CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
including the
REVISED RTP POLICY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE EDUCATION

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) establishes college-wide standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members within the college. Readers should still consult the university RTP policy (PS 23-24).

Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This policy should not be considered as a substitute, however, for those parts of the agreement that affect RTP matters.

> ***The RTP policy developed by the Department of Science Education provides additional clarifications necessary for establishing standards of excellence specific to the discipline of Science Education and the expectations of the Department. This document provides the departmental perspectives and specific expectations needed for candidates seeking reappointment, tenure and promotion. These additions have been embedded in the CNSM document and have been designated using bold italic typeface.***

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

1.1. College Mission and Vision

The College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics is a center of scientific learning in Long Beach offering excellent educational opportunities. Our student-centered instructional and research environment fosters equity, diversity, and access; mentors students for lifelong success by elevating character, skills, and mindset; creates scientific knowledge through research; and promotes science and mathematics in our community.

The College's vision is to educate the next diverse generation of scientists and mathematicians, as well as a science- literate citizenry, through inclusive teaching and research programs within the departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Earth Science, Mathematics and Statistics, Physics and Astronomy, Science Education, and the Environmental Science and Policy program.

1.2. Principles

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's mission. A college policy establishing standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing flexibility to recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual disciplines. This policy strives to balance clarity and flexibility by establishing roles and college-wide expectations and giving directions to department RTP policies. In particular, department policies must be consistent with this policy, meaning that department policies must

observe inclusions/exclusions and minima/maxima articulated in this policy, but they may match or exceed within the boundaries established by this policy. Departments must create specific guidelines for how faculty can fulfill the University's academic mission, while abiding by these principles.

1.2.1. CNSM 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) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three areas.

1.2.2. RTP reviews must be clear, fair, transparent, and unbiased at all levels. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.

1.2.3. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards consistent with the department and college RTP policies for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of quality performance over the period of review. Reappointment decisions are based on evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing a record of evidence that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.

1.3. Values

The criteria according to which decisions regarding RTP are made are among the clearest expressions of the university community's values. The criteria in this policy are based on, and department RTP policies should embody, the following values:

1.3.1. CNSM values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. This policy and all department RTP policies should reflect these values.

CNSM recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all department RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

1.3.2. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive, inclusive, collegial environment benefiting the CSULB community. This policy should be interpreted as valuing these actions. All department RTP policies should implement mechanisms to recognize these contributions, and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.

1.3.3. Shared governance is vital to CSULB's mission. Good academic citizenship requires all faculty, especially those with tenure, to contribute to shared governance at more than one level. This policy and all department RTP policies should acknowledge and reward service in shared governance.

1.3.4. All faculty must contribute to CSULB's mission in all three areas: instruction, RSCA, and service. However, since faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting CSULB's mission, this policy should be construed as allowing for adjustments in the weights assigned to instruction, RSCA, and service based upon faculty strengths as well as department, college, and university needs.

> *1.3.5. The Department of Science Education acknowledges the increased demands that accompany identities that are minoritized in higher education faculty, often described as cultural or identity taxation. Ongoing reflection on this phenomenon is important for an equitable and thriving workspace.*

2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of excellence in 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards.

Candidates for tenure and promotion recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent, competent, and deficient in each area of evaluation for tenure and promotion. While written feedback during the reappointment review at the college level is required, the use of the specific terms excellent, competent, or deficient is discouraged.

A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of research, scholarly and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

The classification of candidate activities in the three areas of evaluation should follow the descriptions below. In certain circumstances, a set of candidate activities may be reasonably described as falling within more than one category, across multiple categories, or otherwise not clearly falling into just one category. In such cases, the activities should be placed into a single category of the candidate's choice. This is to avoid the appearance of attempting to receive more credit than a single activity would typically allow (i.e., "double-dipping"), and the candidate should provide justification for the category the activity is placed in. RTP committees should provide flexibility for candidates to make reasonable decisions about the classification of their activities insofar as they do not obviously contradict the classifications described below.

> *In Science Education, service, instruction and scholarship are frequently intertwined, especially those activities that reach beyond the university and into local educational institutions. The candidate may 'designate' these intertwined activities in the section that they feel is most appropriate; they should provide guidance for the reviewers regarding their discussion of these multidimensional activities and must make sure that these efforts are not double counted.*

> *The Department of Science Education acknowledges the increased demands that accompany identities that are minoritized in higher education faculty, often described as cultural or identity taxation. The Department expects that all faculty members reflect on issues of*

cultural or identity taxation. The department suggests that faculty address cultural and identity taxation in their narrative.

2.1   Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers of our diverse student body at CSULB and provide evidence of this effectiveness in their files. Instruction is defined by the university as any action designed to engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to their success, regardless of whether it is part of formal coursework.

Instruction and instructionally related activities therefore include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom (classroom, laboratory, and field) and can include, but are not limited to, activities such as: curriculum and course development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student research projects and fieldwork, chairing thesis committees, student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

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

In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation regarding instruction or instructionally related activities should describe how their instructional activities were influenced by this.

The candidate's narrative should include sufficient information to allow the RTP Committee to appropriately assess the four main aspects of instruction described in the remainder of this section and facilitate the evaluation of activities described in section 2.2.

Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB compensation for any of the instructional activities described in their narratives. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward instructional activities.

2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and describe ways in which they assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning. This may include the adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent with course/curriculum goals, clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and goals, and should be designed to be student-centered.

2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and methods

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

The scholarly content of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses taught in the discipline. Course materials and teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be of value in facilitating learning. If the course serves as a prerequisite

for later courses, it should be well-aligned with the expected academic background for those courses. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the learning goals for the course, and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline.

Course policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to students. The results of grading practices (i.e., GPAs and DFW rates) should be reasonable.

