

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
Department of Family and Consumer Sciences
College of Health and Human Services
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) and its faculty are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore, FCS promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the department 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 College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) and recognize this diversity as a source of strength that enables the college to grow in stature.

In this Department RTP Policy the CHHS document serves as the foundation. Portions of the University RTP Policy that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted. All University RTP Policy insertions in the College RTP Policy are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the University and College policies. 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

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. 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.

The Mission of the department of FCS is to prepare leaders for the Family and Consumer Sciences professions.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1.2.1 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 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 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 *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 *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

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

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 ongoing excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

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

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. Thus, it should address not only achievements, but also responsiveness to comments made by previous reviewers (with the exception of the initial candidate's review).

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

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

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; community outreach; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

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.

- (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.*

(4) *Evidence of efforts to continually enhance teaching effectiveness. These actions are especially encouraged for those with low teaching evaluations.*

(5) *Positive teaching evaluations as assessed by peers who visit the classroom to observe teaching style, breadth, depth, and overall effectiveness. Candidates shall explain how the peer reviewer was chosen and the nature of their professional relationship. Objective peer evaluations are more highly valued. 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 and/or an evaluator from the Faculty Center for Professional Development (FCPD). It is recommended that peer reviewers utilize objective criteria. Examples of peer evaluation forms can be obtained from the academic unit. Refer to the current CBA for guidance on peer evaluation.*

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

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

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

(b) *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; and 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.*
- (c) 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, and student recruitment and/or retention efforts.*

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

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

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

- (a)** Candidates shall submit student evaluation summary sheets for two courses taught during each of the Fall and Spring semesters, regardless of rank.
Courses taught outside the academic year (winter, summer, and special sessions) should not be submitted and will not be evaluated.

If one written student comment is referenced in the narrative, all

original student evaluation forms for that class must be submitted in supplemental materials. Likewise, if one original student evaluation is included in the supplemental materials, all original student evaluations must be included for that class.

- (b) It is expected that *ratings by students reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.*
- (c) *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.*
 - (1) *Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.*
 - (2) *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.*
- (d) *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. Furthermore, candidates should not solicit letters of support from current students.*
- (e) Course Syllabi
 - (1) At a minimum, course syllabi should adhere to current Senate syllabus and grading policies.
 - (2) More effective syllabi also should do the following:

- (A) include a detailed description of the requirements of each assignment;
- (B) explain how the student's performance will be assessed (e.g., scoring rubrics, score card, rating scale, or checklist, etc.);
- (C) explain how the score on each requirement will contribute to the student's course grade.

(f) Exams

If exams are used, examples of exam questions, linked to the student learning outcomes they assess, should be included.

(g) Course Grade Distributions

When assessing course grade distributions, evaluators compare the candidate's means for a given class to those for the department and college as a whole at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels as appropriate. The candidate should explain departures from those averages.

(h) Peer Evaluations

(1) Effective classroom sessions, at a basic level, should include: a) an introduction, b) objective and rationale, c) content (a means of providing information), d) guided practice for students to apply the knowledge in class with the instructor's assistance, e) assessment (e.g. class discussion, group work, labs, or journal entries), and f) closure (wrapping up the session by having students indicate what they have learned).

(2) Classroom sessions should be evaluated on some or all of the following aspects (using FCS provided peer evaluation forms): a) organization and preparation, b) teaching to multiple and cultural groups, c) varied instructional methods, d) standards and academic rigor, e) connection between the instructor and students; and, f) genuine student engagement, interest, and motivation.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies. Having varied topical coverage in one's research agenda is appropriate when the candidate makes a connection between their research agenda and the advancement of the discipline. Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to: books, journal articles that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly book chapters, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, artistic exhibits or performances, and awarded grants or contracts, as required by their individual academic units. It is imperative that the candidate explain their contribution to the publication and the publication's contribution to the discipline (e.g. impact factor, acceptance rate, audience, journal prestige).

Variability due to intense service roles

There may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in service, such as serving as the department chair, associate chair, graduate advisor, undergraduate advisor, program director, or in a position of leadership with college-wide and/or university-wide significance. In such cases the reduction in scholarship should not be counted against the candidate, but there should be evidence that the candidate's scholarly activity has been maintained to some degree and has promise for full resumption when the other activities return to normal levels.

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines

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

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. Expectations for typical progression for retention tenure and promotion:

General expectations are 1 peer-reviewed journal publication every 1-2 years with 3-4 supplemental RSCA every 1-2 years (see breakdown below). Because sustained productivity is expected, the candidate should explain gaps in the RSCA productivity.

