluations (if submitting qualitative evaluations, ALL qualitative responses must be included), in accordance with the following requirements:
- 1) In all years of review, candidates must submit all quantitative student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught.
 - 2) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are encouraged to submit copies of all student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, from **all** sections of all courses taught since their last promotion review.
- B. Additional Documentation: Faculty are encouraged to submit one high quality sample of a project they have supervised. The submission may include a completed directed study, comprehensive graduate project, thesis, and other mentoring and supervisory experience that is not evaluated formally by student response to instruction questionnaires.
- C. Evaluation by RTP Committee: *Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.*
- 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; when teaching under-enrolled courses which could easily result in skewed evaluations, when implementing new teaching approaches), overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages.*
 - 2) Student ratings of instruction are "consistently favorable" when both of following criteria are met:
 - a. the mean for students' responses to questions on standardized teaching evaluation forms are no lower than one standard deviation below the departmental mean; and
 - b. student evaluations submitted by candidates provide evidence of the following trends:
 - I. For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
 - II. 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.
 - III. 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.

- 3) *Caveat on the Use of Student Ratings: Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form--or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information--does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. For this reason, candidates must present other information, such as their syllabi, grade distributions, and, if possible, peer evaluations of instruction.* These additional materials, in addition to others mentioned in 2.1.3B, serve to help the Department of Speech-Language Pathology's RTP Committee contextualize student ratings

2.1.4 Syllabi

All course syllabi must comply with the requirements of the current Senate syllabus. All syllabi must indicate 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. Syllabi must be based on the most current standard course outline (SCO) and contain, among other additions:

- 1) the measurable learning goals and objectives of the course;
- 2) the ASHA Competencies fulfilled by the course;
- 3) detailed grading practices, standards, and criteria;
- 4) an outline and description of instructional methods that will be used in the course and how they relate to the course's content;
- 5) a listing of readings and recommended journals and websites that go beyond assigned textbooks;

2.1.5 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. Grade distributions assist in the evaluation of a candidate's teaching effectiveness. The RTP Committee should evaluate a candidate's grade distributions within the context of the candidate's interpretation of results, the level of education of students, and the particular nature of a class. Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions. Undergraduate grade distributions at both lower and upper levels of a students' progression through the Department of Speech-Language Pathology's program must be viewed within the context of the level of the course. Likewise, clinical practicum classes, which have a different format and structure from large classes and seminars,

must be viewed within the context of a field preparation framework. In summation, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor's teaching methodology, a class's structure and size, and its sequence within the overall curriculum. Course assessments should be varied to accurately evaluate student knowledge and acquisition of learning objectives. The final grade distribution should reflect an accurate portrayal of student learning. At times, the candidate may need to provide explanation of flat grade distribution and explain how teaching strategies and/or evaluation methods are being revised to better capture accurate student achievement.

2.1.6 Evaluation relative to context

The candidate's teaching effectiveness should be evaluated while considering the following factors:

- 1) Class characteristics: course level (graduate or undergraduate), course type (clinical course or academic course).
- 2) Candidate's teaching assignment: number of new course preparations during the evaluation period, total number of different course preparations, alignment of course with the candidate's area of expertise/training.
- 3) Candidate's effort in improving teaching effectiveness and keeping content up to date.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

All faculty are expected to engage in an ongoing program of research, scholarly, or creative activity (RSCA) that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in speech-language pathology over time. The department expects all faculty to produce scholarly and/or creative achievements which contribute to the advancement of the discipline of speech-language pathology and closely related professions such as special education, education, nursing, and psychology. The department strongly encourages candidates to formulate a sustainable research plan of scholarly studies to support ongoing and productive RSCA.

Research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) are a critical part of a candidate's contributions to the field and professional status among his/her peers. The Department of Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) believes that there are several ways that candidates can demonstrate their commitment to excellence in this area. RSCA is a significant aspect of a faculty member's professional role in the department and the field for several reasons including those mentioned here.

