CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
SCHOOL OF NURSING
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES – MISSION STATEMENT …… 2

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION ……. 4

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities ……. 5

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA) ……10

2.3 Service ……14

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS ……18

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS ……26

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA ……28

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS ……29

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES ……30

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY ……30

APPENDIX

GUIDELINES FOR THE MINI REVIEW ……32

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
SCHOOL OF NURSING
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

School of Nursing(In Italics)
The School of Nursing and its faculty, as members of the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore, the *School of Nursing* promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to CHHS,the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the *school* establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Evaluation of faculty at all levels of review shall take into consideration the diversity of expertise within the *school* and recognizes this diversity as a source of strength that enables the school to grow in stature.

In this *School of Nursing RTP Policy*, portions of the University *and CHHS* RTP Policies that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted. *Specific requirements of the School of Nursing follow the pertinent CHHS policy and are labeled "Nursing".* Portions of the University RTP Policy not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the original University Policy.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Mission and Vision

(University) 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.

(College)In service to the university's mission, the CHHS seeks to be nationally and internationally recognized as an innovator and leader in community connections, the discovery of knowledge, and for educating diverse students in the health and human services professions.

(Nursing) The School of Nursing is a student-centered program whose mission is to educate undergraduate and graduate students to become quality professionals for entry into practice in diverse community settings.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1.2.1 (University) A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service is essential to accomplishing the articulated mission and vision of both the university and the college. Faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the academic unit (e.g., school, department, or program), college, university, community, and the profession.

1.2.2 Decisions regarding 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 differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, 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) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.

1.2.4 This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; academic unit and college needs; and university mission.

1.2.5 (College) All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the academic unit, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior.

1.3 Governing Documents

1.3.1 (College) The college adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of the Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 09-10) and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA or the university RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

1.3.2 (College) Academic units within the college shall adopt RTP policies that elaborate on discipline-specific standards in all areas of evaluation. The standards adopted at the academic-unit level shall not be lower than university-level or college-level standards. If any provision of an academic unit RTP Policy conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university

RTP Policy, or the RTP policy of the CHHS, the specific conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of the academic unit's RTP Policy, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

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

1.4 Obligations

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

1.5 Standards

(College)Recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or directors of academic units (if submitted) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit. Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

(College)RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by each academic unit. Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The RTP policy of each academic unit applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria.

1.7 Narrative

(College) In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

(College and University) In addition to following the minimum standards that have been developed by the university and the college, academic units are responsible for defining

further the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of both the university and the college. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The standards and criteria adopted at the academic-unit level shall not be lower than standards specified in this document.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

(University) Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to: curriculum development; academic and academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to: mentoring students; taking students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

(University) Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student differences.

(Nursing) To help evaluate a candidate's instructional philosophy and teaching effectiveness, candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit four types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: student evaluations, peer evaluations, course syllabi, and grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the School of Nursing's RTP committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.1(a) Hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and practice which should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials include, but are not limited to:

(1) Course materials that clearly convey to students, in

behavioral terms, the learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education.

(2) Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices, standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic responsibilities and/or individual personal growth).

(3) Evidence of up-to-date instructional methods and materials that are appropriate to the courses taught and foster student learning. *(Nursing) Examples may include but are not be limited to innovative changes in course learning activities, incorporation of new technology in the classroom, development or use of virtual learning experiences, and development or use of innovative laboratory simulations.*

Instructional methods and materials should be appropriate to the course content and objectives as specified in the Standard Course Outline (SCO) as well as appropriate to all accreditation standards including the accreditation standards of professional subspecialties in nursing.

(4)(College) Evidence of efforts to continually enhance teaching effectiveness. *(Nursing) Teaching effectiveness may be reflected in a variety of instructionally related activities such as classroom teaching, curriculum development, and development of teaching techniques to enhance student learning. Such evidence may include participation in pedagogical workshops, colloquia, conferences, round table discussion sessions, teaching retreats and teaching-learning institutes.*

(5)(College) Positive teaching evaluations as assessed by peers who visit the classroom to observe teaching style, breadth, depth, and overall effectiveness. Such evaluations of classroom performance may be conducted by peers from the academic unit, the academic unit RTP Committee, the director or chair of the academic unit, and/or faculty from other academic

units with relevant expertise who are approved by the academic unit RTP Committee. *(Nursing) Candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit at least two but not more than four peer evaluations conducted within the three years prior to the review, by different tenured colleagues at or above the candidate's rank. Peer evaluations must be based on personal observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. To standardize the type of information contained in the peer evaluation, the form in Appendix A must be used by the tenured peer evaluator to assess the candidate's teaching effectiveness.*

2.1.1b(College) Candidates for reappointment must provide evidence of either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must provide evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.1.1c Thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness are expected of all CHHS faculty. This pattern of change should be described in the candidate's narrative and documented by supporting materials. These actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

(2) Developing innovative approaches to teaching; fostering increased student learning in the classroom; and participating in the evaluation of instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.

(3) Involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for Professional Development; teaching-development seminars or conferences sponsored by the academic unit, college, university or relevant professional organizations; formal or informal

pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.

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

2.1.1d All faculty members are expected to be actively involved in instructionally-related activities outside the classroom in such areas as academic advising, field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, thesis or project supervision*(Nursing) (as chairperson or committee member), and student recruitment and/or retention efforts.*

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

(University) Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

(University) In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by academic unit and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

(College) Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with the requirements of the RTP Policy of their academic unit.

2.1.3.a In developing their RTP policies, academic units are encouraged to require:

(1) candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor to submit student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since their initial appointment; and

(2) candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor to submit student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since their last promotion review.

2.1.3.b(Nursing) The School of Nursing requires candidates to submit student evaluations for every course in which the university administered SPOT evaluations were given:

Initial appointment
Last review for a mini- evaluation
Review for retention (3rd year)
Review for tenure
Last review for promotion

2.1.3.c(College) Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.

2.1.3.d While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the academic units and/or the college for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative, overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages. Academic units within the college shall articulate this criterion.*(Nursing) Generally, teaching evaluations should be no lower than one standard deviation below the school mean on all evaluation indicators. However, an occasional course might be evaluated below this threshold. The candidate should provide a context or explanation for course evaluations below this threshold. explainable reasons.*

(1). (College) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in teaching *(Nursing) in response to feedback from peers and students* (College) or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

(2) (College) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

(3) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.1.3.e Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other

information—does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. For this reason, candidates must present other information, such as their syllabi, grade distributions, and peer evaluations of instruction.

(1.) (Nursing) Nursing is an applied discipline in a rapidly changing health care environment. This necessitates the nurse educator to maintain clinical currency. Enrollment in certificate programs, continuing education workshops, updates in clinical practice, or advanced academic courses that are clinically focused are examples of on-going professional development that can be described in terms of teaching effectiveness.

(2).(Nursing) Teaching effectiveness can also be evaluated by students' written comments. The university standard evaluation form provides an anonymous opportunity for students to write comments on the back. Candidates are not required to submit the written comments from the students in their evaluated courses. However, if candidates chose to submit the comments, all of the comments from the evaluated course must be submitted.

(3)(Department) Unsolicited student feedback may be included as supplemental attachments and further evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

(University) 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.

(College) Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to: books, journal articles that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly book chapters that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, artistic exhibits or performances, and awarded grants or contracts, as required by their individual academic units.

(Nursing) Nursing is a profession that has many specialties/ subspecialties and RSCA encompasses a variety of different approaches. These varied specialties use a diverse array of methodologies that are all equally valued. The RSCA activities must be relevant to the candidate's specialty/subspecialty within the discipline. Advances in nursing knowledge have the potential for improving the quality of life.

(Nursing) RSCA represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and beneficial components of an academician's role. Scholarly activities enable professions to create their own visions of the future. For these reasons, the faculty in the School of Nursing are expected to be engaged in an ongoing program of RSCA which demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application and/or pedagogy of the profession. RSCA that impact the discipline include the development of the following:

Theory
Empirical data
New discoveries
Expanding existing knowledge
Developing new insights or methods of integrating what is currently known
Methodological innovation
Clinical innovation
Creative clinical strategies and modalities

(Nursing) Across successive publications and creative works, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (as opposed to multiple dissemination of similar work).

