INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT Policy On Reappointment, Tenure, And Promotion

Table of Contents

I . COLLEGE OF BUSINESS RTP DOCUMENT 4
A. Preamble. 4
B. Commitment and Purpose. 5
C. RTP Guidelines. ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
D. Narrative Requirements 6
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES 6
A. Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching in the College of Business. 8
B. Continuous Professional Learning. 8
C. Reflection & Instructional Adaptation. 8
D. Instructional Practices that Foster Learning. 10
E. Other Instructional Activities. 11
III. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA) 12
A. RSCA in the Information Systems Department. 14
B. RSCA Criteria for Reappointment. 16
C. RSCA Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor. ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
D. RSCA Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor. ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
E. Additional RSCA Contributions. ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
F. Hierarchy of Journal Quality. 18
IV. SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY, IN THE COMMUNITY AND IN THE PROFESSION. 18
A. Service in the Information Systems Department. 20
B. Service Expectations and Standards. 20
C. Service Evaluative Criteria. 22
D. Minimum Service Expectations by Rank. 22
E. The Candidate's Responsibilities 22
V. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS 23
VI. COMPOSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF COB RTP COMMITTEES 23
A. Committee Membership Criteria. 23
B. Promotions. 23
C. Department Chair. 23
VII. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS 24

VIII. REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA 24
IX. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS. 24
X. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES 24
XI. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY 24
XII. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AMENDMENTS 24

I . College Of Business RTP Document

A. Preamble.

The College of Business ("College") views the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion ("RTP") documents from all three levels of evaluation (the individual department, the College and the University) as a single interlocking continuous RTP document varying only in the level of specificity of standards and guidelines to be used in evaluating a Candidate for reappointment, tenure and promotion ("Candidate"). All parties shall refer to these three documents for a full understanding of the philosophy, intent, and specific RTP standards. In this Information Systems (IS) Department (Department) RTP document, portions of the University RTP document that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted. All University RTP document insertions in the IS Department RTP document are presented in italics and labeled (PS 23-24) to clearly distinguish between the University and IS Department documents. Portions of the University document not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the original University document.

(PS 23-24) 1.0 MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES

1.1 University Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.

1.2 Principles

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's mission. A university 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 university-wide expectations and giving directions to college and department RTP policies. In particular, college and department policies must be consistent with this policy, meaning that college and department policies must observe inclusions/exclusion and minima/maxima articulated in this policy, but they may match or exceed within the boundaries established by this policy. Colleges, and departments, where department policies exist, must create specific guidelines for how faculty can fulfill the University's academic mission, while abiding by these principles:

***1.2.1** Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in all three of the following areas:*

- Instructional activities
- Research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA), and
- Service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

***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, college and university RTP policies for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.*

1.3 Values

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

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

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

1.3.2 *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 college and 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 *CSULB recognizes that faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should value diverse forms of RSCA and create mechanisms to recognize and reward them.*

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

1.3.5 *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.*

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instructional activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

The work of advising and mentoring is often discipline specific, cutting across multiple evaluation areas. Colleges and departments shall articulate expectations and possibilities for advising and mentorship as appropriate to each area of evaluation.

B. Commitment and Purpose.

The Department is committed to providing an instructional program of high quality for all of its students. A strong faculty dedicated to excellence and who continue to grow professionally

throughout their careers is necessary to fulfill that commitment. The broad purpose of this document is to encourage Candidates to develop in a manner that produces a culture within the Department that values all aspects of active involvement in the University and its mission.

C. RTP Guidelines.
College and department RTP documents are to be used as guidelines by Candidates and their mentors in assessing progress through the various stages of the RTP process. They are also to be used by RTP committees in evaluating Candidates. Consequently, the documents define the standards by which Candidates will be evaluated. The documents specify the level of performance which is expected for a positive recommendation at each step of the RTP process. The quality and on-going nature of a Candidate's performance are the most important elements to consider in evaluating individual achievement. As noted in the University RTP Policy, "The college RTP committee must take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating [its Candidates]" (PS 23-24 §3.6).

D. Narrative Requirements.
In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, Candidates are required to present a written narrative with supporting materials describing the extent and quality of their work in each of the categories to be evaluated: Instructional Activities, RSCA, and Service. Specifically, in their narrative, Candidates must demonstrate the value and quality of their contributions in each of these three areas. The narrative also should serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional goals and values as they relate to the mission of the department, the College, and the University. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained.