If the candidate teaches courses which have high DFW rates (>20%), it is recommended that they address these rates and describe their efforts to reduce these rates in their narrative. A variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., nature of course material, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence DFW rates and the RTP Committee should consider these rates in that light.

The most recent syllabus from each different course taught during the period under review must be included.

Additional teaching materials (e.g., additional syllabi showing evidence of course changes, samples of student work with instructor feedback, example assignments, etc.), or other materials (e.g., a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, etc.) may also be provided to add context or serve as examples discussed in the narrative document.

2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher

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

There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in both maintaining the currency of the material in their courses, and in enhancing their teaching approaches used in the classroom or during other instructionally related activities.

The candidate should demonstrate thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant evidence. This may include activities such as: classroom visitations, consultations on course improvement, involvement in pedagogical professional development programs, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness. Ideally, the narrative will include multiple examples of how participation in such activities led to specific changes in instruction.

2.1.1.3. Effective Teaching

Faculty members in the Department of Science Education are expected to be effective teachers and advisors. Effective teaching is characterized by developing appropriate student learning outcomes, engaging students with appropriate and varied pedagogies, using a variety of assessment techniques, critically analyzing one's teaching, and reflecting on one's practice and constructive feedback.

Candidates are expected to remain current in their science content knowledge as well as student-centered pedagogies consistent with current education research. They also strive to continually improve their instructional effectiveness, embedding opportunities to reflect on

---

teaching and their own identity as practitioners as part of their practice. Candidates also participate in professional learning activities to support their ongoing growth as teachers.

2.1.2. Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) scores

Course SPOT summary pages must be included for all courses evaluated during the period under review, but SPOT data for independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department seminar/colloquium courses should not be included.

Candidates are expected to address aspects of their SPOT score summaries in their narrative, especially with regard to changes over time or differences between courses. Candidates should describe actions taken to improve student perceptions. Importantly, these evaluations alone do not provide complete or sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

It has been established that a variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence SPOT scores and the RTP Committee should consider these scores in that light. Nevertheless, some attention to SPOT score evaluations should be present in the candidate's narrative.

Note: in this document, "SPOT scores" refers to the values from the official teaching evaluation mechanism used by students. If this mechanism changes name in the future, the use of "SPOT" is intended to encompass those new evaluations as well (i.e., without requiring formal amendment of this document).

2.1.2.1. Additional guidance regarding evaluation of teaching

The department of Science Education recognizes the potential shortcomings of 'values from the official teaching evaluation mechanism', in whatever iteration used. Any one measure can fail to capture instructional effectiveness. We recognize, as mentioned in 2.1.2, that contextual issues may influence scores and student feedback. As such, we encourage candidates to provide the context necessary for appropriate interpretation of the different measures of teaching effectiveness, including, but not limited to, SPOT data (both quantitative and qualitative). We also suggest that they consider pursuing additional opportunities for capturing students' voice and incorporating other evaluation approaches into their practice to support student success and teacher growth.

2.2.   Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be based on a careful reading of the candidate's narrative, evaluation of appropriate materials in the candidate's RTP file, peer observations of teaching, and on student course evaluation forms for all courses evaluated since the last promotion or since appointment. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be based on the quality of teaching performance across all courses assigned to the candidate, with particular attention paid to progress and improvement.

Science Education candidates should provide evidence of instructional effectiveness, student learning, and efforts to improve instruction. Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are described through the narrative, with supporting documentation.

Candidates should discuss instructional improvements they have made, as well as the rationale leading to those changes. Supporting documentation also provides evidence of the changes. Modifications to instruction made as a result of feedback from prior reviews are expected; such changes should be addressed in the narrative. Candidates are advised to refer to section 2.2.9 to determine which instructionally related artifacts must be included in the file.

2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for appropriate discussion of the four main parts of section 2.1 of this document: (i) instructional philosophy and practice, (ii) pedagogical approach and methods, (iii) ongoing professional development as a teacher, and (iv) student perception of teaching (SPOT) scores.

2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly content of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses taught by tenured/probationary faculty members. Typically, this involves the use of average GPAs or DFW rates, but recognition should be made that some aspects of courses outside of the instructor's control may influence these. Such factors may include, but are not limited to, the difficulty or desirability of the material (e.g., pre-requisites for other majors), class meeting times (e.g., early mornings or Fridays), class size (e.g., large lecture vs small discussion), or semester (e.g., spring GPAs are lower campus-wide than fall GPAs).

2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness, including a critical analysis of all student input included in the file or submitted during the open period. This analysis must include the candidate's student course evaluation data. Following university policy however, student course evaluation data should not be used as the primary component of the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating the learning process. When appropriate, choices of materials that recognize the diverse nature of our student body and their lived experiences should be valued.

2.2.5. As part of the review process, class visits shall be made by at least two members of the department RTP committee and to multiple class meetings. Ideally, these class visits will be conducted during the semester in which the review takes place. If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made subsequent to the last RTP action during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be used. At least two observations must be performed during the review period, however a maximum of two observations from prior years may be used. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in advance if this situation is likely to arise.

 2.2.5.1. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, there will be a minimum of four reviews of class visits. The expectation is that these four reviews would be as follows, one from the review two years previous to the semester of review, one from the previous year, and two (to multiple classes) from the semester of review, each conducted by the RTP committee of the corresponding year. The candidate may opt out of having reviews from the either (or both) of the two previous years, in which case the RTP committee will conduct sufficient visits during the semester of review to bring the total to four visits.

If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be

used. At least two observations must be performed during the review period, however a maximum of two observations from prior years may be used. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in advance if this situation is likely to arise.

2.2.5.2.   For promotion to Professor, as part of the review process, class visits shall be made by at least two members of the department RTP committee and to multiple class meetings. Ideally, these class visits will be conducted during the semester in which the review takes place. If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made subsequent to the last RTP action during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be used. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in advance if this situation is likely to arise.