- 1) These activities contribute to the knowledge base in the field which has an impact upon both theoretical and practical frameworks.
- 2) RSCA that lead to new knowledge which finds its way into classrooms and clinics.
- 3) RSCA that bring prestige and visibility to the University and the Department. Publications and presentations increase 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.

- 4) RSCA that increase the likelihood that students will develop a research-based approach to the assessment and management of clients with communication disorders and will apply both art and science to their intervention choices.
- 5) RSCA that are viewed as a significant aspect of training programs in speech and language pathology by accreditation bodies such as the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

Within this framework of developing theoretically strong, clinically competent clinicians, faculty members in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology are expected to be engaged in an ongoing RSCA activities that contribute to their own and their students' intellectual growth and to the continued evolution of the field of speech and language pathology.

2.2.0 Ethical Concerns

Any ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative. Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest; monetary payment to secure publications; and duplicate publication:

- A. Conflict of interest: conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to serving on the editorial, advisory, or executive board of the press or journal with which one has published.
- B. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure publication shall be considered a priori an ethical concern regardless of selection process. This does not include ventures that require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., open access fees, charges for images)
- C. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprint must be labeled as such.

2.2.1 Variability within Speech-Language Pathology

- A. Variability in RSCA Activities: Speech and language pathology is a diverse and specialized field. Thus, any application of standards needs to respect individual differences in scholarly programs and goals.
- B. Variations Due to Service Roles: There may be some years when the level of scholarly activity may be slightly reduced due to a significant increase in service, such as serving as the department chair and/or graduate advisor. In such cases, a change or increase in responsibilities should be considered when evaluating RSCA.
- C. Interdisciplinarity in research: Collaborative research with health-related disciplines (e.g., nursing, nutrition) or education related disciplines (e.g., special education) are encouraged and valued.

2.2.2 Standards for the Production of Scholarly Research and Creative Activities

- A. Standards: Faculty members 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. Evidence of RSCA could include but is not limited to, research disseminated via professional peer-reviewed journals or conferences, publishing textbooks or textbook chapters, or submitting external grant proposals.
- B. Types of RSCA: All faculty members in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology are required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, theoretical, and/or other discipline-appropriate scholarly work consistent with the provisions of this Policy. This section only lists the type of RSCA. Evaluation of RSCA work is listed in 2.2D.
 - 1) Publications in SLP/AUD and closely related peer-reviewed journals is expected of all candidates at all levels of review. "Research" in Communication Sciences and Disorders involves scientific, clinical, social-interactional, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods that rely on or are derived from data and/or clinical experience and observation. A diverse range of publications in peer-reviewed journals would be evaluated by the department's RTP committee for their quality and for their overall contribution to knowledge in the field. For example, ASHA journals (e.g., AJA, JSLHR, AJSLP, LSHSS, ASHA Perspectives) directly target speech-language pathologists (SLPs) and audiologists. Publication in journals in other closely related disciplines should also be valued depending on the contribution of research findings in clinical implications and advance of professional knowledge.
 - 2) Conference presentations: A variety of presentations are considered during the review process, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. Peer-reviewed national conferences: presentations at the annual American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA) conference conferences are valued highly by the Department of Speech-Language Pathology. Other national conferences in other closely related disciplines or professional groups (e.g., National Black Association for Speech-Language and Hearing) should also be valued.
 - b. Peer-reviewed international conferences: presentations at specialty specific international conferences (e.g., AAC, stuttering, child language disorders, aphasia, hearing) should be valued.
 - c. Peer-reviewed regional conferences: presentations at the regional conferences such as annual California Speech Language Hearing Association (CSHA) conference are not valued equivalently to ASHA due to the less competitive nature of the submission and evaluation process.

- d. Invited presentations: invited presentations are not peer-reviewed. Even though invited presentations are not valued equivalently to other types of presentations listed above, they increase visibility of the department, college, and university. Invited presentations at national, international and regional conferences should be listed in a separate invited presentations category.