II. Instructional Activities

(PS 23-24) 2.1 Instructional Activities
As a comprehensive public university, all CSULB faculty members are expected to demonstrate they are effective at teaching a diverse student body, regardless of instructional mode. However, instruction, as defined in this policy, encompasses many activities. Instruction is any action designed to engage students, help them to learn, and contribute to their success, regardless of whether it is part of formal coursework.
Colleges and departments are strongly encouraged to provide examples of instructional activities in their own policies. Instructional activities could include but are not limited to classroom instruction; chairing thesis committees; supervising individual students enrolled in activities like independent study, research, internships, honors, student teaching; and instructionally-related mentoring and advising students and other faculty. Curriculum and course development may also be instructional activities. Colleges and departments should make clear where faculty members must disclose and describe any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time.

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

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:
• continuous professional learning,
• thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction, and

• the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals.

The following subsections are designed to guide candidates, their evaluators, and those revising college and department RTP policies to understand how this document defines effective instruction, its assessment, and to provide parameters for candidates documenting & committees evaluating instruction.

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

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

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

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

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

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

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

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

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

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes, and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

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

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

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

A. Requirements and Definitions of Effective Teaching in the IS Department.
The University RTP Policy grounds effective teaching in three principles: 1) continuous professional learning; 2) reflection and instructional adaptation; and 3) instructional practices that foster student learning. This section outlines these principles and the relevant evaluation criteria for committees in the IS Department.

B. Continuous Professional Learning.
In addition to providing excellent classroom and classroom-related instruction, a Candidate is expected to be a teaching role model and shall provide ethical leadership and advising to undergraduate and graduate students. They should strive to excel in the classroom, maintain instructional relevance and currency, and ensure that students attain course learning goals and peers respect their instructional skills. A Candidate should strive to continuously improve instruction and to implement pedagogies that engage students and provide meaningful learning outcomes. A Candidate is also expected to maintain currency regarding the technology used within the discipline.

Evaluative Criteria
Candidates under review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion must document efforts to improve their teaching. In demonstrating continuous professional learning (University RTP Policy Section 2.1.1), candidates should explain how they have remained up to date with course content, pedagogical methods, and best practices for educating their students in their narrative. The various dimensions of candidate's instructional activities, including their goals, efforts made to achieve those goals and the resulting outcomes, will also be described by the candidate in their narrative.

Evidence supporting the narrative will include, but is not limited to, participation in professional development activities (e.g., on- and off-campus), attendance at teaching sessions and workshops at professional conferences, and incorporation of observation of instruction by peers.

As a minimum, candidates under review for tenure to associate professor or promotion to full professor must have at least two peer teaching evaluations conducted at least one year apart. Evidence of improvement should be demonstrated between the two evaluations. At least one peer evaluation must be conducted by a department member. A candidate under review for reappointment is not required to have their teaching evaluated by peers; however, they must include in their narrative a plan for future peer evaluation of teaching.

C. Reflection & Instructional Adaptation.
Due to the diversity of the subject matter within the various functional areas of business, College faculty employ a variety of different teaching pedagogies, such as small and large lectures, online versus face-to-face instruction, discussions and presentations, teams and project groups, case studies, computer-

based approaches, etcetera. The instructional methods employed by a Candidate should be appropriate for the course taught, and materials should be up-to-date and relevant to the course.

Consistent with University teaching philosophy, a Candidate is encouraged to develop new approaches to teaching where appropriate. Evaluation of new approaches to teaching shall recognize the experimental nature of the pedagogy used. In addition, favorable consideration shall be given by reviewers when the pedagogy is carefully planned and thoughtfully implemented with robust learning outcomes.

In the Information Systems Department, the evaluation criteria may take into account the applied and technology-driven nature of the discipline, including but not limited to experiential learning, project-based instruction, use of emerging technologies, and industry-relevant tools, among others. Evaluation criteria may vary based on the pedagogical approach used by a Candidate as well as the level of the course (e.g., graduate, upper division, lower division).

For the peer review of teaching, the Candidate shall select a peer reviewer from within the Information Systems Department who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, whenever possible. If a faculty member at this rank is not available, the Candidate may select a peer reviewer at the rank of Assistant Professor from the Department and shall explain and justify this choice in their narrative. If no appropriate peer reviewer is available within the Department, the Candidate may select a peer reviewer from another discipline within the College or the University. In such cases, the Candidate must provide a justification for the selection in their narrative.

