CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

PREAMBLE

The ability of a college to serve fully its university community, to progress in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and to achieve excellence in these endeavors depends upon the individual and collective performance of the faculty. Therefore, the success and reputation of a college are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among its faculty and the effectiveness with which these talents are utilized to accomplish the mission of the college.

To achieve and maintain high quality, an effective faculty evaluation process is essential. The objective of the RTP process should be the evaluation of the professional development of a faculty member in the teaching and learning process, research and scholarly activities, and leadership in service. The faculty review process should also encourage professional growth, excellence in performance, and continuous improvement, while permitting appropriate recognition of achievements. The core emphasis of the faculty review process should be the quality of performance, with measureable effects on academic and professional growth as well as the advancement of the missions of the college and the university.

This document is the College of Engineering Policy for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) for the Engineering and Computer Science tenured and probationary faculty. This policy was developed in accordance with University RTP Policy (PS 09-10), which governs and supersedes the College Policy. Additionally, the RTP Policy for the College of Engineering (COE) faculty should be in compliance with the Unit 3 (faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA).

The objectives of this policy are to:
- further articulate and define areas and standards for evaluating COE faculty as described in the university policy
- provide guidelines for candidates, departments, review committees, and administrators in understanding the specific standards appropriate for RTP considerations in the College of Engineering
- encourage fair and equitable college standards

This policy recognizes the diversity of departments and programs within the College and considers the needs and priorities of each department, while providing guidelines for the development of department policies and appropriate evaluation criteria. It requires that each department provide a greater level of specificity of standards and criteria.

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The College of Engineering is dedicated to excellence in all three areas of faculty evaluation: instruction and instructionally-related activities; research, scholarly and creative activities; service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The COE RTP process is intended to be a rigorous assessment of the faculty in all three areas of evaluation, while fully acknowledging that the strength of the College is derived from the diversity of its members and their individual, unique contributions to the mission and goals of the College. In this context, the process of faculty reviews and evaluations within all COE departments shall include:

- clarity of expectations and responsibilities
- consistent standards
- constructive and proactive evaluation
- formative feedback
- objective appraisal by peers and students

The College values diversity in the methods which a faculty member develops in order to excel in his or her academic career while contributing to the collective success of the department, the College, and the University. In line with the COE's mission and vision, the College RTP process shall recognize and encourage:
- excellence in instruction and in research and scholarly and creative activities
- commitment to teaching and learning
- professional development and involvement in professional activities
- student success
- collegiality and professionalism
- assessment for continuous improvement
- service to the College, University, community, and profession

2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION AND REVIEW

Faculty shall be evaluated in the following areas:
- Instruction and instructionally-related activities
- Research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)
- Service

2.1 INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Effective teaching is critical to the mission of the COE and the success of Engineering and Computer Science programs and their students. All faculty members are expected to teach courses with appropriate content, communicate course objectives clearly, and demonstrate learning objectives via appropriate assessment methods. Evaluative areas should include but are not limited to:

- Student teaching evaluations of the instructor
- Organization and quality of teaching materials and methods
- Improving and updating curriculum, including developing new courses and laboratories, providing innovative approaches to teaching, and contributing to an enhanced learning environment

Each department should consider additional areas of evaluation as appropriate, such as class visits and other peer evaluations; educational or instructionally-related materials (such as textbooks, monographs, lab manuals, software, etc); arranging field trips and industrial tours to enhance student learning; supervision of student projects, directed studies, theses and dissertations; effective incorporation of research results into teaching; use of best practices in student advising and mentoring; contributions to student success; responding to industry needs.

2.2 RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)

Engineering and computer science are dynamic, fast developing, and constantly evolving fields of study. Consequently, research and scholarly activities and achievements are critical to the development of the faculty in the College of Engineering. The contribution to research and scholarly activities provides the faculty with insight and knowledge that can be applied to curricular development and classroom presentation, as well as expanding the student learning experience by engaging them in the research and publication process.