Please note that presenting to a class is considered a guest lecture, not a conference presentation. Similarly, presenting to a club or organization is considered an invited presentation, not a conference presentation (e.g., a presentation at a NSSLHA event qualifies as an invited presentation but not a conference presentation). Conference presentations in other closely related disciplines should also be valued depending on the contribution of research findings in clinical implications and advance of professional knowledge. There is no hierarchy in evaluating conference presentations. However, the following factors must be considered when assessing the value of a presentation:

- a. The type of presentation (e.g., 60-minute oral presentation, panel discussion, poster presentation)
 - b. The nature of the presentation (e.g., experimental study, literature review, anecdotal experience sharing)
 - c. Peer reviewed presentation vs. invited presentation
 - d. The format of the presentation (e.g., panel discussion on a non-researched topic, research-based presentation)
 - e. The innovation of the presentation (e.g., exploring different research topics in different presentations vs. presenting the same topic at different venues)
 - f. The presenters (e.g., presenting with students, solo presentation, panel discussion)
 - g. The relevance to the SLP/AUD profession (e.g., professional conferences vs. conferences in allied health or education)
- 3) Publication of authored textbooks in the field of speech language pathology is also valued. If more than one author wrote the textbook, the candidate must specify contributions in the candidate's narrative along with evidence.
 - 4) Edited textbooks and contributed chapters in texts are also a valued component of a candidate's RSCA. The overall role of the editor in the process must be clarified in the candidate's narrative along with evidence.
 - 5) Grant writing is a critical aspect of both research and training components in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology. Candidates are encouraged to submit grants to federal, state, local, and private agencies. Candidates should include the grant proposal and grant review report regardless of if the grant proposal is funded or not.
 - 6) Non-peer-reviewed articles: articles in ASHA Leader or CSHA magazine should also be included during the review even though the evaluation weight is lighter. Both the article content and magazine should be relevant to the SLP profession.

- 7) RSCA work in other languages in the field of SLP/AuD: authored translated chapters, textbooks, or textbooks published in other languages.
- C. The Department of Speech-Language Pathology expects all faculty to maintain productive research lines and demonstrate a record or evolving RSCA activities overtime through advancing original research work and collaborative work with professionals in other disciplines.
- 1) Expectations of RSCA across the levels of review Faculty in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology are expected to establish and maintain an ongoing commitment to research, scholarly, and creative activities. The department supports the continued productivity of scholarly activity throughout the various stages of a candidate's reappointment, tenure and promotion. Toward these ends, the following guidelines offer a roadmap for consideration:
- Peer-reviewed publications
 - a. In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to plan and operationalize an RSCA agenda. Faculty members are expected to submit manuscripts to have publications in the record during the review for reappointment.
 - b. Reappointment: By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have at least one peer-reviewed journal articles (or justified substitutions) either in print or formally accepted for publication.
 - c. Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor: Following initial reappointment, faculty are expected to demonstrate a consistent record of scholarly activity. By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have at least three peer-reviewed journal articles (or justified substitutions) either in print or formally accepted for publication.
 - d. Promotion to the rank of Professor: A sustained pattern of publications and presentations in the field of SLP/AuD is required since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the sustainability and productivity of the scholarly record. Candidates should also be able to demonstrate how their RSCA agenda is both continuing and evolving (e.g., new lines of research, new research topics). By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have at least four peer-reviewed journal articles (or justified substitutions) either in print or formally accepted for publication.
 - e. While all candidates are expected to publish peer-reviewed scholarly articles, candidates may substitute articles for equivalent peer-reviewed scholarly work. It is incumbent upon candidates to provide justification for these equivalencies in the form of evidence of peer-review. For the purposes of determining the threshold of scholarly work (justified substitutions), a peer-reviewed textbook is equivalent to two peer-reviewed journal articles,

while two peer-reviewed book chapters count as one peer-reviewed article. Serving as the Principal Investigator (PI) on a funded external grant is equivalent to one peer-reviewed article, while being a primary editor of an edited textbook count as one peer-reviewed article.