The peer reviewer shall conduct a classroom or online course visit, review relevant teaching materials (including syllabi, assignments, assessments, and instructional technologies), and provide written, constructive feedback to the Candidate. The review should address instructional effectiveness, pedagogical approach, and alignment with departmental and college expectations. The process is intended to support continuous improvement in teaching while contributing to personnel evaluations in a consistent and equitable manner. Reviews shall take into account the level of the course (lower division, upper division, or graduate) and the mode of delivery (face-to-face, hybrid, or online).

In addition, in terms of **Course Design, Communication and Grading Policy**, when examining a Candidate's teaching effectiveness, the Candidate's adherence to Department and College standards and policies in the following areas must be considered:

1. A Candidate's syllabus and other course documents must meet relevant Department, College, and University standards and policies. A Candidate is urged to consult with their Department chair and/or other senior colleagues with respect to the Department's standards regarding syllabi and other course documents. A Candidate must submit one representative course syllabus for each course taught during the review period.

2. The grading practices of a Candidate must be consistent with those of the Department and the College. A Candidate is urged to consult with their Department chair and/or other senior colleagues with respect to the department's grading standards. The grade point average of the courses taught should be in line with those of other sections of the same course and, when appropriate, with those of other courses at the same level. In instances where course GPAs significantly deviate from Department standards, it is incumbent on the Candidate to provide in their narrative an explanation for this deviation. In all cases,

important criteria for evaluation of a Candidate's teaching effectiveness are the quality of their teaching and the achievement of course learning objectives by students. The candidate must submit class GPAs for all courses taught.

3. A Candidate must cover all the learning objectives included in the Standard Course Outline (SCO) developed for that course where available.

Evaluative Criteria
Candidates under review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion must reflect upon their teaching and how adaptation of new instructional practices effected learning outcomes in their narrative (University RTP Policy Section 2.1.2). This might include specifying one or more instructional goals or practices the candidate decided to change, based on the evidence that indicated the need for a change, and concluding with an explanation of the effort undertaken to make the change and resulting learning outcomes.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to instructional materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes. Instructional materials include, but are not limited to, class handouts, lecture notes/slides, descriptions of class activities, and web page printouts. Departments may define supporting documentation as appropriate to their disciplines.

D. Instructional Practices that Foster Learning.
A Candidate must follow University, College and Department policies regarding student evaluations of courses and should get all class sections evaluated. If a Candidate does not have all their class sections evaluated during a semester, they must provide an explanation for that and should ensure that the courses evaluated are representative of all the courses taught. A Candidate may provide an interpretation of their teaching evaluations.

1. Student evaluations of instructors shall initially be interpreted on a comparable course basis. Following careful comparison at the appropriate level, general comparisons should then be made across different course types and levels. In addition to considering the performance levels in various courses, student evaluations of a Candidate's teaching performance shall be considered with respect to the trend of performance over time. All items on the student evaluation forms shall be considered.

2. In their narrative, a Candidate should summarize and contextualize their student evaluation results over the review period rather than relying solely on raw numerical scores. Candidates may include quantitative data such as overall ratings, trends over time, comparisons across courses, delivery modes (face-to-face, hybrid, online), and course levels (lower division, upper division, graduate). When appropriate, Candidates may also compare their results to Department, College, or University benchmarks, if available. The narrative should also address factors that may influence student evaluations such as class size, required versus elective courses, course modality, curriculum changes, or the applied and technical nature of Information Systems coursework. A Candidate should reflect on how they have responded to feedback and describe any instructional improvements or innovations implemented as a result.

Consistent with the University RTP policy, while student evaluations provide useful information about the instructor's teaching ability and how they can improve the course, these evaluations should not be considered as the only metric for assessing a Candidate's instructional activities. A Candidate can provide additional evidence, if appropriate, to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness.

Evaluative Criteria

Candidates under review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion must show how they have engaged and helped students achieve course outcomes. In demonstrating instructional practices that foster learning and achievement of course goals (University RTP Policy Section 2.1.3), a candidate should explain how they have supported student learning, achieved course outcomes, and accommodated student differences. Their narratives should discuss their philosophy and how it aligns with their instructional strategies. Their narratives should also address, as appropriate, student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level as well as grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

Evidence supporting the narrative must include course syllabi, quantitative student course evaluation summaries, and grade distributions. A Candidate may include additional syllabi as needed to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation. Evidence supporting the narrative could include student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), formative or summative assessments (e.g., discussion assignments, labs, quizzes, papers or project assignments, or comprehensive final assignments or exams), a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, qualitative student perception data, observations by trained or peer observers, or support letters submitted during open period. Departments may define supporting documentation as appropriate to their disciplines.