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines

(College) Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Consistent with University expectations of all faculty members, RTP candidates within the CHHS must demonstrate achievements in the area of research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in this Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in the RTP policies of their respective academic unit(s). When developing such policies, academic units shall incorporate the standards specified below in subsections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

2.2.2 Research

(College) Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, clinical, and/or other discipline-appropriate research, as well as other scholarly and creative activities consistent with the specific requirements in the RTP policy of their academic units.

2.2.2 a (College) As used in this document, "research" involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as, where appropriate, legal or policy analysis, clinical practice scholarship, or secondary data analysis) that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment or qualitative research methods such as critical and interpretive theory.

2.2.2.b (College) Other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, and article reviews) are valued and strengthen the candidate's portfolio. These types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the college RSCA standards required for favorable

reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate.

2.2.2.c (College) Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank.

2.2.2.d (College) Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.

2.2.2.e (Nursing) Although scholarly activities in the School of Nursing take many forms, faculty members must develop a scholarly agenda and a record of scholarly publication that follows the pursuit of that agenda. The product of that agenda, the faculty member's RSCA, must make an impact on the profession. The following RSCA standards provide the foundation for the evaluation of the candidates' RSCA.

(1) Quality work as judged by one's peers
(2) Extent of recognition of the work in the profession
(3) Sustained effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment
(4) The impact of the RSCA on the profession

Copies of all such scholarly work must be submitted so that the School RTP Committee may review the quality of the work.

External review of a candidate's materials may be requested. See current senate policy on External Evaluation.

2.2.2.f (Nursing) An important element of any evaluation is the faculty member's future plans and goals. While primary focus is clearly on accomplished contributions during the probationary years, it is important to respect and support continued scholarly activity after the award of tenure and promotion. While the focus of scholarly activity can be expected to change with professorial maturation through an academic career, continuity, reflection, and growth are expected to persist. Towards these ends:

1. (Nursing) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to formulate and pursue a scholarly agenda.

2.(Nursing) The progression to reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires that the candidate's RSCA show

progression of that agenda as evidenced by publications in suitable, scholarly venues (as described in Dissemination, 2.2.3 below).

3.(Nursing) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained pattern of achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly record.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA

(College) Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to disseminate their research and other scholarly and creative activities to appropriate audiences through discipline-specific (or relevant interdisciplinary), peer reviewed publications and scholarly presentations. In their RTP policies, academic units shall explain their disciplinary norms and standards for the production and dissemination of RSCA as well as specific criteria for evaluating the quantity and quality of candidates' RSCA contributions.

(College) Publication of scholarly and creative works in peer reviewed journals is required of all candidates. The RTP policy of each academic unit shall detail the unit's specific publication requirements.

2.2.3.a (Nursing) Scholarly publications –The quality of the work is defined by its significance in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to validate the work's significance. Normally, this means that the finished works will be published and/or disseminated in a respected venue consistent with accepted professional/disciplinary standards

(Nursing) Faculty are expected to be working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals for editorial consideration in their first two years following appointment. By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment in the third probationary year, it is expected that the candidate will have at least one peer-reviewed journal article either in print or formally accepted for publication. This is a minimum qualification and should not be viewed as a limit. Exceeding this baseline expectation by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

(Nursing) After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period (years four through six), faculty should demonstrate continued progress in publishing in peer reviewed journals.

(Nursing) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have consistently maintained their scholarly activity with publication, and to have demonstrated the ability through sustained effort and direct involvement to bring significant projects to fruition thereby establishing an on-going record of accomplishment. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will generally be expected to have progressed in publication in appropriate peer-reviewed journals since the last promotion, being always mindful

that quality is more important than quantity. Multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner may not be regarded as high quality scholarship.

2.2.3. b (Nursing) Criteria for the Evaluation of Specific Published Forms of RSCA – Faculty in the School of Nursing should produce a core of disciplinary scholarship disseminated in nationally-recognized outlets such as peer-reviewed professional journals, scholarly books, textbooks, chapters in edited volumes, and contributions to well-known professional publications. The following guidelines should be used by the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the various outlets for dissemination:

(1). Authorship – For publications with multiple authors, the amount or nature of the faculty author's contributions should be specified

(2). Refereed (peer-reviewed) Journal Articles – Any professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal should be specified

(3). Publishing in well-respected, top-tier journals constitutes evidence of strong scholarly achievement.