Every member of the COE faculty is expected to develop an ongoing research program and make significant contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, with evidence of success in the research community through a peer review process. Evaluative areas should include but are not limited to:

- Refereed journal and refereed conference publications appropriate to the discipline (departments may determine the appropriate journals and conferences depending on their weight, circulation, significance, impact, or other criteria)
- Research grants received and peer-reviewed research proposals submitted
- Supervision of student research projects

Each department should consider additional areas of evaluation as appropriate, such as scholarly contributions to teaching and research including textbooks, monographs, book chapters and/or other similar publications; patents awarded; conference and seminar presentations and invited talks; technical/industrial reports, book reviews, industrial standards/manuals, notes and review articles in technical journals; citation of research by international authors; research awards, recognitions and honors by professional societies, government agencies, and industry; development of software/hardware systems; research collaboration with academic, professional organizations, and industry; research fellowships and other recognitions.

2.3 SERVICE

COE faculty are expected to demonstrate commitment to the mission and the goals of department, College, University, community, and profession. Evaluative areas should include but are not limited to:

- Active participation and appropriate leadership roles in the department, College, and University committees, task forces, and other faculty governance activities
- Participation in professional activities such as serving as a chair/organizer of a professional meeting, technical program committee member, or professional society officer
- Participation and engagement in community activities and services

Each department should consider additional areas of evaluation as appropriate, such as student advising; effective participation and contributions in university councils/committees, academic senate, special-purpose ad hoc committees and task forces; serving as faculty advisor for student chapters of professional societies; other professional leadership roles; serving as editor of professional journals and/or conference proceedings; serving as reviewer of papers, proposals, and textbook manuscripts; serving as external evaluator for academic and accreditation bodies; leadership roles in community service such as initiation of a new collaborative program, response to societal needs, as well as other professional and service collaborations.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES

As stated in Section 3 of the University RTP Policy.

4. TIMELINES FOR RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 4 of the University RTP Policy.

5. REVIEW CRITERIA

5.1 Reappointment
The candidate must demonstrate:
1. Effective teaching, as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.1 above and Section 5.1 of university policy.
2. Research progress and promise as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.2 above and Section 5.1 of university policy.
3. Service as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.3 above and Section 5.1 of university policy.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department policy.

5.2 Tenure

The candidate must demonstrate:
1. Effective teaching, as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.1 above and Section 5.2 of university policy, as well as the promise and evidence of continued growth and fulfillment of programmatic needs after awarding of tenure.
2. Research progress and accomplishment as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.2 above and Section 5.2 of university policy, as well as evidence of continued and sustained growth in research and scholarly activities.
3. Service as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.3 above and Section 5.2 of university policy.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department policy.

5.3 Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate must demonstrate:
1. Effective teaching, as evidenced and documented in Section 2.1 above and Section 5.3 of university policy as well as establishment of one's teaching area.
2. Research progress and promise as evidenced and documented in Section 2.2 above and Section 5.3 of university policy, as well as establishment of one's research area.
3. Service as evidenced by and documented in Section 2.3 above and Section 5.3 of university policy.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department policy.

5.4 Promotion to Professor

The candidate must demonstrate:
1. Consistent record of excellence in teaching, as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.1 above and Section 5.4 of university policy.
2. Proven research achievements and high quality contributions to the field as evidenced by and documented according to section 2.2 above and Section 5.4 of university policy.
3. Significant service and leadership to university, community and/or profession as evidenced by and documented according to Section 2.3 above and the Section 5.4 of the university policy.

Moreover, the candidate shall have reached a level of excellence in one or more of the areas of instruction, research and scholarly activities, or service.

Specific criteria and requirements should be specified by department policy.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

Early tenure and/or early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and college dean regarding requirements, criteria, and expectations for early tenure and/or early promotion. The candidate must satisfy criteria stated in the university policy Section 5.5 (5.5.1 for early tenure and/or 5.5.2 for early promotion as applicable). Candidates for early tenure and/or early promotion are strongly encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the University Policy on External Evaluation.

6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 6 of the University RTP Policy.

7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

As stated in Section 7 of the University RTP Policy.

8. CHANGES TO COE RTP POLICY

Changes to the COE RTP Policy may occur as a result of:

8.1 Changes in the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), as well as changes in the University RTP Policy and/or Procedures
8.2 Amendments approved by the majority vote of the COE tenured and probationary faculty and approved by the College Dean and the University Provost

Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and probationary faculty to the College Dean

2. By action of the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC)