

1                                   **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH**  
2                                   **Department of Health Care Administration**  
3                                   **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**  
4                                   **Draft 4.20.2010**  
5

6 The Department of Health Care Administration (HCA) and its faculty are committed to  
7 providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and  
8 service to their constituents. HCA encourages continued professional growth of faculty in  
9 teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university,  
10 profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the department establishes this policy  
11 for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment,  
12 tenure, and promotion (RTP).

13  
14 Portions of this RTP that are direct quotes from CHHS RTP Policy, and University RTP Policy  
15 these portions are italicized.

16  
17 **1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES**  
18

19 **1.1 Department Mission and Goals**

20 The mission of the CSULB Health Care Administration Department is to prepare professionals  
21 to manage, lead and improve a changing health care system. Our graduate and undergraduate  
22 programs are designed, and continually strive to improve their efforts, to meet the needs of the  
23 dynamic Southern California health care system, and to emphasize culturally appropriate patient-  
24 centered service delivery systems.

**Departmental Goals**

In today's environment, health care managers must achieve and continually improve specific competencies in and out of school and also thorough their work experience. Our departmental mission statement emphasizes training and educating professionals for health care management jobs, either entry or more advanced level positions, with the following goals:

- Offer a curriculum that supports and matches the needs of the health care industry and meets accreditation standards.
- Attract and retain well-qualified students with a variety of substantive, challenging, affordable and convenient degree programs.
- Conduct, facilitate and disseminate health services research through external and intramural funding.
- Develop and maintain strong ties with HCA alumni, the practitioner community, the University and the College of Health and Human Services.
- Serve as a resource for University governance and the industry as volunteers and consultants

to promote the efficient and effective operation of the University, health care and professional organizations.

## **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 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.*

68 *1.3.2 Academic units within the college shall adopt RTP policies that elaborate on*  
 69 *discipline-specific standards in all areas of evaluation. The standards adopted at*  
 70 *the academic-unit level shall not be lower than university-level or college-level*  
 71 *standards. If any provision of an academic unit RTP Policy conflicts with any*  
 72 *provision within the CBA, the university RTP Policy, or the RTP policy of the*  
 73 *CHHS, the specific conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of the*  
 74 *academic unit's RTP Policy, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

75  
 76 *1.3.3 Collectively, the RTP policies of the university, college, and academic unit*  
 77 *shall be used to assess candidates' performance through the stages of their*  
 78 *academic progress.*

#### 79 80 **1.4 Obligations**

##### 81 82 **1.4.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Start Process**

83 *In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an*  
 84 *RTP file.*

##### 85 86 **1.4.2 Completeness of Candidate's File**

87 *Candidates must furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation*  
 88 *(e.g., for teaching, student evaluations, course syllabi, peer evaluations, and grade*  
 89 *distributions; for RSCA, copies of manuscripts under review and/or presented at*  
 90 *conferences; preprints or reprints of articles; letters accepting manuscripts for*  
 91 *publication; etc.; for service, letters documenting the candidate's service which*  
 92 *assess the quality of the service contributions).*

##### 93 94 **1.4.3 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee**

95 *The reputation, success, and future credibility of the Department of Health Care*  
 96 *Administration are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence*  
 97 *with which Department RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating*  
 98 *the evidence to support its recommendations.*

#### 99 100 **1.5 Standards**

101 *Recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or*  
 102 *directors of academic units (if submitted) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's*  
 103 *strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just*  
 104 *merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an*  
 105 *analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit.*  
 106 *Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the*  
 107 *academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching,*  
 108 *scholarship, and service. Evaluation must also be guided by the following expectations*  
 109 *that apply to all Department faculty members at all ranks:*

##### 110 111 **1.5.1 Staying Current**

112 *Faculty members must keep abreast of scholarly and applied discourse in the*  
 113 *relevant sub-fields of Health Care Administration applicable to the faculty*

114 member's areas of teaching and research interest(s) through appropriate means.  
 115 Currency is demonstrated by updated syllabi, conference attendance, professional  
 116 association membership and participation.  
 117