In line with the University RTP Policy, RTP committees should consider multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness as it relates to fostering student learning, achieving course goals, and accommodating student differences.

Course evaluation summaries provide one among several ways to measure instructional effectiveness and should be supplemented with other instructional materials. While SPOT evaluations for every course taught must be submitted by the candidate, SPOT evaluations must not be the sole criterion for evaluating teaching.

E. Other Instructional Activities.

In addition to the design and delivery of classroom courses, a Candidate is encouraged to engage in other instructional activities that take place outside the traditional classroom. These activities should be clearly delineated as relevant to instructional effectiveness and discussed in the Candidate's narrative. Efforts to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness are expected of all candidates. This improvement should be described in the Candidate's narrative and supported by exemplary materials. A Candidate under review for reappointment is required to be involved in at least one other instructional activity. A Candidate under review for tenure is required to be involved in at least two other instructional activities. Below is a list of representative activities. Note, this list is not exhaustive as candidates are encouraged to explore a wide variety of opportunities.

1. Regular interactions with colleagues regarding various pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development.

2. Involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center; participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or relevant professional organizations; giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching and other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.

3. Development of innovative approaches to teaching, fostering increased student learning in the classroom, and participating in the evaluation of instructional effectiveness to improve instruction.

4. Development of new curriculum, instructional programs or materials, including electronic or multimedia instructional software or new advising materials or programs.

A candidate under review for promotion to full professor must demonstrate leadership in fostering a culture of pedagogical excellence within the College. Such engagement may include, but is not limited to, serving as a course coordinator, developing or redesigning courses or curricula, mentoring junior faculty or lecturers, organizing and leading teaching workshops, serving as a teaching peer reviewer, and sharing innovative teaching practices with colleagues. In addition, it is expected that a candidate under review for promotion to full professor contributes actively to graduate-level instruction in the College, bringing their expertise and experience to advanced courses that enrich the academic programs and support student success.

A candidate is expected to demonstrate ongoing and meaningful improvement in their overall teaching effectiveness as they progress from one rank to the next. Evidence of improvement should be apparent across all criteria outlined above, including continuous professional learning, reflection and instructional adaptation, and instructional practices that foster student learning.

III. Research, Scholarly, And Creative Activities (RSCA)

(PS 23-24) 2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

CSULB faculty engage in a variety of valuable scholarly and creative activities. Because academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), the University RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees engaged in evaluating scholarly work. Departments and colleges must develop their own 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, or international communities.

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

In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not

restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

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 and Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.*

- *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.*

Departments and colleges, however, 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.

Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor: The candidate is expected to have produced high-quality peer-reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study.

Appointment/Promotion to Professor: Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor. Successful candidates will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of their discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study.

Within their narratives candidates should 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 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 addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

A. RSCA in the Information Systems Department.
Candidates are expected to remain abreast of their field, and to be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship and creative activity that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time. Scholarly contributions should create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting all scholarly communities.

The COB values a diverse range of RSCA, reflecting the breadth and depth of disciplinary practices. RSCA considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion may take various forms, including, but not limited to, the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and engagement, or teaching and learning.

Standards of High Quality RSCA: All RSCA should demonstrate scientific rigor appropriate to the discipline, critical analysis, and a meaningful contribution — whether advancing theoretical frameworks (for Discovery and Integration) or driving practical improvements (for Application and Engagement). This flexibility supports faculty in pursuing impactful, high-quality scholarly work while maintaining the college's academic standards and mission (see section 2.2 above). A Candidate bears the ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.

In particular, a Candidate is required to focus their research efforts on publications of articles in peer reviewed academic journals, as AACSB accreditation standards state that faculty must publish peer-reviewed journal articles. Journals of **Highest Quality** are recognized within a discipline as having a *significant impact on the scholarship or pedagogy* of that discipline. Journals of **Recognized Quality** are acknowledged within a discipline as having a *favorable impact on the scholarship or pedagogy* of that discipline. A recommendation for indicating the quality of a journal is discussed in Section F.. Yet it is incumbent upon the Candidate to justify the quality of both the journal and publication through quantitative and qualitative factors. Failing to do so may result in a publication not being counted towards RSCA.

Important notes include:

- If a journal is not classified as Highest Quality or Recognized Quality by the IS Department, it can count towards RSCA only if the provided evidence is viewed as sufficient.
- If a journal is classified as Highest or Recognized Quality or equivalent in one field, the IS Department may use that ranking to evaluate their research in that journal if the Candidate provides sufficient supporting evidence to make the case.
- If a journal in another field outside of business is considered of Highest or Recognized Quality or equivalent, and a Candidate publishes in that journal, this could be considered as such by the IS Department only if the Candidate is able to provide sufficient supporting evidence.
- Publications in predatory journals will not be counted by the Department with no exception (the definition of predatory journals is provided in Section F).