- f. The following activities are not considered equivalent to a peer-reviewed article: anecdotal stories or experience reports, peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed presentations, and subsequent editions of authored or edited textbooks, or book chapters with only minor changes.
 - g. Unaccepted publications may be included as evidence for attempts at publication. However, candidates are held to the minimum standards outlined above.
- Conference presentations
Conference presentations are not valued the same as publications. Even though there is no minimum number of presentations for each level of review, candidates should also have a record of presentation at national, international, or regional conferences. Candidates should also be able to demonstrate how their RSCA agenda is both continuing and evolving (e.g., new lines of research, new research topics) through presentations.
- 2) Student and/or Community Involvement — In keeping with the mission of the university and the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), the Department of Speech-Language Pathology values scholarly activities that involve students and/or that are connected to the department's service to the communities in which we work and live. The involvement and contribution of student and community partner should be clarified in the candidate's narrative. If the student or community partner is the lead author, the candidate must clearly specify the candidate's contribution. The RSCA section should be a record of the candidate's research related activities. Mentoring a student thesis should be included under "Teaching" not "RSCA."
 - 3) Internal research funding: All faculty are encouraged to seek internal research funds supported by CSULB. Internal research funds may be supported by ORED, CHHS RSCA award, and other [centers such as Ukleja Center for Ethical Leadership](#). Neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank. For the funded research project, deliverables (e.g., publications, presentations) along with the received funding/assigned time should be listed in the candidate's narrative and PDS.
 - 4) External research funding: 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. For the funded research project, deliverables (e.g., publications, presentations) along with the received funding/assigned time should be listed in the candidate's narrative and PDS. The candidate is encouraged to include the review result of the external grant proposal as a supplemental material regardless of if the proposal is funded or not to acknowledge the time and effort spent on developing the grant proposal.

D. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of RSCA

Within the narrative, the candidate should discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities are high quality, relevant, or impactful within the field of SLP. The narrative is not meant to be merely a list of activities. The candidate is encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation. The candidate is responsible for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.

- 1) Authorship: Sole-authored and first-authored works are evaluated highly. The Department of Speech-Language Pathology believes that co-authored works do not necessarily represent a "lower level" of excellence. For multiple-authored works, the candidate must present a clear contribution list indicating specific sections or percentage in a candidate's narrative. Supporting documents (e.g., letters from co-authors) must be included as supplemental material. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate should be the first author or sole author for at least two peer-reviewed publications. For promotion to full professor, the candidate should be the first author or sole author for at least three peer-reviewed publications.
- 2) Peer-reviewed/Refereed journal articles: Peer-reviewed/ Refereed journal articles are highly valued. Impact factors should not be considered when evaluating the quality of the peer-reviewed/ refereed journal article because the impact factors of SLP journals are relatively low.
- 3) Publications in journals in other related disciplines: The Department of Speech-Language Pathology strongly encourages faculty members to collaborate with other disciplines and produce collaborative RSCA work. Peer-reviewed/ Refereed journal articles are also valued. It is the candidate's responsibility to clarify the nature of the collaborative work, the impact on and contribution to the SLP profession and the candidate's individual contribution to the collaborative work.
- 4) Textbook, edited textbook, book chapter: The number of authors that contribute to the textbook and book chapter needs to be considered just like Peer-reviewed/ Refereed journal articles. The contribution of the candidate must be clarified in the narrative with appropriate and supporting evidence provided in the supplemental

material. The purpose and content of the textbook/chapter should also be evaluated as well as originality and novelty of the textbook. An updated version of the textbook/chapter should not be weighed the same as original work unless significant revision was completed as evident in the candidate's narrative and supplemental materials.