2.2.5.3.   For peer visits, the candidate should be informed that the visits normally occur during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of a possible visit at least five days prior to the start of the classroom visit period, which will normally occur over a two-to-three-week period. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. Class visits should include the entire scheduled time period. Exceptions may be made with written approval of the dean and the candidate.

The candidate may submit course syllabi, provide Canvas access, or otherwise notify the RTP committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee to choose the most appropriate days for visits. Candidates are encouraged to arrange meetings with the members of the RTP Committee who will visit their class to discuss their course design in order to place the material and activities intended for the reviewed class meetings into context.

The committee members' evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should address factors such as instructional clarity, communication with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and electronic media or demonstrations. If the candidate provides syllabi or other course materials, these should be reviewed to provide context for classroom activities. Reports based on class visits must be included in the candidate's RTP file and shared with the candidate. The signed reports must include times and dates of the visits.

Departments are encouraged to develop rubrics and standardized forms to facilitate consistency and utility of evaluations.

2.2.5.4. Faculty in the Science Education Department will be observed as part of the instructional/instructionally related activities assessments. Such evaluation should incorporate an open-ended standardized observation protocol, approved regularly by the department prior to the observation period. All observations should include a pre-observation communication to clarify the student learning goals, the context of the classroom activities, and the observation criteria. The observation should also be followed by a post-observation communication, when possible, in which the candidate and evaluator can reflect on the observation criteria and the observed instruction. Reviewers are expected to consider each observation within the context of the instructional goals of that class session and the context of the instruction both before and after the observation.

2.2.6.   If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the candidate in supervisory courses. The narrative should describe the candidate's mentoring philosophy, goals, and procedures they use to facilitate student success. The candidate is encouraged to provide evidence in the narrative of student success outcomes arising from mentored students. Outcomes

such as acceptances into graduate and professional programs are appropriately described in this section whereas outcomes such as student conference presentations or publications are appropriately described in the RSCA section.

2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student academic advising, they should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this effort and should address in their narrative the effectiveness of this advising in meeting student needs.

2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities: The college recognizes that there are a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category:

> (a). Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching.
>
> (b). Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides.
>
> (c). Substantial participation in the supervision and mentoring of student researchers, thesis research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation of such research.
>
> (d). Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories.
>
> (e). Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the candidate's assigned workload, and academic mentoring of students.
>
> (f). Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students.
>
> (g). Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-based materials.
>
> (h). Participating in pedagogy, education, or cultural awareness professional development activities designed to improve instruction.
>
> (i). Attending, developing, and/or offering workshops, colloquia, and other forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.

2.2.9. All candidates must include the following in their RTP files:

> (a). Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated during the period under evaluation.
>
> (b). The most recent syllabus from each different course taught during the period under evaluation.
>
> (c). Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and homework sets.

2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional relevant items for inclusion.

2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline

Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate.

2.2.12 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to <u>Associate Professor</u> in Science Education

In the department of Science Education, we evaluate teaching effectiveness using a diverse array of artifacts. We emphasize that, in accordance with University policy, student course evaluation data should not be used as the primary component of the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

i. <u>Rating of Competent.</u> In addition to providing and reflecting on the artifacts listed in the CNSM policy 2.2.9 above, the candidate must demonstrate reflective practices to improve instruction and student learning in more than one course, including instructional choices and changes to instruction based on:

- ***professional knowledge of effective instruction,***
- ***student feedback (including but not limited to SPOT feedback), and***
- ***students' funds of knowledge (Candidates should show that they surface and leverage student voice and experiences within their instructional practice. This might include incorporating instructional activities that bring in students' communities, families, or histories into course design,) and***
- ***participation as a learner in one (on average) instructionally related professional development activity per year, with evidence of how that experience impacts their own instruction.***

ii. <u>Rating of Excellent.</u> For a rating of excellent, the candidate must satisfy all requirements for a rating of competent and show involvement in instructionally related activities (as defined in the CNSM policy as delineated in section 2.2.8) beyond their own classroom instruction including, but not limited to, professional learning activities with local educators, supporting curriculum design or implementation for a CSULB science course, leading a workshop at a practitioner-focused conference, or collaborating with other CSULB faculty for instructional improvement.

***iii. <u>Rating of Deficient.</u> For a rating of deficient, the candidate fails to demonstrate reflective practices to improve instruction and student learning in more than one course
or meet criteria for rating of Competent, as outlined in section 2.2.12.i***

2.2.13 Criteria for Promotion to <u>Full Professor</u> in Science Education

In the department of Science Education, we evaluate teaching effectiveness using a diverse array of artifacts. We emphasize that, in accordance with University policy, student course evaluation data should not be used as the primary component of the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

i. <u>Rating of Competent.</u> In addition to providing and reflecting on the artifacts listed in the CNSM policy 2.2.9 above, the candidate must:

The candidate must demonstrate sustained reflective practices to improve instruction and student learning in more than one course, including instructional choices and changes to instruction based on:

- *professional knowledge (in both science content and effective instruction),*
- *ongoing efforts to stay current in research-based best-practices),*
- *student feedback (including but not limited to SPOT feedback),*
- *students' funds of knowledge (Candidates should show that they surface and leverage student voice and experiences within their instructional practice. This might include incorporating instructional activities that bring in students' communities, families, or histories into course design), and*
- *participation as a learner in at least one instructionally related professional development activity per year, with evidence of how that experience impacts their own instruction.*

ii. <u>Rating of Excellent.</u> For a rating of excellent, the candidate must satisfy all requirements for a rating of competent and show substantial and sustained involvement in instructionally related activities (as defined in the CNSM policy as delineated in section 2.2.8) beyond their own classroom instruction including, but not limited to: professional learning activities with local educators; collaboration with faculty on curriculum design, improvement or implementation of a CSULB course; or leading a workshop at a practitioner-focused conference.

iii. <u>Rating of Deficient.</u> For a rating of deficient, the candidate fails to demonstrate reflective practices to improve instruction and student learning in more than one course or meet criteria for rating of Competent, as outlined in section 2.2.13.i

2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA

CNSM Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers and produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies.