- Duplicate publications will not be counted towards RSCA. Examples include, but are not limited to, the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprints must be labeled as such.
- If a journal is ranked as Highest Quality or Recognized Quality at the time of the Candidate's publication and is afterwards reduced in ranking, this will not impact the Candidate's achievement of attaining a Highest Quality or Recognized Quality publication.

Type and Level of Impact for Intellectual Contributions: A Candidate must specify the type and level of the impact of each intellectual contribution in their narrative. The narrative is not meant to be merely a listing of activities. Within their narratives a candidate should 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 Highest Quality, Recognized Quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. It is the responsibility of the Candidate to address the contributions and provide supporting documents without repeating content. The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their field.

Importantly, the Candidate's RSCA portfolio must demonstrate that the Candidate will continue their RSCA activities after the review period, in other words, the Candidate must demonstrate a pipeline of ongoing research. This should be explained in the narrative.

Regarding publications in academic journals, a Candidate should demonstrate the quality of the intellectual contribution (i.e., the published article) through readily recognizable criteria, <u>such as, but not limited to</u>**:**

1. Departmental journal ranking (i.e., High Quality, Recognized Quality)
2. Widely accepted journal rankings
3. Impact factor
4. Reputation of the journals' publisher
5. Comparable measures recognized within an academic discipline or academia, and other criteria that indicate the level of the journal quality (e.g., affiliation of journal editorial boards and peer/external reviews, although this is necessary but not a sufficient criterion for quality designation of articles published)
6. The expertise and credentials of its Associate Editors and Editorial Review Board members.
7. Inclusion in abstracting and indexing databases (e.g., SSCI, EBSCO, ProQuest, PsycINFO, Scopus, Cabell, ABI/INFORM, Business Source Premier)
8. Immediacy Index (the count of citations of the journal in the current year that reference content in this same year, journals that have a consistently high immediacy index attract citations rapidly)
9. Research that is consistently disseminated and cited not only within the field but also across domains and journals in other fields especially those that are prestigious.

Important notes on the narrative are as follows:

- It is the responsibility of the IS Department to ensure that the appropriate documentation is provided for the Candidate, prior to sending the file to the COB RTP committee.
- The candidate must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

- All published articles, conference material, or material accepted for publication at the time of submittal, will show the Candidate's affiliation with the COB/CSULB. Exception to this rule is allowed, but only for publications completed during the "service credit period."
- All articles published during the years granted to the Candidate towards RTP must be included in the Candidates' RSCA portfolio.

B. RSCA Criteria for Reappointment.
Reappointment is critical as it indicates the University's and College's potential for long-term commitment to the Candidate. The Department requires that the Candidate must show a reasonable likelihood that they will be able to meet the RSCA requirements for tenure. A Candidate should note that reappointment does not guarantee a favorable recommendation for tenure.

A Candidate is expected to have multiple research projects in progress and at least one paper that has the potential to be published based on a "revise and resubmit" in a Recognized Quality journal or equivalent. This means that the Department RTP committee would evaluate the claim based on an email/letter from the journal editor. Additionally, having a research paper that has the potential to be published based on a "revise and resubmit" in a Highest Quality journal or equivalent should receive special attention in the review process.

Conference presentations, proceedings, or other intellectual contributions will make the Candidate's case stronger but do not substitute for journal publications. These can be viewed as contributing to a pipeline of research which would make the Candidate's potential for a successful tenure and promotion review stronger. In addition to intellectual accomplishments, a Candidate's portfolio shall contain works-in-progress that clearly show a strong likelihood of continued research productivity and output in Highest Quality or Recognized Quality or equivalent journals, after being reappointed.

Tenure track faculty represents a substantial investment by the College and must demonstrate satisfactory RSCA progress toward tenure before being reappointed.

C. RSCA Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor.
For a positive recommendation on tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the Department requires at least **four** peer reviewed journal publications of Recognized Quality or equivalent. However, the quality of a Candidate's publications can affect the quantity of publications required during the Candidate's probationary period inclusive of service credit year(s). If a Candidate has **one Highest Quality** or equivalent publications **and two Recognized Quality** or equivalent publications, the candidate is eligible for tenure and promotion to associate professor. If a Candidate has **two Highest Quality** or equivalent peer reviewed journal publications, the candidate is eligible for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

There must be evidence that the Candidate will continue to publish in journals of at least **Recognized Quality** or equivalent after being tenured and promoted to associate professor.