- 5) Non-peer reviewed RSCA publications: Non-peer reviewed publications can be listed but do not have an equal weight as Peer-reviewed/ Refereed journal articles.
- 6) Peer-reviewed conference presentations: Peer-reviewed presentations in SLP/AuD professional conventions or in other closely related disciplines are valued but not weighed the same as peer-reviewed/ refereed journal articles. Presentations cannot be used to replace publications. In addition, the purpose, targeted audience, and relevance to SLP profession (if presented in other closely related disciplines) should be considered during the evaluation.
- 7) Journal reviewer, journal editor, grant reviewer: The service to the professional community as a journal article reviewer, journal editor or grant reviewer should be listed under "Service" instead of RSCA. A list of articles reviewed or evidence indicating the candidate's appointment of journal editor or grant reviewed must be provided. Even though it is important to provide service to the professional community, the department encourages the candidate to carefully manage the time and energy spent on these services while actively developing the candidate's RSCA record. **Please refer to the Service section.**
- 8) RSCA work in preparation: The candidate can provide a list of RSCA work in preparation to give the reviewers an idea of the candidate's on-going research productivity. However, only published, in-print, accepted Peer-reviewed/ Refereed journal articles during the evaluation period will be considered. Any RSCA work outside the evaluation period will not be considered during the evaluation. In addition, documents submitted throughout the research project such as IRB approval letter should not be included as part of the candidate's RSCA work.

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.

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.

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. The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive:

- 1) 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.*
- 2) Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise.*
- 3) Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.*

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.

2.3.1 Expectation of Service Commitments

All faculty are encouraged to engage in ongoing, high-quality service that demonstrates significant contribution more frequently than ad-hoc service opportunities. The quantity, quality, and duration of service must be considered during evaluation. Evaluation criteria also consider the value and impact of each candidate's service activities. All faculty are expected to contribute to shared governance activities on campus.

Quality service means active participation and meaningful contribution (e.g., constructive feedback that goes beyond simple editing, drafting documents that require minimal revision, contribution that significantly facilitates progress) to the committee a candidate serves. Membership and attendance alone are not sufficient. Meaningful contribution and

quality work supported by tangible evidence and deliverables is expected at all levels of review. Documentation of the candidate's contributions to the committee output produced should be provided. Candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation and provide documentation of service roles and the time commitment given their various committee assignments within each committee. The candidate should provide information in their narratives with additional information regarding 1) service activities with objectives or actions, 2) contributions to the work accomplished as the member or chair, 3) compensation received (i.e., assigned time, stipend, or no compensation), and 4) the outcomes or impact of the work. All service activities listed in the narrative must be supported by evidence or supplemental materials.

The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience. All faculty in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology are expected to provide meaningful service and constructive contribution at the department level, regardless of the level of evaluation.

- A. By the reappointment review, candidates are expected to have meaningfully engaged in department service. Some college-level service is encouraged but not required.
- B. By the tenure and promotion review, candidates are expected to have engaged in meaningful departmental and college-level service along with some university service and/or professional or community service. Once the candidate receives reappointment, service should be expanded to college level while continually providing service at the department level. Taking a leadership role in workload-heavy department-level committees (e.g., curriculum committee) is highly valued. University-level service should be explored but not required. Some service to the professional community is expected by the time of this level of review.
- C. By the full professor review, candidates are expected to have demonstrated a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership in all levels of service across department, college, university, and profession/community. Chairing workload heavy department-level committees (e.g., RTP committee, curriculum committee, search committee) and college-level committees is highly valued. In addition, providing concrete and significant contributions that facilitate department/college/university operations, such as drafting policies, developing new templates, procedures, and programs across the levels of service, is highly valued. Taking a leadership role in professional communities such as American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA), Multicultural constituency groups (MCCGs), ASHA Special Interest Groups (SIG), and other SLP/AUD professional organizations should be recognized.