(4). Books can be assessed by the standing of the publishers in the academic discipline, published reviews and/or size of readership.

(5). Peer –reviewed and documented conference proceedings and presentations strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank. However, conference presentations alone do not constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

2.3 Service

(University) 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.

2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments

(College) All CHHS faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance through service to their academic units, the college, and the university. Additionally, CHHS faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession.

2.3.1.a The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience.

(1) During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in college and university service; however, they are expected to perform quality service at the academic unit level.

(2)(Nursing) Examples of Quality service to the School of Nursing include, but are not limited to:

(a). Membership/ participation in standing and ad hoc committees, as assigned

(b).Participation in authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the School of Nursing

(c).Participation in professional development opportunities sponsored by the School of Nursing

(d).Participation in student activities such as thesis, directed project, comprehensive examination, student organizations, and/or honor societies

(e).Student advisement

During the first three years, probationary faculty are not expected to assume committee leadership roles and should do so only if their research, scholarly and creative activities and instructional effectiveness have reached the levels required for reappointment.

2.3.1.b(College) For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to their academic unit and to the college. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have made quality service contributions to the community and/or to the profession.

(Nursing) Quality contributions to the School of Nursing (in addition to those indicated above) include leadership positions on standing and/or ad hoc committees as assigned and voluntary membership on various working groups and task forces.

Evidence of specific contributions to school and college committees, rather than just membership, is needed to establish the quality of service contributions. University level service is desirable but not required.

2.3.1. c (College) For promotion to the rank of Full Professor (consistent with Section 5.4 of the University RTP policy and Section 5.4 of the Policy governing the CHHS), faculty members are required

to have provided significant, quality service and leadership in their academic unit, colleges, and at the university, as well as a sustained pattern of quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession. In their RTP policies, academic units shall articulate the requirement for "significant, quality service and leadership" within the context of their specific program, department, or school.

(Nursing) Examples of significant, quality service and leadership to the School of Nursing include, but are not limited to:

(a.) Leadership positions at the College and/or University level

(b). A sustained record of leadership by chairing standing and ad hoc committees within the School of Nursing

(c). Assuming leadership positions in other areas of faculty governance

(d). Service to colleagues such as site visits, classroom observations, making recommendations for improving teaching effectiveness, mentoring faculty through the RTP process, and co-authoring publications

(e). Creating or significantly contributing to revising program curricula, documents, reports, policies, procedures, and position statements .

2.3.1.d (College) If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member. Such community service may include consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations. Academic units must make clear the types of community service that are appropriate to their discipline, as well as the criteria for the evaluation of quality community service.

(Nursing) It is the faculty's responsibility to provide service to the community at the local, state, national, and/or global levels and to provide evidence of specific contributions. This service may be to the professional community of the faculty member or to the lay community, depending on the interest and attributes of the individual faculty member. Examples of quality community service include, but are not limited to:

(1). Membership on advisory boards of health related organizations
(2). Presentation of health related topics to community organizations

(3). Direct delivery of health care to individuals, families, and/or the community

(4). Participation in health fairs, health clinics, health promotion events, school health events, community health events, disaster preparedness simulations, immunization clinics

(5). Authoring short health articles for newsletters, newspapers, brochures, handouts, fact sheets, and electronic information sources

2.3.1.e (College) Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected professional offices. Academic units must make clear the types of professional service that are appropriate to their discipline, as well as the criteria for the evaluation of quality professional service.