A Candidate's portfolio shall contain works-in-progress that clearly show a strong likelihood of continued research productivity and output after being awarded tenure. One way of demonstrating this is with conference proceedings and presentations as part of their intellectual contributions to be included in their pipeline of work-in-progress.

In all cases, a balance between quality and quantity must be maintained with quantity never substituting for minimally acceptable quality.

D. RSCA Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor.
Full professor is the highest rank a faculty member can achieve. Promotion to full professor shall not be an automatic advancement over time, but an earned honor based on performance. For promotion to full professor, the Department requires at least **four** journal publications of **Recognized Quality** or equivalent, within the preceding six years or a shorter period, since their last promotion. However, the quality of the publications can affect the quantity of publications required. If a Candidate has **one Highest Quality** or equivalent publications **and two Recognized Quality** or equivalent publications, the candidate is eligible for promotion to full professor. If a Candidate has **two Highest Quality** or equivalent publications, the Candidate is eligible for promotion to full professor.

In addition to one of the above two criteria, for promotion to full professor, the candidate must provide evidence of additional scholarly contributions. Such activities and products may include books, book chapters, articles in professional journals, successful grants, fellowships, software, and serving as a journal editor. This is not an exhaustive list, and the above listing does not imply that these are all equally weighted in terms of impact. Candidates bear the ultimate responsibility for presenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their additional RSCA accomplishments are acceptable as additional scholarly contributions by the IS Department.

It is incumbent upon the Candidate to specify and provide evidence to support the quality of their publication portfolio.

There must be sufficient evidence that the Candidate will continue to publish in at least journals of Recognized Quality or equivalent journals after being promoted to full professor. This evidence shall be demonstrated through a pipeline of working papers, on-going research -in-progress, along with conference proceedings and presentations, grant proposals, and/or other similar intellectual contributions.

E. Additional RSCA Contributions.
A Candidate can enhance the strength of their RTP file by additional activities that include, but are not limited to, substantial records of peer-reviewed professional activities and products. Such activities and products may include books, book chapters, articles in professional journals, conference proceedings and scholarly presentations both at conferences and invited scholarly presentations at universities and professional/ governmental organizations, successful grants, fellowships, contracts, software, electronically published documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers, serving as a journal editor, and serving as a lead author in a journal publication (proof of contributions should be provided). The above listing does not imply that these are all equally weighted in terms of impact.

Another critical requirement for evaluating the Candidate's RSCA accomplishments to determine reappointment, tenure, promotion to associate, and promotion to full, is related to authorship. When a journal publication is submitted as part of the RSCA accomplishments, any journal articles that are not sole-authored publications, should provide an accompanying statement as to the contribution of the Candidate. This should be included in the RTP package.

F. Hierarchy of Journal Quality.
The hierarchy of the term 'quality' for journals is as follows:

1. Highest Quality – Significant/High Impact: These journals are listed in a majority of widely recognized journal rankings as having the highest and most significant impact based on a set of qualitative and quantitative metrics.

2. Recognized Quality – Favorable Impact: Journals of Recognized quality are journals that are acknowledged within a discipline as having a favorable impact on the scholarship or pedagogy of that discipline.

3. Predatory – publications in venues to which an author is required to make a monetary contribution to secure publication (e.g., for-profit presses and predatory presses) shall be considered a priori an ethical concern, regardless of selection process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images, open access, or subvention).

A recommendation for indicating the quality of a journal is through the use of the following journal rankings:

- ABS: https://journalranking.org/ (Association of Business Schools)
- ABDC: https://abdc.edu.au/abdc-journal-quality-list/ (Australian Business Deans Council)
- FT50: https://guides.lib.usf.edu/FT_Top_50_Journals (Financial Times Top 50)
- AIS Senior Scholars' List of Premier Journals: https://aisnet.org/page/SeniorScholarListofPremierJournals

Recommended categories for consideration as Highest Quality could include ABS J. Rankings 4* and 4, any on FT50, ABDC J. Quality List A*, AIS Senior Scholars' List of Premier Journals, the main list. Recommended categories for consideration as Recognized Quality could include ABS J. Rankings 3, 2 and 1, ABDC J. Quality List A and B, and AIS Senior Scholars' List of Premier Journals, the SIG Recommended Journals.