### 118 **1.5.2 Involvement in the Profession**

119 Faculty members are expected to attend and/or participate in at least one annual  
 120 meeting (when funding is available) of professional organizations such as the  
 121 Association of University Programs in Health Administration (AUPHA), the  
 122 Commission on the Accreditation of Health Management Education (CAHME), the  
 123 American College of Healthcare Executives (ACHE), Academy Health, the  
 124 American Public Health Association (APHA), the American Sociological  
 125 Association, the American Psychological Association, and other similar national  
 126 and regional organizations (such as the Southern California Chapter of the  
 127 American College of Healthcare Executives). Or other similar national and  
 128 regional organizations appropriate to the faculty member's areas of expertise.  
 129

### 130 **1.5.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing**

131 Faculty members must actively pursue a research and publishing agenda relevant to  
 132 one or more of the following types of scholarship, regardless of reliance on  
 133 quantitative, qualitative, or other discipline-appropriate methodologies, but  
 134 discipline related research is more highly valued:  
 135

- 136 A. Scholarship of Discovery – the traditional research model in which new content  
 137 knowledge is acquired and disseminated;
- 138
- 139 B. Scholarship of Integration – the creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and  
 140 making connections across disciplines or sub-disciplines;
- 141
- 142 C. Scholarship of Application – the bridging of the gap between theory and  
 143 practice through both research and action in ways that promote positive social  
 144 change and/or promote policy-oriented problem solving; and
- 145
- 146 D. Scholarship of Pedagogy – the discovery of the ways our students learn and the  
 147 identification and assessment of methods used to foster learning.  
 148

### 149 **1.5.4 High-Quality Instruction**

150 Faculty members must involve students in active learning through excellence not  
 151 only in their "in-classroom" teaching, but also in their mentoring of students in the  
 152 following ways:  
 153

- 154 A. by their own examples of service to the Health Care Administration  
 155 Department; the College of Health and Human Services; the University;  
 156 professional organizations; and in the community at large;
- 157
- 158 B. through collaborative research that engages students in the processes of critical  
 159 inquiry and discovery;

- 160  
161 C. through engaging students in service learning projects;  
162  
163 D. through unique disciplinary interactions with students through directed readings  
164 and independent research projects;  
165

## 166 **1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks**

167  
168 Health Care Administration Department RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying  
169 specific criteria established by the University, the College of Health and Human Services,  
170 and in accordance with Sections 5.0 – 5.5.2 of the University and College RTP Policies,  
171 the standards applicable to each academic rank. This Department Policy applies these  
172 standards using discipline-specific criteria.  
173

## 174 **1.7 Narrative**

175  
176 In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional  
177 context, candidates are required to submit a written narrative describing their work in  
178 each of the three categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide  
179 to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements.  
180  
181

## 182 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

183 HCA RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments  
184 in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2)  
185 research, scholarly and creative activity (RSCA); and 3) service and engagement at the  
186 university, in the community, and in the profession.  
187

### 188 ***2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities***

189 *Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction*  
190 *and instructionally related activities focus on learning inside and outside the traditional*  
191 *classroom and include, but are not limited to: curriculum development; academic and*  
192 *academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; and*  
193 *related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional*  
194 *instructional activities may include, but are not limited to: mentoring students; taking*  
195 *students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the*  
196 *production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.*  
197

#### 198 ***2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice***

199 *Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices*  
200 *and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to*  
201 *improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching*  
202 *methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also*  
203 *requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities*  
204 *associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods*

205 *shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student*  
 206 *differences.*

207  
 208 To help evaluate candidate's instructional philosophy and practice/teaching effectiveness,  
 209 candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit four types of indicators of  
 210 teaching effectiveness: student evaluations, peer evaluations, course syllabi, and grade  
 211 distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee for  
 212 evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy.