(Nursing) Examples of quality service to the profession include, but are not limited to:

(1). Membership /participation in professional health or nursing organizations

(2). Leadership roles in professional health or nursing organizations (chairperson, officer, coordinator, organizer, panel or roundtable leader, moderator, workshop chair, group leader)

(3). Committee appointments and participation in professional health or nursing organizations

(4). Serving on governing boards appropriate to the discipline

(5). Participation in the authorship of professional organization's documents, reports, policies and procedures, position statements, standards and protocols

(6). Instructional/advisory services to the profession

(7). Participation in academic or nursing practice related consultancies or advisory groups

(8). Authoring recurrent features, sections, departments or columns (such as clinical pearls, editorials, viewpoints, note

worthy news, anecdotal experiences, biographical sketches) in a professional journal

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments

(College) The quality of contributions to service is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in Section 2.3.1. Academic units shall specify criteria appropriate to their academic missions that meet or exceed the standards for service set forth in this Policy.

(Nursing) Service must directly invoke the academic and professional expertise of the faculty member. The service may be paid or unpaid, but must be consistent with the mission of the School of Nursing and its instructional program.

2.4 Evaluation of Service

2.4.1 Candidate's Responsibility

(College) The candidate must provide a documented narrative of his or her service contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative criteria in his/her narrative.

(a) Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance in addition to documenting their attendance and participation.

(b) Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.

2.4.2 Quality of Participation

(College) The evaluation of service shall be based on the quality and significance of the service activity. Relevant factors include, but are not limited to, the nature of the service commitment; the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, College, and/or academic unit; the depth/extent of the candidate's involvement and contribution to the service activity; and the degree of the candidate's leadership in the service activity.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

(University) Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the academic unit, the academic unit RTP committee, the chair or director of the academic unit, 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 RTP committee of the academic unit, the chair or director of the academic unit, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP shall make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the chair or director of his/her academic unit, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of his or her accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all information and supporting materials specified in all applicable RTP policies. The candidate must clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. It is recommended that the narrative be between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Academic Unit RTP Policy

Each academic unit shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Academic unit standards shall not be lower than the university- and college-level standards. The RTP policy of each academic unit is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the specific academic unit and to approval by the college faculty council, the Dean, and the Provost. Academic unit RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the academic unit's tenured and probationary faculty.

3.3 Academic Unit RTP Committee

The academic unit 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. Academic unit RTP committee members are responsible for critically analyzing the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the academic unit. The committee shall forward its evaluation and recommendation with supporting materials to the college RTP committee.

3.3.1 Election of Committee

The tenured and probationary faculty members of an academic unit elect representatives to their unit's RTP committee.

(a) The committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be comprised of tenured Associate and Full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be comprised of tenured Full Professors.

(b) Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on an academic unit RTP committee.

(c) Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP committees of academic units if elected by a majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the President. However, academic unit RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

(d) Chairs or directors of academic units may serve as members of their unit RTP committee, if elected. However, if they serve as a member of the academic unit RTP committee, they may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this document. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, chairs or directors of academic units may not sit with an academic unit RTP committee during the time that it is considering his or her own materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

3.3.2 Committee Composition

(a) Members of academic unit RTP committees who participate in promotion recommendations must not only be tenured, but also must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. Moreover, they must not themselves be candidates for promotion.

(b) Within each academic unit, all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

(a) The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.

(b) Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations.

3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

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

3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

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

(a) Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.

(b) After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election.

3.3.6 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy Statement 94-11.

3.4 Chair or Director of the Academic Unit

The chair or director of the academic unit (hereinafter referred to as “the chair”) is responsible for communicating the academic unit, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with academic unit expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college and/or academic unit mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

3.4.1 Meeting with Committee

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

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by Director or Chair

Directors or chairs of academic units may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the director or chair is elected to the RTP committee of their academic unit. However, in promotion considerations, a director or 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 director or chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4.3 Candidate’s Rights

At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the candidate’s file and also be sent to all previous levels of review. This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.

3.5 College RTP Policy

This document serves as the official college RTP policy. It shall be interpreted to ensure consistency of standards across the college to the

maximum extent possible in light of the breadth of disciplinary diversity and expertise within the CHHS.

3.5.1 Ratification

The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members with the CHHS, and to approval by the Dean and the Provost.

3.5.2 Review for Currency

The college RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate, the RTP committees of academic units within the college, and, when submitted, the evaluations and recommendations of chairs or directors of academic units.