IV. Service And Engagement At The University, In The Community And In The Profession.

(PS 23-24) 2.3 Service
Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, and the academic profession and strengthens shared governance processes. Universities cannot and should not function without faculty service contributions. Therefore, service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators. It is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation.

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

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles. The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive:

- *Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university, CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to CFA.*
- *Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise.*
- *Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.*

The University RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees engaged in evaluating service work. Colleges and departments must develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of service.

Departments and colleges must make clear to candidates the types of service appropriate to faculty rank, experience, and course load. In no case shall departments and colleges limit candidates to an exclusive list of service activities or accomplishments necessary for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Differential workloads may result in varied service expectations.

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

As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. Service activities like these (whether academic or personal, supporting faculty or students), may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways. Department and college policy should specify the evaluation criteria and the process to recognize their importance and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.

Department and college evaluation criteria should also be based on recognition that service to the community or profession should connect to candidates' academic expertise and professional goals. Departments and colleges are encouraged to outline criteria that acknowledge work done in support of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, on campus and off campus as well as in support of racial and social justice, including for instance the elimination of anti-Blackness more broadly.

Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity. In general, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or actions (for instance,

what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and then describe outcomes or impact of the work. Student mentoring or advising (when being considered as service) could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g., numbers of students, extent of work) and impact of the candidate's work, highlighting student success. Candidates can describe off-campus or profession-linked work in terms of what the work is, how it utilizes the candidate's academic expertise, and how it impacts the profession or wider community. In general, candidates should discuss and (when possible) document the importance, scope, and length of their service accomplishments, noting the time, effort, and amount of work involved in the activities as well as (when possible) the overall impact of the service and the number of individuals impacted.

Candidates should describe, and department and colleges should recognize and take into account as part of the service workload activities supporting our diverse student population, including underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students.

A. Service in the Information Systems Department.

Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, and the academic profession and strengthens shared governance processes. Faculty should consider themselves to be representatives and envoys of their department, College, University, and profession when conducting service engagements both internal and external to the University. Candidates should not only represent their department and the College in a professional and collegial manner but must also ensure that service activities and outcomes are reported to and shared, where appropriate, with College and Department committees. A Candidate's service may be contributed to the University, the community, and the discipline, but it should be related to the academic expertise of the Candidate or chosen willfully by the Candidate to advance their professional career; service should not be assigned, recommended or otherwise pressured upon a Candidate based on factors unrelated to their professional career or interests, such as their personal characteristics and history. It is incumbent on the Candidate to ask the Department chair if potential service is consistent with the College and/or University mission.

B. Service Expectations and Standards.

A candidate is expected to participate actively in the collegial processes of faculty governance, as well as in appropriate professional organizations and/or activities. A candidate is expected to provide quality service, where in addition to regular committee attendance they show initiative and leadership by actively engaging and participating in Department, College, and/or University initiatives. Service may be informal as well as through structured roles or opportunities. Importantly, candidates are not expected to perform *all* the examples below in *each* category (Campus, Profession, Community), but rather to serve in ways that align with their unique professional interests. Examples of service include, <u>but are not limited to</u>:

1. **Service to the Campus.** Service to the Campus may include:

    (a) Active involvement on committees and task forces at all levels of the University and the university system. Service at the departmental and College levels is expected for assistant professor candidates seeking promotion to associate professor. Service at the University level is expected for associate and full

professors seeking promotion or retention, in addition to Departmental and/or College level service.

(b) Leadership positions, such as Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, or others on committees or task forces.

(c) Authorship of documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or department mission and/or procedures.

(d) Advising, sponsoring, or otherwise contributing in meaningful ways to student groups, including student recruiting, development, and retention activities.

(e) Supervision of student workers, including the mentoring and development of students in teaching- or research-oriented assistant roles.

(f) Supervising student theses or coaching and leading students in case competitions or other regional or national contests.

(g) Participating in the College's AACSB accreditation efforts (*e.g.*, preparation of AACSB reports and the assessment of College programs).

(h) Reviewing grant applications internal to the University.

(i) Any additional contributions to other constituents within the University, such as oversight or advisory boards, the California Faculty Association (typically through a formal representative role), or administrative staff, including staff recruiting, development, and retention activities.

2. **Service to the Profession**. A Candidate is expected to provide services to their profession through active involvement and participation in discipline-oriented activities such as:

(a) Holding an office in a professional society or association at local, state, national, and/or international levels.
(b) Serving on the editorial board for an academic or professional journal; must specify the extent of the demands of your role (e.g., Review Board member, Associate Editor, and so on).
(c) Reviewing manuscripts for academic or professional journals and conferences.
(d) Reviewing grant applications external to the University.
(e) Serving as conference program organizers, session chair or paper discussant for academic conferences or meetings.
(f) Serving on selection panels for grants, fellowships, and contract awards.
(g) Mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.
(h) Invited talks or academic presentations at other Universities.

