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

In this College of Education (CED) RTP Policy, portions of the University RTP Policy that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the University and College policies.

Table of Contents

7.0 Additional Processes

The College of Education (CED) Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy establishes the College *vision, mission, and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The* CED *RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.*

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

This policy begins with a description of the University Mission and Vision, the College Mission and Vision, and the guiding principles for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) in the CED.

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.

1.1.1 College Mission and Vision
Vision: Equity & Excellence in Education

Mission: The College of Education at CSULB is a learning and teaching community that prepares professional educators and practitioners who promote equity and excellence in diverse urban settings through effective pedagogy, evidence-based practices, collaboration, leadership, innovation, scholarship, and advocacy.

1.2 CED Guiding Principles for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 Faculty *dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing both the university's and college's articulated mission and vision.* Faculty members are expected to provide high quality instruction. Faculty members are also expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement of scholarship and/or pedagogy within the discipline. *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing service contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.* Faculty members should engage in

teaching, RSCA, and service activities that are guided by the college vision and mission.

The CED values faculty who link their teaching with their RSCA and their service. These linkages lead to complex and dynamic interrelationships between these 3 areas. As an example of these linkages across teaching, RSCA, and service, the CED values scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of engagement with local communities and schools as well as the development of global relationships in professional service to our fields.

Successful faculty will distribute their workload across these 3 areas but in ever-changing ways due to the complex and dynamic relationship between teaching, RSCA, and service efforts. In the narrative, the candidate should discuss any overlap between accomplishments in each of these areas due to this dynamic relationship but also clearly identify the specific contributions in each of the 3 areas of review.

1.2.2 *Decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet CED and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.*

1.2.3 *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 activity (RSCA); 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated in each of the three areas as having* 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, or 3) not met expectations.

1.2.4 *This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college needs; and university mission.* Such adjustment in workload shall be considered by the RTP committees during the evaluation process.

2.0 RTP AREAS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

In this policy, the CED defines *the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion* of faculty *in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction*

and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community and in the profession.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. In the college, instructors are encouraged to engage continually in both self-reflection on their effectiveness based on students' responses to instruction and self-assessment. In the narrative, the faculty member should share how the practice of self-reflection contributes to enhanced teaching effectiveness. Additional instructional materials that should be submitted to reflect quality of instruction include, but are not limited to, syllabi, student learning outcomes (SLOs), sample types of assessments used, and a rationale for text selection. *Instruction and instructionally-related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom.* The most highly valued instruction and instructionally-related activities are those that fulfill the college vision and mission of equity and excellence in education.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy

Effective teaching requires that faculty members adopt an instructional philosophy that fits their discipline and the needs of their students. *They should reflect on their teaching practices* as noted above *and assess their impact on student learning.* The faculty member's narrative should clearly articulate his/her instructional philosophy and how that philosophy is translated into effective, high-quality teaching.

2.1.2 Effective Teaching

Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and nonclassroom assignments. Professional development activities include but are not limited to attending workshops/conferences, working with a faculty coach/mentor, participating in the Faculty Center for Professional Development events, and reading about new and effective teaching practices. It is expected that the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher will develop over time through self-reflection, self-assessment, and professional development.

Teaching methods should be consistent with course curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences. Instructors in the CED are expected to differentiate instruction to accommodate the diverse students in their classes. Instructional practices and course materials should clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals.

Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. The narrative should summarize the faculty member's attention to these issues and discuss evidence of student learning.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by CED RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. However, student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Additional forms of evaluation may include other documented, systematic informal assessments of student response to instruction (e.g., mid-semester student evaluations), peer observations, or program exit survey data. Information on the validity and rigor of these other evaluation methods may be included in the supplemental materials.

When instructors present a critical analysis of their teaching accomplishments in their narrative, they should discuss the student ratings, including an examination of means as they compare to Department and CED means, the range of scores, the percentage of students who rate the standard evaluation elements as "agree" (4) or "strongly agree with" (5), and trends over time.   They should reflect on, including but not limited to, the impact on student evaluations of the nature of the course and content, pedagogy, rigor, class size, and undergraduate vs. graduate level courses and any specific, deliberate actions they have taken or plan to take to address student concerns.

2.1.4 Instructionally-Related Activities

Instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and department advising, and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructionally related activities may include, but are not limited to: activities involving student learning and engagement (e.g., support for student research, advisor to graduate student association, chairing theses and dissertations), and administrative assignment (e.g., program coordinator, area coordinator, assessment coordinator).

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

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 and pedagogy of the discipline. Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA.

Engagement in RSCA is understood to be a cumulative process which will span an entire career as faculty members develop their scholarly agenda. It is therefore expected that scholarly activities and publications will become increasingly substantive along a developmental continuum as careers progress. It is also expected that candidates will engage in a variety of different types of scholarly activities. Faculty of all ranks are required to have peer-reviewed scholarly publications and conference presentations that contribute to the knowledge base in their field to meet college expectations for RSCA. Additionally, faculty must demonstrate that they continue to be engaged in a wide variety of scholarly activity throughout their careers.

The most highly valued RSCA will be engagement in research that leads to peer-reviewed publications and presentations that fulfill the CED vision and mission. In addition, we value a record of scholarly activities that is varied and includes multiple types of scholarly and creative activities. This includes RSCA that, for example, reflects a traditional research paradigm, textbook development, and professional conference presentations as well as emerging paradigms including action research and scholarship of engagement. Scholarship of engagement is inquiry and creative activities undertaken collaboratively with members of a specific community in order to improve the educational opportunities and life chances of that community.

Evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments in the CED includes publications of merit reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, fellowships, grants, contracts, technical manuals and reports, action research, and scholarship of engagement as defined above.
The following is a list of most highly valued, highly valued, and valued contributions as identified by a sample of college faculty across all departments and ranks. Within each category, the list is alphabetized:

Most highly valued:
Book editor
Books and book chapters
Journal editor
Peer reviewed journal articles
Refereed conference presentations

Highly valued:
Book series editor
Conference papers

5/3/10

Conference proceedings
Fellowships awarded
Field-based research
Funding from public and private agencies and organizations
Grant administration
Grants funded
Invited conference presentations including keynotes
Invited papers and articles
Journal reviewer
Program evaluation
Technical or procedural manuals
Technical reports

Valued contributions:
Action research
Book reviews
Conference presentation proposal reviewer
Fellowship applications
Grant writing and/or participation

The faculty member's narrative should describe their scholarly agenda, the nature of their scholarly work, and its impact on the field. They should discuss how their accomplishments demonstrate intellectual and professional growth over time, and how their scholarly and creative achievements have been disseminated to appropriate audiences, including professional, practitioner, and public audiences. The narrative should describe the scope of the RSCA audience (international, national, state, or local) and relative contribution of the candidate (primary contributor vs. participant). The narrative should describe both the quality and quantity of the contributions.

In the narrative, RSCA should be shown to:
(a) contribute to the missions of the Department, College, and University;
(b) be relevant to the candidate's assignment including teaching, administration, research, college to community linkages, etc.;
(c) demonstrate continuous intellectual engagement and original contributions to the field; and
(d) represent significance to the field of study.
(e) contribute to the advancement of scholarship and/or pedagogy within the discipline.
(f)) reflect intellectual and professional growth over time.
(g) demonstrate how their scholarly activities and publications have developed over time.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the quality of their RSCA achievements, how their RSCA contributes to the advancement of scholarship and/or

5/3/10

pedagogy within discipline, how their RSCA reflects intellectual and professional growth over time, and how their scholarly activities and publications have developed over time.

Since each discipline is unique, each project differs in length of time to publish or disseminate, and in significance to the particular field of study, the candidate should articulate the scholarly merit of his/her RSCA. The candidate should also articulate future RSCA goals and activities and how his/her ongoing record aligns with the CED mission.

2.3 Service

High-quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of faculty governance and to maintain active engagement within the university, community, and profession through high quality service contributions and activities throughout their career. Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member. The most highly valued service is that which fulfills the college vision and mission.

Significant service contributions include, but are not limited to, leadership in governance activities and committees; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to University, CED, or Department policies and procedures; ongoing advising of student groups; service or leadership activities in professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community organizations. The narrative should include a description of the nature of the service at all levels and its significance. The faculty member should also describe the extent and duration of activities, positions held, and how the service activities are related to the candidate's professional field or bring substantial recognition to the university.

Examples of service contributions include, but are not limited to:

a) Service to Department, College, University
Committees: Elected, Ad Hoc, appointed
Subcommittees: Elected, Ad Hoc, appointed
Volunteer roles
Leadership roles on committees
Leadership roles within a program
Mentoring faculty (e.g., support for RSCA, peer observations of teaching)
Other (describe activities and contributions)

b) Service to the Community:
Serving on a mental health board,
Consulting in a school district,

Working with local communities to actively recruit members of under-represented groups to our programs
Promoting stronger school-family partnerships with non-native English speaking communities
Development of global initiatives
Other (describe activities and contributions)

c) Service to the Profession
Leadership roles in professional organizations
Elected positions
Committee memberships or other service to national or international professional organizations
Program review activities or participation in the development of standards for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Consulting with other IHEs overseas as they develop programs
Other (describe activities and contributions)

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the Open Period. Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair and other RTP advisory resources such as The Faculty Center for Professional Development, department RTP workshops, and department colleagues, *particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied.*

The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials (See College RTP Procedural Guide). *Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. One important part of the required documentation is a*

narrative. This narrative should describe the candidate's priorities and areas of professional emphasis, including their scholarly agenda. Other elements of the narrative have been described throughout this policy. *The narrative shall include a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instructional and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the University, community, and profession* as well as the linkages between these areas as was discussed earlier. A recommended length for the narrative is 10-20 double spaced pages, 12 point font with 1 inch margins.