Reappointment

- 1 peer-reviewed journal article and
- 1-2 presentations, reviews, non peer-reviewed publications, workshops or other RSCA (refer to 2.2.2 b, c, d & e below)

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

- 2-3 peer-reviewed journal articles and
- 3-4 presentations, reviews, non peer reviewed publications, workshops, or other RSCA (refer to 2.2.2 b, c, d & e below)

Promotion to Full Professor

- 4-6 peer-reviewed journal articles since last promotion and
- 6-8 presentations, reviews, non peer-reviewed publications, workshops or other RSCA since last promotion (refer to 2.2.2 b, c, d & e below)

(a) *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. For multiple use data sets, candidates should indicate the uniqueness of each paper. When developing a conference presentation into a publication, candidate should discuss how the paper has evolved over time. The most highly valued RSCA in FCS are anonymously, peer-reviewed, and original (e.g. journal articles).*

(b) *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. RSCAs in this category may or may not present original work. Anonymously reviewed works are more highly valued in this category. (Examples*

include but are not limited to: textbooks, invited manuscripts, paper presentations at conferences, poster presentations at conferences, book chapters, literature reviews, funded internal grants, funded external grants, reviewed juried shows or exhibitions, and market generated product designs).

- (c) *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.*
- (d) *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. RSCAs that strengthen a candidate's file in FCS, but are not alone sufficient, are activities that are not generally peer-reviewed, but could be either editorially reviewed, or valued for other contributions to the discipline (e.g. instructor manuals, workshops at conferences, editorial published work, solo exhibitions, original work included in collections, book reviews, or reviews of creative activities).*
- (e) The candidate should increasingly demonstrate the ability to contribute to the theoretical edifice of their discipline. Both solo and collaborative authorship are valued. However, in collaborative authorship, it is expected over time that candidates will engage in more leadership and lead authorship as growth through the ranks from assistant to associate to full professor is achieved.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA

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.

- (a) Publication of scholarly and creative works in peer reviewed journals is required of all candidates. The candidate should indicate the prestige of the journal, including acceptance rate, impact factor and

audience. International and national venues are considered more influential than local and regional venues. (b) Conference proceedings and presentations, as well as other conference-related exhibitions and creative activities strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank.

2.3 Service

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

All FCS 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, FCS faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession.

- (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) *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 or university. 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.*
 - (3) *For promotion to the rank of Full Professor (consistent with Section 5.4 of the University RTP policy and Section 5.4 of this 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. Refer to 2.4.1 (a) for details.*
- (b) *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. Parallel to*

the Department's mission, candidates should participate in service which utilizes their area of expertise to improve the lives of individuals and families across the life span.

- (c) *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. While compensated and non-compensated contributions are appropriate for inclusion, non-compensated service is more highly regarded.*

2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments

The quality of contributions to service is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in Section 2.3.1. If gaps appear or life circumstances lessen productivity, the candidate should provide evidence of resuming service.

2.4 Evaluation of Service

2.4.1 Candidate's Responsibility

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. In the department of FCS, candidates should detail the nature of the position and the committee. Membership and attendance alone are not sufficient. Documentation of candidate's contributions to committee output produced should be provided.*
- (b) *Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the quality and quantity of the candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.*

2.4.2 Quality of Participation

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 the department of FCS; 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

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 in writing and signed.

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). Department chair and peer review evaluations should be independent. 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 in the narrative. Supplemental materials not explained in the narrative will not be considered.

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 each contribution to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. Candidates should also address weaknesses identified from past reviews. 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. Supplemental material for a conference presentation would include: a page from the conference book with the candidate's name and presentation title, the cover page of the conference book, and a copy of the paper or poster. Supplemental material for a publication may include an acceptance letter from the publication, a copy of the manuscript, or a reprint of the manuscript. If many submissions (eg. Publication, conference presentation) use the same data, explain how the uses were different

and significant to the field. Supplemental Material for service should only include documents that indicate the candidate's role in the service. (i.e., it is not necessary to include all of the meeting minutes, but only those that indicate the involvement of the candidate). Also refer to Section 2.1.1 . *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 after the review to discuss recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit if the chair wrote a review. 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 communicate 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. Moreover, if anything is added when the file is at the CHHS level of review, it must go back to the department level for review.*

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

Pursuant to Section 3.5.1, this policy must be approved the FCS faculty under the terms and conditions specified in Sections 8.3.1 to 8.3.3 below.

8.2 University Approval of this Document

The RTP policies and procedures of the academic units and the college are subject to the review and approval of the Provost.

8.3 Amendments

Amendments to this document may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the entire full-time tenured and probationary faculty of the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Dean (either directly or through the Department Chair) shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the FCS faculty at least two weeks prior to voting.

8.3.1 Voting

Voting on amendments shall be by secret ballot of the preceding academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CBA.

8.3.2 Majority Approval Required

To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean and the Provost.

8.3.3 Voting Rights

Tenured and probationary faculty in FCS, including those on leave and those participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) during a semester of active service, are eligible to vote on RTP policy matters.