CNSM recognizes and appreciates the diversity of methods, epistemologies, and perspectives represented within the college and endorses an inclusive definition of scholarship aligned with the university's policy which recognizes scholarship as a continuum of diverse forms of knowledge and knowledge-making practices that can be pursued in a multitude of ways. CNSM values the direct involvement of students in these scholarly activities through research mentoring and advising activities, including those that directly impact underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students in science and mathematics.

In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe how their RSCA activities were influenced by this.

Because academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA, the CNSM RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees engaged in evaluating scholarly work. Departments must develop their own discipline specific definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA, including examples of specific accomplishments. These definitions, standards, and criteria should value scholarly contributions which create, apply, or

expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, and/or international communities. Department standards may be higher than college-level standards. The department RTP policy shall list non-exhaustive examples of specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies.

Candidates for tenure must develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed publications in which the candidate is identified as a senior investigator, consistent with the co-authorship practices of each discipline. Thus, a candidate's research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged, and departments must define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement.

The candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the candidate's scholarly activity, and this narrative must identify the candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects, and the involvement of students. Within their narratives candidates should also discuss (and committees should consider) their scholarly vision or program--the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work and aims or expected outcomes of their work. They should discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities are high quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. The narrative is not meant to be merely a list of activities and candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment. Candidates should discuss their plans for sustained RSCA. Candidates are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their fields.

In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. In addition, candidates must disclose any scholarly or creative activities for which they received reassigned time, grant buyouts, or additional compensation. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward RSCA activities.

2.3.1.1. Science Education as a field is interdisciplinary, with collaborations across departments, colleges, campuses, educational levels, and venues. The discipline of Science Education values collaboration and recognizes that it takes time to build collaborative endeavors. Collaborative endeavors often result in end-products that are of higher quality and value than products developed individually. Candidates must clearly describe their roles in collaborative endeavors and their contributions to RSCA products.

The discipline of Science Education emphasizes the importance of the scholarship of engagement, including but not limited to partnerships with schools, districts, informal education organizations, and other community groups. We acknowledge the importance of the scholarship that emerges as a property of these partnerships (i.e., the partnership itself) that may not result in a peer-reviewed publication and that these partnerships require a significant investment to develop. Candidates engaging in this form of scholarship are encouraged to clearly explain this scholarship of engagement, evidence for its quality, and its impacts on community.

Another unique and important aspect of Science Education is the importance of creating RSCA products for a practitioner audience, including teachers and informal, out-of-classroom educators. These practitioners are often the means for bringing our ideas and innovations to children and families in classrooms and other learning environments. Candidates must describe their efforts at reaching this audience in meaningful ways.

2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA

2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA element to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to evaluators in understanding the candidate's intellectual and professional achievements in this category, the nature of student involvement in the candidate's RSCA, the candidate's plans for continuing RSCA into the future, and how the candidate places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the department, college, and university RTP policies.

2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted, examples of the candidate's best work, along with an explanation of why these materials should be regarded as significant contributions. Evaluation criteria at the departmental level should recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and values of the College, including the importance of involving students in RSCA. For jointly authored activities, departmental RTP policies must specify how the candidate should identify the specific extent of their participation.

2.3.2.3. The College follows the University RTP policy which lists the following forms of RSCA, with examples. The College policy acknowledges that different disciplines weight types of contributions differently. Departmental policies may further specify other forms of RSCA.

In all cases, the CNSM policy highlights the importance of activities that include successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship of publications and student presentations at scientific meetings. Candidates may list mentorship of research students as an accomplishment in their narratives.

The University RTP policy states:

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

> Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities.

> - Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.

> Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge.

> - Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta- analyses.

Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact.

- Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA.
- The College also includes collaborations with private industry or government agencies, as well as patents and technology transfer stemming from RSCA.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study.

- Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.

2.3.2.4. Grant and Funding Applications: Applications for internal and external funding may be used as evidence of RSCA by the candidate. These may include applications for research support, education grants, infrastructure grants (e.g. NSF MRI), or grants to support students.

2.3.2.5. Guidelines for departmental criteria: The department RTP policy shall list non-exhaustive examples of specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies. Departments and colleges should not limit candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments.

Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. 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 and demonstrate ongoing progress.

> **2.3.2.6. The Department of Science Education recognizes the University and College requirements of RSCA evaluation, as described in sections 2.3.2.1 through 2.3.2.5. Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills. Specific criteria regarding RSCA quality and authorship are described in greater detail in section 2.3.3.**

> **2.3.3. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor in Science Education**
>
> **The Department of Science Education expects candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor to create a sustained record of research and scholarly work. Candidates shall show, within their body of scholarly work, evidence of effective engagement with the research community as well as practitioner audiences.**

Examples of RSCA products are delineated in the CNSM RTP Policy in section 2.3.2. In Science Education, we recognize the importance of the scholarship of engagement, including but not limited to development of partnerships with community members beyond the university; scholarship of application, including but not limited to curricular or professional development materials used beyond the typical instructional responsibilities of the university setting; and scholarship of teaching and learning, including but not limited to the professional development and support of faculty at the university level. Candidates bear primary responsibility for explaining the significance of activities in this category, as well as the quality of these activities (especially in cases where materials are not 'peer reviewed' in the same manner as journal publications.) Candidates should include drafts of work under review as well as other products in progress that are discussed in the narrative. The Science Education RTP Committee will use their expertise along with candidate explanations to determine the quality of the RSCA work, including reputation of publication journals and other outlets.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate and articulate a record of sustained and ongoing productivity over the review period. The quality of the candidates' performance and their record of productivity are the primary criteria for evaluation.

i. Rating of Competent. To earn a rating of competent, candidates shall have a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications. One must be a research publication (or equivalent—refer to section 2.3.2.3.) representing significant intellectual work conducted as a member of the faculty at CSULB with the candidate identified as the first author. In the case that the candidate is not identified as the first author, but their participation was equivalent to that of a first author, the candidate must document equivalent contributions via letters from collaborators detailing their contributions.