3.6.1 Duties

The college RTP committee shall conduct evaluations of all candidates' files in accordance with Section 3.6.6 of this document, which shall include a recommendation to the college Dean for a personnel action in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.

3.6.2 Membership

The college RTP committee shall consist of five (5) tenured, full-time faculty members, each of whom holds the rank of Professor.

3.6.3 Election, Service, and Terms

(a) Members of the college RTP committee shall be elected by secret ballot of the college faculty.

(b) There shall be no more than one member from any one academic unit.

(c) Members shall serve staggered, two-year terms.

(d) Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e., more than four consecutive years). After one year has elapsed, an individual is again eligible to be elected to serve on the college RTP committee.

3.6.4 Vacancies

In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the college RTP committee, either a meeting of the college faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the office of the Dean of the

college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).

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

3.6.6 Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files

(a) The college RTP committee shall evaluate all candidates' files in accordance with standards established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university.

(b) The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the academic unit's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.

(c) The college committee shall prepare and forward an independent, written evaluation to the college Dean concerning each RTP candidate. The evaluation must conclude with a personnel action recommendation in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.

3.6.7 Recommendations

(a) For all candidates seeking reappointment or tenure, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit as part of its evaluation of the candidate and recommend whether reappointment or tenure should be granted or denied.

(b) For all candidates seeking promotion, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit and make a positive or negative recommendation with respect to the proposed action.

(c) The college RTP Committee shall forward to the Dean the entire candidate file, including its own evaluations and recommendations and those from the academic unit.

(d) The college committee shall inform all candidates of the committee's recommendation in writing.

3.7 Dean of the College

The Dean has a unique role in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college.

3.7.1 General Responsibilities

The Dean mentors the chairs and directors of academic units regarding their roles in the RTP process; encourages academic units to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance; provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee; and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with the policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university. The Dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

3.7.2 Responsibilities with Regard to RTP Recommendations

The Dean shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations and recommendations from academic units and the college RTP committee, and provide a written, independent recommendation to the Provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier in Sections 2.1 to 2.3.3.

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 academic units' 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 tenure-track faculty members 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

4.1.1 Periodic Review

In the first year and second years of service, as well as in successive probationary years during which a candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The periodic review is conducted by the academic unit RTP committee, the chair or director of the academic unit, and the college Dean. The periodic review provides guidance for professional development, especially with regard to the candidate's progress toward reappointment and, later, tenure. Thus, periodic reviews shall commend probationary faculty member for meeting or exceeding expectations in the relevant areas of review, while providing written guidance for making improvements in areas which need strengthening.

4.1.2 Reappointment Review

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 the rank of Professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured Associate Professor, however, may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in accordance with the provisions of 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 relevant Academic Senate policy documents.

5.0 APPOINTMENT 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 or she is making significant progress toward tenure. Based upon criteria established by the academic unit and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in 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 academic unit level and consistent with academic unit and college service expectations.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

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

Tenure is based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of high quality 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 meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, college, and the university. For review of an Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to the rank of 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 university or the expanded community.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Standards for promotion to the rank of 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 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, as well as either in the community or to the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate shall receive initial guidance from the chair or director of his or her academic unit and the 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 the rank of Associate Professor. Tenured Associate Professors may apply for early promotion to the rank of Full Professor. However, non-tenured faculty members who hold the rank of Associate Professor 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 academic unit and 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 Academic units shall post in their offices 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 chairperson of the academic unit RTP committee 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 academic unit RTP committee by the deadline.

6.5 The academic unit 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 chair or director of the academic unit, if eligible and if not an elected member of the academic unit RTP committee, may review 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

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 be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as 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 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

8.1 Ratification

This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members in the School of Nursing and to approval by the Faculty Council, Dean, and the Provost.

8.2 Amendments

Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the entire full-time tenured and probationary School faculty. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Chair of the School shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the tenured and probationary faculty members in the School at least two weeks (i.e., 14 calendar days) prior to voting.

8.2.1 Voting on Amendments

Voting on amendments shall be by secret ballot prior to the close of the preceding academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CSU/CFA Bargaining Agreement.

8.2.2 Majority Needed to Adopt

To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured and probationary faculty members and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8.2.3 Voting Rights

All tenured and probationary School faculty members, including those on leave and FERP are eligible to vote.

APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MINI REVIEW

Mini review of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the School of Nursing, the School Chair, and the College Dean. The University approved form for evaluation must be used. The candidate will be evaluated in the following areas of activity.

(1) instruction and instructionally-related activities;
(2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and
(3) department, college, university, community, and professional service.

Candidates for mini-review are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini review or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).

To assist the School of Nursing RTP Committee in conducting a mini review of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit:

1. An updated, current Professional Data Sheet (PDS);

2. A narrative that reflects and explains the candidate's accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation since the last review.

The content of the narrative should express the candidate's philosophy of pedagogy and student learning, as well as examples of how the candidate incorporates these tenets into his/her teaching and course design. The narrative must also contain a discussion of the planned program of scholarly research as well as current progress in achieving the goals set forth in the plan. It is important that specific goals and plans - both current and future - be clearly articulated and documented in order to validate the progression from intent to production of tangible outcomes. This should include not only a written plan of research activity, but also some indication of how data for empirically-based research may be derived or obtained. Finally, the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period should be explained.

2. Student Evaluations

a) Probationary Faculty Prior to Initial Reappointment - In accordance with School of Nursing RTP Policy, must submit copies of student evaluation summaries for all courses in which the university administered SPOT evaluations were given. In addition, candidates must submit a summary table of their student evaluations from all sections of all courses evaluated since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses that are subsequently evaluated by students. The table should be presented as follows:

Table 1: Summary of Student Feedback on Teaching

Course No.	No. of Stdnts Enroll	Acad Sem	No. of Stdnts Respond	Lect Mean	Lect SD*	School Mean	School SD	College Mean	College SD*
					.				

b) Probationary Faculty Following Initial Reappointment - Following reappointment, copies of student evaluations for all courses in which the university administered SPOT evaluations were given must be submitted.

3. Peer-Evaluations - Candidates for mini review must submit peer evaluations of teaching that were conducted within the year prior to the application. Candidates should have at least one peer-evaluation from tenured faculty each semester they teach. Ideally, candidates should ask for a peer evaluation each semester that he/she teaches a course to show that growth, development, or consistency exists in the candidate's teaching. Such evaluations may be conducted by faculty members in the School or qualified faculty members from other departments/schools who are approved by a majority vote of the School of Nursing RTP Committee. Experts in the relevant sub field may also provide additional evaluations of the content of a candidate's teaching.

4. Syllabi - Syllabi from all courses taught in the period of review must be submitted. Only one syllabus per discrete course should be submitted, not multiple copies of syllabi used in different sections or semesters. An exception to this rule, however, is if the candidate has made substantial changes to a syllabus in response to suggestions from students or peers. In such an event, candidates should submit "before" and "after" copies as evidence of efforts to improve courses. Candidates should make sure that their syllabi conform to current senate policy.

5. Table of Grade Distributions - Candidates must submit their grade distributions *in summary tabular form* from all sections of all courses taught since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses taught. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 2: Summary of Grade Distributions

Date	Course Number	A (n)	B (n)	C (n)	D (n)	F (n)	W (n)	CR (n)	NC (n)	RP (n)	Total *H* (%)	Mean Class GPA	Mean School GPA
											(100%)		
											(100%)		
											(100%)		
											(100%)		
											(100%)		
											(100%)		
											(100%)		

6. Scholarly Publications - Materials submitted by candidates must document their scholarly publication record. During mini reviews, candidates should include copies of papers presented at conferences; manuscripts under review with pertinent evaluative comments from peer reviewers; preprints of articles accepted for publication along with the letter of acceptance; reprints of articles that have been published; proposals for funded research; and letters documenting service as an editor or peer-reviewer. When submitting published articles, a copy of the cover of the journal as well as any published information regarding the pre-publication review process, journal audience, and publication frequency should be submitted.

7. Documenting Service - Candidates during mini reviews need not submit any documentation of service; simply listing such service on their updated Professional Data Sheet (PDS) is sufficient. Candidates are well advised, however, to be careful to keep such documentation since it is required to be submitted as part of a candidate's RTP file for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.