In addition to serving as Department Chair, Graduate Advisor or Undergraduate Mentor who regularly advises students, service provided to support underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students should be valued. The candidate's service in support of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, on campus and off campus,

as well as in support of racial and social justice, should also be valued. The candidate is encouraged to provide documentation of service and deliverables in narrative and supplemental materials. Cultural and identity taxation on minority faculty should be carefully considered. (per University RTP Policy 1.3 and College RTP Policy 2.3)

2.3.2 Types of Service Across Levels of Evaluation

It is important to consider the service load of each committee/task force by reviewing the frequency of committee meetings, nature of the committee work, work accomplished, and the candidate's contribution as the committee member. In serving as an alternate member of a committee the candidate must provide evidence showing contribution and participation during a specific period of time when filling in for an elected member. Any compensation, such as assigned time and stipends, must be reported.

A. Service to the Department

All faculty members must provide service to the department to support program implementation and improvement and participate in program governance. Department RTP policy recognizes that differential workloads may result in varied service expectations while considering types of service appropriate to faculty rank, experience and course load. However, activities that faculty generally contribute to, such as attending faculty meetings, reviewing graduate admissions applications, participating in graduate admissions interviews, and grading of comprehensive exams, can be listed but are not considered substantial department service activities.

The department RTP policy recognizes the value of a variety of service contributions to the department and includes the following activities as examples. Evaluation criteria should consider the value and impact of candidates' service activities.

- 1) Chairing the department, serving as the graduate advisor, undergraduate mentor, or clinic director
- 2) Advising student organizations or clubs (i.e., National Student Speech Language Hearing Association (NSSLHA).
- 3) Participating actively and substantially in departmental committees, especially by chairing a department committee (i.e., RTP/mini review committee (must be tenured faculty), curriculum committee, award and scholarship committee).
- 4) Engaging in activities to establish, maintain, and improve departmental operations, such as revision of policies, development of bylaws, handbooks, and other department guiding documents, serving as department liaison to promote interdisciplinary professional education (IPE), leading support groups in the on-campus clinic.

Advising student theses (i.e., master's thesis, honor thesis) should be included in the Teaching section.

B. Service to the College

Service to the CHHS may include, but is not limited to, serving on CHHS committees, engaging in activities to represent and support the CHHS mission and strategic initiatives, and supporting programs and their students in other departments within CHHS.

The department RTP policy recognizes the value of a variety of service contributions to the College and includes the following activities as examples. Evaluation criteria should consider the value and impact of candidates' service activities.

- 1) Serving on the CHHS committees, ad hoc committees, or task force, especially chairing a CHHS committee or task force.
- 2) Chairing the CHHS committees, serving a role in the CHHS leadership team as champion, co-director, or other leadership position.
- 3) Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to CHHS.

C. Service within the University

Service to the university may include, but is not limited to, serving on university-level committees and engaging in activities that promote the reputation of and support the CSULB university values and strategic priorities.

The department RTP policy recognizes the value of a variety of service contributions within the University and includes the following activities as examples. Evaluation criteria should consider the value and impact of candidates' service activities.

- 1) Serving on academic senate councils, committees, and subcommittees as an active alternate.
- 2) Serving on or playing a leading role in university-level groups such as presidential commissions, employee affinity groups (EAGs), etc.
- 3) Serving on ad hoc committees such as administrator review committees, and search committees.
- 4) Holding an elected position in or chairing university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces.
- 5) Playing a leading role in campus-wide initiatives.

D. Service to the Community and/or Profession

All faculty members are encouraged to provide quality service in the community and/or to the profession. Due to the small number of full-time faculty in the Department of Speech-Language Pathology, it is important for candidates to set their priorities in terms of the amount and time they contribute to community service. This service is highly valued but should not interfere with the faculty member's ability to honor their departmental

responsibilities, including teaching and completing other departmental assignments.

If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member such that they apply academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional, national, or international issues. Department RTP policy values the service to the community or profession that connect to candidate's academic expertise and professional goals.