The other peer-reviewed publication (or equivalent—refer to section 2.3.2.3.) must be a practitioner-oriented article written during the review period. In the case that the candidate is not identified as the first author, but their participation was equivalent to that of a first author, the candidate must document equivalent contributions.

To be considered for review, articles must be in print or in press prior to the deadline for the submission of the file to the department RTP committee, although late publications may be considered (with justification) if published before final university review (per University RTP 7.3) Regardless, articles still in review at the time of submission should still be mentioned in the RTP document.

Additionally, faculty members are expected to engage in at least four peer-reviewed presentations (or equivalent) during the review period. At least one presentation must be intended for a researcher audience and at least one must be developed for a practitioner audience. The presentations must be completed before submission of the file to the department RTP committee. Candidates who experience cultural taxation can provide evidence of such labor in place of one of the required RSCA peer-reviewed presentations required for the rating of competent. See Table 2.3.3.1. for clarification.

ii. Rating of Excellent. To earn a rating of excellent, in addition to meeting the requirements for a rating of competent, candidates must have at least five additional RSCA products during the review period (see sections 2.3.2. and 2.3.3. for examples of RSCA products.) Two of the

additional peer-reviewed RSCA products must be peer-reviewed publications (or equivalent, per CNSM RTP 2.3.2.3.)

To meet these criteria, articles must be <u>in print</u> or <u>in press</u> prior to the deadline for the submission of the file to the department RTP committee, although late publications may be considered (with justification) if published before final university review (per University RTP 7.3) Regardless, articles still <u>in review</u> at the time of submission should still be mentioned in the RTP document.

<u>iii. Rating of Deficient.</u> Candidate fails to meet criteria for rating of Competent, as outlined in section 2.3.3.i. and Table 2.3.3.1.)

Candidates who experience cultural taxation can provide evidence of this labor in place of one of required RSCA products that count toward the excellent rating. However, the candidate's RSCA products must include the remaining four peer-reviewed publications to achieve a rating of excellent. See Table 2.3.3.1 for clarification.

Taken as a whole, RSCA products for tenure and promotion to associate professor must demonstrate a continued pattern of scholarship. The candidate should articulate this pattern of products and how they anticipate it being sustained in their future work.

2.3.3.1 RSCA Products for Promotion to Associate Professor in Science Education

	Competent	Excellent
Peer-Reviewed Publications (or equivalent)	Two (2) Total: • 1 first-author researcher publication • 1 practitioner publication	Includes all requirements for the rating of competent, plus: • 2 additional publications (any audience)
Presentations (or equivalent)	Four (4) Total: • 1 researcher presentation • 1 practitioner presentation • 1 researcher or practitioner presentation • 1 researcher or practitioner presentation OR provide evidence of cultural taxation (as recommended within this Department RTP document)	Includes all requirements for the rating of competent, plus: • 3 additional RSCA products (any audience)
Other RSCA Products	May be included but are not required for a rating of competent.	
Total	6 RSCA Products	11 RSCA Products

2.3.4 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor in Science Education

Candidates for promotion to professor must show continued productivity following the awarding of tenure. The quality of the candidates' performance and their record of productivity are the primary criteria for evaluation. The Department expects candidates for promotion to full professor to maintain an ongoing record of research and scholarly work throughout the period of review. Candidates shall show, within their body of scholarly work, evidence of effective engagement with the research community as well as practitioner audiences. Examples of RSCA products are delineated in the CNSM RTP Policy in section 2.3.2. as well as the Science Education RTP policy, section 2.3.3.

i. <u>Rating of Competent.</u> To earn a rating of competent, candidates shall have a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications. One must be a research publication (or equivalent—refer to section 2.3.2.3.) representing significant intellectual work conducted as a member of the faculty at CSULB with the candidate identified as the first author. In the case that the candidate is not identified as the first author, but their participation was equivalent to that of a first author, the candidate must document equivalent contributions via letters from collaborators detailing their contributions.

The other peer-reviewed publication (or equivalent—refer to section 2.3.2.3.) must be a practitioner-oriented article written during the review period. In the case that the candidate is not identified as the first author, but their participation was equivalent to that of a first author, the candidate must document equivalent contributions.

To be considered for review, articles must be <u>in print</u> or <u>in press</u> prior to the deadline for the submission of the file to the department RTP committee, although late publications may be considered (with justification) if published before final university review (per University RTP 7.3) Regardless, articles still <u>in review</u> at the time of submission should still be mentioned in the RTP document.

Additionally, Science Education faculty members are expected to engage in at least five peer-reviewed presentations (or equivalent) during the review period. At least one presentation must be intended for a researcher audience and at least one must be developed for a practitioner audience. The presentations must be completed before submission of the file to the department RTP committee. At least one RSCA product should be coauthored with one or more current or former CSULB students.

Science Education candidates who experience cultural taxation can provide evidence of such labor in place of one of the required RSCA peer-reviewed presentations required for the rating of competent. See Table 2.3.4.1 for clarification.

ii. <u>Rating of Excellent.</u> To earn a rating of excellent, in addition to meeting the requirements for a rating of competent, Science Education candidates must have <u>at least five additional</u> RSCA products during the review period (see sections 2.3.2. and 2.3.3. for examples of RSCA products.) <u>Two of the additional peer-reviewed RSCA products must be peer-reviewed publications (or equivalent, per CNSM RTP 2.3.2.3.)</u>

To meet these criteria, articles must be <u>in print</u> or <u>in press</u> prior to the deadline for the submission of the file to the department RTP committee, although late publications may be considered (with justification) if published before final university review (per University RTP 7.3) Regardless, articles still <u>in review</u> at the time of submission should still be mentioned in the RTP document.