3. **Service to the Community.** In addition to service to the University and the profession, Candidates may participate in community activities requiring their academic expertise and professional skills as faculty members of the University. These may include:

(a) Giving speeches or media interviews.
(b) Serving on committees or providing seminars or workshops.
(c) Providing consultantships to schools, local government, community service groups, and local businesses or other organizations.
(d) Serving on the boards of community organizations.

C. Service Evaluative Criteria.
The evaluation of service shall be based on:

(a) The scope and significance of each service activity itself.
(b) The quality and the extent of the Candidate's involvement and contribution to each service activity.
(c) The impact or outcomes of the service activity, with emphasis on the Candidate's contributions to those impacts or outcomes.
(d) The degree of the Candidate's leadership in each service activity.
(e) The quantity of all service activities performed in the evaluation period, with clear emphasis on service to Campus and service to Profession.

A Candidate is encouraged to highlight the extent to which their contributions to any service activity support diversity, equity, inclusion, and access for members of underserved and/or historically marginalized communities, either on campus or in the broader community, as well as achieving racial and social justice. A Candidate is also encouraged to highlight the extent to which their contributions to any service activity support the mission of the College or University.

D. Minimum Service Expectations by Rank.

i. Tenure-track faculty members are required to focus on service activities at the department-level or college-level during their probationary period.

ii. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, tenure-track faculty members are required to provide contributions to their department, and to either the college or to the university.

iii. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful Candidates are required to have a substantive service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) leadership at the college and/or university levels; and (3) service to the community and/or to the profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices and/or of active engagement.

E. The Candidate's Responsibilities.
The Candidate must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions, and it is incumbent on the Candidate in this narrative to describe in detail the above evaluative criteria.

1. Candidates shall describe the objectives, scope, and structure (e.g., frequency of meetings) of the Campus, Profession, and Community service activities.

2. Candidates shall summarize their personal contributions to Campus, Profession, and Community activities in addition to documenting their attendance. Examples include, but

are not limited to, an estimate of the hours of work per semester or per year committed to a service activity, describing or providing excerpts of sections or elements of policy the Candidate wrote or revised, detailing or providing excerpts of content developed or presented by Candidate, or description of the roles or responsibilities of the Candidate compared to others involved in the service activity. Candidates should clearly disclose and describe any activities that involved reassigned time or additional compensation.

3. Candidates shall describe the outcome or impact of their service contributions, where appropriate. Examples include, but are not limited to, the number of individuals affected, evidence of student success, improvements to operations, or other outcomes relevant to the service area.

4. Candidates shall also include documentation of contributions to service activities, and their impact, through an appendix in their file of supplemental documents. Examples include, but are not limited to, the first page of minutes of council and committee meetings, letters from Academic Senate or other faculty governance bodies that confirm one's service, correspondence from professional or community organizations, testimonials or written feedback, lists of attendees, excerpts of policy or document language, signed cover pages for student theses or work, event flyers/advertisements, posters, or any other form of appropriate evidence.

5. Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, **including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity.**

V. Responsibilities In The RTP Process

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 23-24) – Section 3.0.

VI. Composition And Qualifications Of COB RTP Committees

A. Committee Membership Criteria.
A department-level RTP Committee must consist of at least three members. The College-level RTP Committee must consist of one member from each of the departments of the College. All Committee members must be tenured, full-time faculty. A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President (Collective Bargaining Agreement 15.2). However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of which, are FERP participants.

B. Promotions.
In all promotion cases, members of the committee must have a rank higher than or equal to the rank for which a Candidate is being considered.

C. Department Chair.
This same requirement applies to a Department Chair if they review the faculty member for promotion.

VII. Timelines For The RTP Process

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 23-24) – Section 4.0.

VIII. Reappointment And Promotion Criteria

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 23-24) – Section 5.0.

IX. Steps In The RTP Process.

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 23-24) – Section 6.0.

X. Additional Processes

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 23-24) – Section 7.0.

XI. Changes And Amendments To The RTP Policy

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 23-24) – Section 8.0.

XII. College Of Business Amendments

This policy may be amended as provided in the COB Constitution. Any amendment must be approved by (i) a majority of the IS Departments' tenured and tenure track faculty voting in a secret ballot, (ii) the Dean, and (iii) the Provost.