The department RTP policy recognizes the value of a variety of service contributions to the Community and/or Profession and includes the following activities as examples. Evaluation criteria should consider the value and impact of candidates' service activities.

- 1) Taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or service organizations in a sustained effort.
- 2) Holding a leadership position in a professional organization such as the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA) or other state-affiliated organizations, the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CAPCSD), CA-CAPCSD, and the American Academy of Audiology (AAA).
- 3) Holding a leadership position in ASHA-affiliated organizations such as multicultural constituency groups (MCCGs) or other field related professional organizations.
- 4) Serving as a journal or textbook reviewer and/or editorial board member (must provide evidence of manuscript reviews, e.g., publication profile information)

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.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

Department standards must match or may exceed all college- level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.

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 Department RTP Committee

The department 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.

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 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee level of peer review.

3.3.2 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the Department of Speech-Language Pathology, then additional members from outside the Department of Speech-Language Pathology shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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.

3.3.3 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.

3.4 Department Chair

The department chair 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 college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring. 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.

Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a 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 a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The college RTP policy must specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with the university RTP policy. The college RTP policy must ensure consistency of standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the college.

The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the college.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee must take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. 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.

The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.

3.6.1 Duties

The college RTP committee shall conduct evaluations of all candidates' files and shall include a recommendation to the college Dean.

3.6.2 Membership

The college RTP committee shall consist of eight (8) tenured, full-time faculty members. A minimum of five (5) faculty members must hold the rank of Full Professor. Up to three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members may serve at the rank of Associate Professor. Only tenured Full Professors may vote on applications for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

3.6.3 Election, Service, Appointment, and Terms

- 1) Annually, each department shall be invited to nominate from its membership one professor and an associate professor to the dean of the College during their first/second department meeting. Members of the college committee shall be elected by secret ballot of the college faculty; There shall not be more than one member from any one academic unit; an exception may occur and a second member from the same department can be elected only after all academic units are represented from the eligibility pool;
- 2) Elected members shall serve staggered, two-year terms;
- 3) Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e., more than four consecutive years). After serving four consecutive years in any capacity (e.g., alternate), an individual is ineligible to serve the following year in any capacity.
- 4) A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee of peer review.
- 5) A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee (one-year term at a time) if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President. However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of whom, are FERP participants.

3.6.4 Vacancies

In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the college RTP committee, either a meeting of the college faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the office of the Dean of the college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).

3.6.5 Chair

A chair shall be elected from among the members of the college RTP committee.

3.6.6 Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files

- 1) The college RTP committee shall evaluate all candidates' files in accordance with standards established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university.
- 2) The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the academic unit's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.
- 3) The college committee shall prepare and forward an independent, written evaluation to the college Dean concerning each RTP candidate. The evaluation must conclude with a personnel action recommendation in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.

3.6.7 Recommendations

- 1) For all candidates seeking reappointment or tenure, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit as part of its evaluation of the candidate and recommend whether reappointment or tenure should be granted or denied.
- 2) (b) For all candidates seeking promotion, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit and make a positive or negative recommendation with respect to the proposed action.
- 3) The college RTP Committee shall forward to the Dean the entire candidate file, including its own evaluations and recommendations and those from the academic unit.
- 4) The college committee shall inform all candidates of the committee's recommendation in writing.

3.7 Dean of the College

The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, facilitates mechanisms for guiding/mentoring candidates in the RTP process, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees.

The provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9 President

The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the provost.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

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

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

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.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in exceptional cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways. The candidate's record must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

Furthermore, candidates must include documentation to demonstrate that they have exceeded requirements in all three areas.

In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

To receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Colleges and Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways.

Furthermore, candidates must include documentation to demonstrate they have exceeded requirements in all three areas. For promotion to Full Professor under the differential track model, departments must identify, for each track, what exemplifies exceeding requirements.

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion, but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

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

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 file 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 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur because of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs, and these changes should be communicated in a timely manner.

Effective: Fall 2025