At least <u>two</u> RSCA products should be coauthored with one or more current or former CSULB students.

iii. Rating of Deficient. Candidate fails to meet criteria for rating of Competent, as outlined in section 2.3.4.i. and Table 2.3.4.1.)

Science Education candidates who experience cultural taxation can provide evidence of this labor in place of one of required RSCA product that counts toward the excellent rating. However, the candidate's RSCA products must include the four peer-reviewed publications to achieve a rating of excellent. See Table 2.3.4.1 for clarification.

Taken as a whole, RSCA products for promotion to full professor in the Department of Science Education must demonstrate a continued pattern of scholarship. The candidate should articulate this pattern of products and how they anticipate it being sustained in their future work.

2.3.4.1 RSCA Products for Promotion to Professor in Science Education

	Competent	Excellent
Student Co-Authors	At least one RSCA product from the categories below must be co-authored by a current or former CSULB student.	At least two RSCA products from the categories below must be co-authored by a current or former CSULB student.
Peer-Reviewed Publications (or equivalent)	2 Total: • 1 first-author researcher publication • 1 practitioner publication	Includes all requirements for the rating of competent, plus: • 2 additional publications (any audience)
Presentations (or equivalent)	5 total: • 1 researcher presentation • 1 practitioner presentation • 2 researcher or practitioner presentations • 1 researcher or practitioner presentation OR provide evidence of cultural taxation	Includes all requirements for the rating of competent, plus: • 3 additional RSCA products (any audience)
Other	May be included but are not required for a rating of competent.	
Total	7 RSCA Products	12 RSCA Products

2.4. Service

Academic service plays a vital role in the functioning of the university and should not be minimized or considered less important than teaching and RSCA by both candidates and evaluators.

Academic service consists of activities (other than teaching and RSCA) that strengthen shared governance processes and contribute to the mission of the university, benefiting students, faculty, department, college, university, discipline/profession and/or community. Faculty members are expected to maintain active engagement in service throughout their careers. Note that 3 WTU of our 15 WTU load is designated for service.

Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB compensation for any of the service activities described in their narratives. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward service activities.

2.4.1. Service Expectations

The college acknowledges that departments may have varying expectations regarding service. However, following reappointment, candidates are expected to broaden their involvement beyond their department, and candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect of service.

The candidate's narrative should address the scope and purpose, extent and level of their participation, the outcomes, and the contributions of the service activities to the missions of the university, the college, or the department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise, as applicable.

The college acknowledges that some academic service activities may not be covered under traditional committee-based roles. We also recognize that the service activities undertaken to support diversity initiatives are often provided by marginalized or minoritized faculty as a direct result of their identities (i.e., cultural/identity taxation). This policy defines cultural/identity taxation as the suggested or unstated expectation that faculty from marginalized or minoritized backgrounds or identities should provide representation on committees or service activities related to the groups and communities to which they belong. Marginalized or minoritized backgrounds or identities include, but are not limited to ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, gender, ability, etc.

Candidates are encouraged to include these contributions in their narrative where appropriate, emphasizing how they support our diverse student population, including underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students. Department and College RTP committees should recognize and take such activities into account as part of the service workload and acknowledge the difficulty in documenting this kind of service.

2.4.1.2. Service in Science Education

Faculty are expected to participate actively in department level governance and responsibilities, which include student thesis or project committees, faculty meetings, graduation activities, department seminars and workshops, and coordinating courses and policies within our department.

As a small department with limited staff and infrastructure, departmental level service in Science Education is critical as it is necessary for faculty to take on duties that might normally be handled by staff members and/or spread across a larger number of faculty members. Science Education faculty may be needed to complete departmental tasks that involve instructional and classroom support for all faculty and lecturers, including but not limited to lab coordination and safety supervision, including equipment repair/servicing, instructional materials management, and implementation of diversity initiatives. Such activities, while contributing to the success of our students and university mission, may remain 'invisible' compared to college- or university-level committee work. This work should, nevertheless, be considered as an important contribution comparable to service at the college or university level.

By virtue of this discipline, service is an integral part of what it means to be a Science Education faculty member. Science Education faculty members have service responsibilities/opportunities that regularly expand beyond the department and campus community. It is likely that faculty members will be involved in service throughout the university as well as outreach and collaboration with educational partners outside our campus. Service is often intertwined with scholarly efforts as well as instructional efforts, especially those activities that reach beyond the university and into local educational institutions. The candidate has the ability to 'designate' such activities in the section that they feel is most appropriate; they should provide guidance for the reviewers regarding their discussion of these multidimensional activities and must make sure that these efforts are not double counted.

2.4.2. Criteria for Service

Faculty members must participate in faculty governance through active involvement in committees and/or other service activities at the department and college levels to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor. A faculty member being considered for promotion to full professor must demonstrate significant service (e.g., taking leadership roles in committees or other service activities) at the college, university, or CSU system level. Along with their contributions to shared governance, a candidate's service to their profession and any additional service activities (such as mentoring junior faculty, or mentoring students beyond teaching or RSCA) will also be considered. The quality of service is the primary consideration, rather than mere membership on a certain number of committees.

2.4.2.1. The Science Education department also values service to the broader discipline of science education at local, regional and national levels that shape research and practice in education, including but not limited to professional organizations like California Association for Science Education (CASE), Association of Science Teacher Education (ASTE), or National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST). The department also understands the critical role that faculty can play to support practice in local educational institutions, including but not limited to schools and museums; we recognize that these activities in themselves may serve as evidence needed for tenure and promotion.

