

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

(Supersedes PS 96-12)

The following policy was recommended by the Academic Senate on December 11, 2008
and received the President's concurrence on April 6, 2009.

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the mission, vision, and guiding principles for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members (including coaches, librarians, and Counseling and Psychological Services faculty) eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The university RTP policy also specifies the process by which faculty work shall be evaluated.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 University Mission and Vision

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

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university's articulated mission and vision. CSULB 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 department, college, university, community, and the profession.

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 department, 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 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.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) 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

48 Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally-
49 related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom.
50 Instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and
51 departmental advising, supervision of student research and fieldwork, direction of student performances and
52 exhibitions, and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructional
53 activities may include, but are not limited to, student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

54 2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

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

61 62 2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

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

66 2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

67 In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and college RTP policy documents,
68 student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Student course evaluations
69 alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation
70 form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any
71 single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide
72 sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

73 2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

74 Departments and colleges shall develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA.
75 The University RTP policy provides a guiding framework for this charge.

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

79 Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Evidence of research, scholarly and creative
80 activities and accomplishments includes, but is not limited to, publications of merit reviewed by professional peers,
81 scholarly presentations, fellowships, grants, contracts, scholarship of engagement, and artistic exhibits and
82 performances. These achievements must be reviewed by professional peers and disseminated to appropriate
83 audiences.

84 2.3 Service

85 High-quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and
86 activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to
87 participate in the collegial processes of faculty governance and to maintain active engagement within the
88 university, community, and profession through high-quality service contributions and activities throughout their
89 career. Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member.

90 Departments and colleges shall develop their own standards and criteria for the evaluation of quality service.
91 These standards and criteria shall be based in a comparative evaluation of responsibility and commitment across
92 service obligations at the department, college, and university levels. Departments and colleges shall then make

93 clear to the candidate what types of service are appropriate to faculty rank and experience. Examples of service
94 contributions may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles in faculty governance activities and committees;
95 authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures;
96 ongoing advising of student groups; service or leadership activities for professional organizations or boards;
97 conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community organizations.
98

99 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

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

104 The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to
105 provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

106 Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and
107 recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP
108 committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for
109 Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external
110 reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

111 **3.1 Candidate**

112 A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, particularly
113 regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates have the
114 primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's
115 documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. Candidate should clearly reference
116 and explain all supporting materials.

117 The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review,
118 including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1)
119 instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or
120 profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from
121 student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews
122 and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

123 **3.2 Department RTP Policy**

124 The department shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of
125 candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards shall not be lower than college-level standards.
126 The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary department
127 faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the Provost. Department RTP
128 policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenured and probationary faculty.

129 **3.3 Department RTP Committee**

130 The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the
131 initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
132 Department RTP committee members are responsible for analyzing critically the candidate's performance by
133 applying the criteria of the department.

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

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

141 3.4 Department Chair

142 The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to
143 candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent
144 with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for
145 talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

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

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

153 3.5 College RTP Policy

154 The college RTP policy shall specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas
155 of evaluation, consistent with university and college missions. The college RTP policy shall ensure consistency of
156 standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the standards appropriate to the
157 breadth of disciplines in the college.

158 College RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty
159 members and to approval by the dean and the Provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the
160 tenured and probationary faculty of the college.

161 3.6 College RTP Committee

162 The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP
163 committee and department chair evaluations and recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the
164 candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies.
165 The college RTP committee shall ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college
166 levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee
167 shall take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.

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

169 3.7 Dean of the College

171 The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The
172 dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and
173 clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, and
174 ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The
175 dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

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

178 3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

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

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

183

184 3.9 President

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

187 **4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

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

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

194 4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

195 In the first year and second years of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review. The
196 periodic review provides the candidate with feedback on progress toward tenure. The periodic review is conducted
197 by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the college dean.

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

200 4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

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

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

207 4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

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

211 A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the
212 faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in a
213 separate Academic Senate policy document.

214

215 **5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA**

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

218

219 5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

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

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

228 5.2 Awarding of Tenure

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

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

235 The candidate must present evidence of meeting the required tenure criteria in all three areas of
236 evaluation as established in the RTP policies of the department, college, and the university. For review of an
237 assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor normally are awarded together.

238 5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

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

246 5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

247 Standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate
248 professor. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in teaching, student
249 engagement, and curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that
250 includes high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or
251 interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-
252 reviewed work at the national or international levels. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant
253 service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession.

254 5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

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

261 5.5.1 Early Tenure

262 Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three
263 areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year
264 timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire
265 confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue. In addition, candidates for early tenure
266 are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on
267 external evaluation.

268 5.5.2 Early Promotion

269 In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor,
270 a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial
271 ways the requirements established in the department and college policies.
272 In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process
273 according to the Academic Senate policy on external evaluation.

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

283 **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

284
285
286 6.1 The Division of Academic Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including deadlines for the
287 submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period, completion of all RTP reviews by all review
288 levels, and final decision notification to the candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be
289 consistent with the requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

290
291 6.2 The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for review and specifies items
292 required to be provided by all candidates.

293
294 6.3 Departments shall post in the department office a list of candidates being considered for reappointment,
295 tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open period provided by the Office of Academic
296 Affairs and consistent with the requirements of the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to
297 the candidate. The department RTP committee chair prepares an index of the materials submitted during the open
298 period to be included in the candidate's file.

299
300 6.4 Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the department RTP committee by the deadline.

301
302 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.

303
304 6.6 The department chair, if eligible and if not an elected member of the department RTP committee, reviews the
305 candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level
of review by the deadline.

306
307 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.

308
309 6.8 The dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation
to the Provost by the deadline.

310
311 6.9 The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and
312 recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with
respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

313
314 The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding
315 reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

316 **7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

317
318 7.1 Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any
319 level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

320
321 7.2 If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP
322 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.

323 7.3 At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing
324 the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The
325 candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days
326 following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the
327 RTP package and also be sent to any previous review levels.
328

329 7.4 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with
330 Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

331 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

332 Changes to CSULB RTP procedures may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining
333 Agreement (CBA). Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural changes to accommodate the
334 university calendar or other campus needs. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.
335 The tenured and probationary faculty of CSULB, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached),
336 may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this document.
337 Amendments may be proposed either by the following:

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

340 (2) By action of the Academic Senate.

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

344 Amendments to this document shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a
345 majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the Academic Senate
346 within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the University
347 President.
348

349
350 **EFFECTIVE: Fall 2009**

351