Required information that the candidate must provide also *includes the summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.*

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The department shall follow the CED RTP Policy. *Department standards shall not be lower than college-level standards.*

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for analyzing critically and describing *the candidate's performance by applying* the CED RTP policy and procedural guidelines to the department review process. The committee members will then evaluate the performance as having 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, or 3) not met expectations in each area and overall.

The tenured and probationary faculty of a department shall elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4 Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance

to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee members prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the college and university processes and procedures.

Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The CED RTP policy specifies *in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with university and college missions. The CED RTP policy ensures consistency of standards across the college. College RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the Provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.*

3.6 College RTP Committee

The CED RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations, if any. *The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the college and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee shall ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the college RTP documents.* The committee members will evaluate the performance as having 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, or 3) not met expectations. *The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.*

3.7 Dean of the College

The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college

5/3/10

RTP committee, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with college and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

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

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

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

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

3.9 President

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

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary faculty undergo performance review and evaluation. Probationary 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 Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

In the first 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.

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 Probationary 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 probationary 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 as outlined in a separate Academic Senate policy document.

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he/she is making significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria outlined by the college in this document, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

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

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

5/3/10

The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality over multiple years and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue being productive. Tenure is not based solely on the quantity of scholarly output, courses taught, or committees on which one has served.

The candidate must present evidence of valued contributions in all areas and potential for ongoing professional growth that reflects the college vision and mission. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

An associate professor is expected to be an excellent teacher who is highly effective in the classroom, fosters quality learning experiences, and is responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. At this rank, the faculty member is expected to have a successful and ongoing program of RSCA. The candidate is expected to have produced high quality peer-reviewed work, which contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have made high-quality service contributions to the department and college *or the expanded community.* The service activities should reflect active participation, ongoing contributions, and initiative.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student engagement, and curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that demonstrates greater breadth and depth in their discipline and includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her 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 levels. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession. Promotion to full professor requires consistent involvement in leadership and innovation. It also requires a record of service to the department, college, university, and community.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to associate professor. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

5.5.2 Early Promotion

In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the college policies.

In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

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

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

6.1 *The Division of Academic 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 Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.*

6.3 *Departments shall post in 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 Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The department RTP committee chair prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.*

6.4 *Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the department RTP committee by the deadline.*

6.5 *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.*

6.6 *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.*

6.7 *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.*

6.8 *The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.*

6.9 *The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.*

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

5/3/10

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 package 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 At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation 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 following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any previous review levels.

7.4 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Additionally, campus administrators may make procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

The tenured and probationary faculty of CSULB, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this document.

Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

(1) A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to the chair of the Academic Senate.

(2) By action of the Academic Senate.

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

Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot

5/3/10

conducted by the Academic Senate within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the University President.

8.1 Changes to the CED RTP Policy

Changes to the *College RTP policy are subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the Provost.*

The Faculty Council shall have the power to propose changes to this CED RTP policy by a two-thirds vote of its members. Amendments may also be proposed by a petition of not less than one-third of the *voting tenured and probationary college* faculty presented to the Dean and to the chair of the Faculty Council.

All proposed changes shall be distributed during the academic year to faculty at the College meeting called for discussion of such proposals. Elections regarding proposed amendments shall be conducted via secret ballot. Ballots shall be distributed to all *voting tenured and probationary college* faculty at least 10 working days prior to the due date of those ballots. Ballots may be distributed to faculty having active on-campus appointments via their on-campus mailboxes. However, ballots for voting-eligible faculty who do not have such on-campus appointments during the term of the election (such as faculty on sabbatical) must be addressed and distributed according to the contact information on file at the Dean's Office. In order to certify an election regarding a proposed amendment, at least 2/3 of the *voting tenured and probationary college* faculty must participate in the voting regarding that amendment.

An amendment to this policy shall be adopted and become effective when it has satisfied all of the following conditions: (a) has been voted on by 2/3rds of the *voting tenured and probationary college faculty* in a certified election, (b) has received a simple majority vote of the voting faculty, (c) is approved by the Dean, and (d) and the Provost.

5/3/10