2.4.2.2. Furthermore, as stated in 2.4.1.2, the Science Education department recognizes the substantial needs and expectations for departmental service. A candidate's significant efforts along these lines can also be used as evidence of service.

2.4.3. Evaluation of Service

The emphasis in the evaluation of service shall be on 1) the quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions of the university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and level of the candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service. Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence, which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.

In their narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe how their service obligations may have exceeded typical expectations due to their marginalized and/or minoritized identities. While not easily quantifiable, the increased service workload undertaken by these faculty can be described in terms of the impact their work has had on their department, college, university, community and/or discipline.

RTP committees and evaluators should recognize that many faculty experience various forms of cultural/identity taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring, and other activities on and off campus that are essential to the mission of the university. The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is the responsibility of committees and evaluators to recognize this service.

2.4.3.1. The Department of Science Education recognizes the importance of clarifying the quality of service. As stated in the College RTP document (2.4.3.), the Department recommends that "assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting

evidence, which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs."

2.4.3.2. The Department of Science Education recognizes the variety of activities that represent faculty service. Candidates (in their narratives) and evaluating committees (in their evaluations) should pay special attention to the relationship between cultural/identity taxation and service, when applicable. Faculty may wish to describe in their narratives how their own unique circumstances intersected with the needs of the campus community during the period under review, stressing how this may have affected their work performance.

2.4.4. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Service

The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as service. Faculty are expected to engage in shared governance as well as other service activities that contribute to the mission of the university. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category:

(a). Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department, the college, or the university

(b). Leading or serving on department, college or university level committees including but not limited to hiring committee, RTP committee, college council, RSCA review committee, academic senate etc.

(c). Leading institutional programs

(d). Other service activities that contribute to the mission of the university

(e). Sponsoring student groups

(f). Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing)

(g). Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media interviews

(h). Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations

(i). Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline.

(j). Participation in activities promoting diversity, equity, inclusion and access (DEIA) (e.g., organizing DEIA workshops/trainings, serving as an advisor or sponsor for cultural or affinity groups, collaborating on DEIA grants or funding proposals, engaging in community outreach for underrepresented groups etc.)

(k). Participating in Department/College recruitment events (e.g. CNSM open house, SOAR)

(l). Oversight of work study/department student workers

(m). Serving on thesis committees as a non-chair member

2.4.4.1. In addition to those listed in the college document, The Science Education Department also recognizes service activities that may be less formal, and sometimes less visible, yet still contribute to the CSULB mission. Such activities may include but are not limited to: 1) informal career mentoring efforts and other forms of student support success in and beyond the university and 2) Interdepartmental collaborations in support of CSULB student success and other faculty who wish to work with TK-12 students and educators.

2.4.5.1 Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor in Science Education

i. Rating of Competent. Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor in the department of Science Education are expected to participate in 'standard' departmental service, including but not limited to serving on MS student thesis or project committees, attending faculty meetings, and participating in departmental graduation activities.

Candidates are also expected to document an average of at least one additional service activity each year following the first year of the review period. Candidates must serve on a department, college, university, or professional committee for at least one year (see CNSM RTP 2.4.4. for examples). Other activities that may fulfill this yearly requirement should include efforts that promote lasting departmental and student success (e.g. Recruitment Coordinator, Program Assessment Lead, Communications Lead, etc.) and extend beyond one-off meetings. Candidates bear the responsibility for defining the different aspects of service, as well as clarifying the nature of their participation and leadership.

ii. Rating of Excellent. To earn a rating of excellent candidates must meet the minimum service requirements for reappointment/promotion as described for 'Competent' rating. In addition, candidates are expected to either serve at least one year in one leadership position (i.e., chairing or co-chairing committees, initiatives, etc.) or serve as a substantive contributor in a college, university, or professional committee OR they must take on multiple service roles beyond the minimum requirements for reappointment/promotion. Candidates bear responsibility for defining the different aspects of service as well as clarifying the nature and quality of their participation and leadership.

iii. Rating of Deficient. Candidate fails to demonstrate service efforts that meet criteria for rating of Competent, including 'standard' departmental service, as well as broader service efforts as outlined in 2.4.5.1.i)

2.4.5.2 Promotion to Professor in Science Education

i. Rating of Competent. Candidates for promotion to Professor in the department of Science Education are expected to participate in 'standard' departmental service, including but not limited to serving on MS student thesis or project committees, attending faculty meetings, and participating in departmental graduation activities.

Candidates are also expected to document an average of at least one additional service activity each year. Candidates must serve on a department, college, university, or professional committee for at least one year (see CNSM RTP 2.4.4. for examples). In addition, candidates should serve at least one year in a leadership position (i.e., chairing or co-chairing

committees, initiatives, etc.) or serve as a substantive contributor in a department, college, university, or professional committee. Other activities that may fulfill this yearly requirement should include efforts that promote lasting departmental and student success (e.g. Recruitment Coordinator, Program Assessment Lead, Communications Lead, etc.) and extend beyond one-off meetings. Service activities for promotion to Professor must include collaborative or traditional mentorship. Candidates bear the responsibility for defining the different aspects of service, as well as clarifying the nature of their participation and leadership.

ii. <u>Rating of Excellent</u>. To earn a rating of excellent, candidates must also document an average of at least two additional service activities each year following the first year of the review period. Candidates are expected to serve on a college, university, or professional committee for at least one year (see CNSM policy for examples). Candidates are expected to serve at least two years in a leadership position (i.e., chairing or co-chairing committees, initiatives, etc.) or serve as a substantive contributor in a department, college, university, or professional committee. Other activities that may fulfill this yearly requirement should include efforts that promote lasting departmental and student success (e.g. Recruitment Coordinator, Program Assessment Lead, Communications Lead, etc.) and extend beyond one-off meetings. Service activities for promotion to Professor must include collaborative or traditional mentorship. Candidates bear the responsibility for defining the different aspects of service, as well as clarifying the nature and quality of their participation and leadership.

iii. <u>Rating of Deficient</u>. Candidate fails to demonstrate service efforts that meet criteria for rating of Competent, including 'standard' departmental service, as well as broader service efforts as outlined in 2.4.5.2.i)

3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process governed by this document include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, and the Dean. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the current 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, and the dean. In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1. Candidate

3.1.1. Candidates should consult the university RTP policy and mission statements of the college and university. 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.

3.1.2. 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.

3.1.3. The CNSM candidate's narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20 single-spaced pages in 12- point font with one-inch margins). In addition to the material above, the narrative shall include a discussion of how the candidate addressed any substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.

3.2. Department RTP Policy

3.2.1. 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 the college-level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with the CNSM and university RTP policies.

3.2.2. 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

3.3.1. 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.

3.3.2. The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The CBA 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.

3.3.3. 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, equity workshops, and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

3.3.4. The Department of Science Education RTP Committee shall consist of three members elected by secret ballot from among the department's tenured faculty. If there are not three eligible faculty members the committee will be filled by a faculty member from a related department if elected by the tenured and probationary faculty in the Department.

All department probationary and tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and may vote for any number of candidates up to the number of open slots. The faculty members receiving the highest number of votes in the secret ballot will join the department RTP committee. The three members shall serve one-year terms with annual elections. If an elected member resigns or otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which he/she was elected, the department will elect a replacement to serve the rest of the term.

3.4. Department Chairs

3.4.1. 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.

3.4.2. Department chairs are strongly encouraged to 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 Committee

3.5.1. 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, equity workshops, and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

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

3.6. Dean of the College

3.6.1. 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.

3.6.2. 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.

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The college follows the university policy, which states:

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

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

4.1. Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Reappointment

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

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

4.2. Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

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

A tenure-track faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under Section 5.5.

4.3. Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

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

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

4.3.1. The period of review for promotion to full professor is the period after the most recent review for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Activities performed in the academic year prior to the awarding of tenure or promotion but not included in the file or materials submitted for tenure and promotion to associate professor, may be considered to fall within the period of review for

promotion to full professor. For faculty members who begin their employment with tenure and appointment at the associate level, the period of review includes all time since being hired with that status.

5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate 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.

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

5.2. Awarding of Tenure

Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure recommendations are based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's overall record of accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the continuation of this record.

Note that criteria for awarding tenure (and promotion) within the Department of Science Education have been embedded within the sections of the CNSM RTP related to evaluation of the three criteria: Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities (2.1, 2.2), RSCA (2.3) and Service (2.4).

5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of RSCA.

5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in Section 2.2 of this policy.

5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue making distinguished contributions in RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in Section 2.3 of this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the

departmental standards for assessment of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments. All levels of review will use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.

5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in service are listed in Section 2.4 of this policy.

5.4. Promotion to Professor

5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the departmental RTP policy. A professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular development. The successful candidate 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. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international level. In addition, a professor shall have provided significant service and leadership on campus and service in the community or the profession.

5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

5.5.   Early Tenure or Early Promotion

5.5.1. A potential candidate should seek (and 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 as in 5.5.2. A candidate for early tenure and promotion must also be rated as excellent in all three categories, as stated in department RTP policies.

The University Policy states: "a candidate [for early tenure or promotion] demonstrates 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."

The college interprets this as meaning achieving a rating of "excellent" in each of the three categories and exceeding a rating of "excellent" in substantial ways in at least one of these categories. It must also include at least one exceptional circumstance and compelling reason as described in the next section.

5.5.2. Examples of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons: (the list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category):

(a). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality teaching.

(b). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality DEIA activities.

(c). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality service.

(d). National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality RSCA.

(e). Grant success well beyond what is typical in the discipline for rank.

(f). Extremely prominent publications in highly ranked journals.

(g). Chairing a significant college or university committee (e.g., College Council during a year of significant work, Academic Senate, GEGC, CEPC, FPCC, etc.) or service in highly unusual situations for rank (e.g. to University or Profession).

(h). Acquiring additional Student Mentorship/DEI grants that span more than one department.

(i). Leading the creation of a significant new curricular or instructionally-related program (beyond the creation of courses).

5.5.3. Exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons shall occur within the evaluation period and while the candidate is a CSULB faculty member.

5.5.4. 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.

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

5.5.4.2. 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.

5.5.4.3. The Department of Science Education expects candidates seeking early tenure or promotion to document evidence that they have met and substantially exceeded the standards for excellence in Teaching, RSCA, and Service as described in both the Department and College RTP documents. Candidates should refer to the College RTP document, section 5.5.2. for examples of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons for receipt of early tenure and/or promotion.

6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The college follows the university policy, which states:

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 qualification 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. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

For additional processes, the college follows the university policy, which states:

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.

8. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

All information in this policy applies to a faculty member appointed jointly to two or more departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the dean(s).

9. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

9.1. Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of changes to the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty members.

9.2. The tenured/probationary faculty members of the college, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy and evaluation criteria section of this policy.

9.3. Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

9.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured/probationary faculty members or

9.3.2. By action of the CNSM Faculty Council.

9.4. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty members called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty members at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.

9.5. Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members voting in a secret ballot conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president or designee.

> *9.6 Amendments to the Department RTP Policy*
>
> *Proposed amendments to the Science Education department RTP policy shall be submitted in writing to the department chair to be discussed at a department meeting within fifteen (15) instructional days of their receipt. The proposed amendments will be distributed by the chair to the department at least five (5) instructional days before the department meeting at which they will be discussed.*
>
> *Voting on amendment(s) shall be by secret ballot by the tenured and probationary faculty. To be effective, proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible tenured and probationary voters and be approved by the college council, the dean and the*

provost. The approved amendment(s) shall go into effect at the beginning of the following academic year.