213  
 214 A. *Hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and practice which*  
 215 *should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by*  
 216 *supporting materials include, but are not limited to:*

217  
 218 (1) *Course materials that clearly convey to students, in behavioral terms,*  
 219 *the learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to*  
 220 *the major and/or to general education.*

221  
 222 (2) *Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course*  
 223 *requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and*  
 224 *grading practices, standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for*  
 225 *which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for*  
 226 *further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest*  
 227 *of the material; development of civic responsibilities and/or individual*  
 228 *personal growth).*

229  
 230 (3) *Evidence of up-to-date instructional methods and materials that are*  
 231 *appropriate to the courses taught and foster student learning.*

232  
 233 (4) *Evidence of efforts to continually enhance teaching effectiveness.*

234  
 235 (5) *Positive teaching evaluations as assessed by peers who visit the*  
 236 *classroom to observe teaching style, breadth, depth, and overall*  
 237 *effectiveness. Such evaluations of classroom performance may be*  
 238 *conducted by peers from the academic unit, the academic unit RTP*  
 239 *Committee, the director or chair of the academic unit, and/or faculty*  
 240 *from other academic units with relevant expertise who are approved*  
 241 *by the academic unit RTP Committee.*

242  
 243 a. *Candidates for reappointment must provide evidence of either*  
 244 *continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-*  
 245 *quality teaching.*

246  
 247 b. *Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate*  
 248 *Professor must provide evidence of a sustained level of high-*  
 249 *quality teaching.*

- 251 c. *Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide*  
 252 *evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of*  
 253 *teaching excellence.*  
 254  
 255 (6) *Thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce continuous improvement in*  
 256 *teaching effectiveness are expected of all CHHS faculty. This pattern of*  
 257 *change should be described in the candidate's narrative and documented by*  
 258 *supporting materials. These actions may include, but are not limited to, the*  
 259 *following:*  
 260  
 261 a. *Regular interactions with colleagues regarding various pedagogical*  
 262 *issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development.*  
 263  
 264 b. *Developing innovative approaches to teaching; fostering increased*  
 265 *student learning in the classroom; and participating in the evaluation*  
 266 *of instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.*  
 267  
 268 c. *Involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for*  
 269 *Professional Development; teaching-development seminars or*  
 270 *conferences sponsored by the academic unit, college, university or*  
 271 *relevant professional organizations; and formal or informal*  
 272 *pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to the*  
 273 *development of improved teaching effectiveness.*  
 274  
 275 d. *Development of new curriculum, instructional programs or materials,*  
 276 *including electronic or multimedia instructional software or new*  
 277 *advising materials or programs.*  
 278  
 279 (7) *All faculty members are expected to be actively involved in instructionally-*  
 280 *related activities outside the classroom in such areas as academic advising,*  
 281 *field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students,*  
 282 *thesis or project supervision, and student recruitment and/or retention*  
 283 *efforts.*  
 284

#### 285 **2.1.1.d. Course Evaluations**

286 Faculty are required to have a minimum of two courses per semester evaluated through  
 287 the CSULB course evaluation process, unless fewer than two courses are taught in any  
 288 given semester.

289 The HCA Department recognizes that faculty members may also teach courses offered  
 290 through CCPE and in addition to the required HCA course evaluations, faculty are  
 291 encouraged, but not required, to submit course evaluations from CCPE courses.  
 292

#### 293 **2.1.1.e. Indicia of Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**

- 294  
 295 A. Keeping abreast of discipline developments through participation in discipline-  
 296 specific conferences and continuing education activities.

- 297  
298 B. Actively participating in the Department's curricular assessment efforts.  
299

300 All faculty should be involved in thesis/projects as these are a required component  
301 of the HCA Master's program. As such, probationary faculty should be involved  
302 as readers/committee members of at least one thesis/project per academic year,  
303 except for the very first academic year of the appointment. Assignment of  
304 probationary faculty to thesis/project committees will be done in consultation with  
305 the department chair and will be done to meet student needs, departmental  
306 requirements and faculty assignments. Documentation of activities as either  
307 thesis/project committee member or chair is captured on the Library signature  
308 sheet and a copy can/will be retained by the faculty member to show successful  
309 completion of thesis/project.  
310

- 311 C. Faculty members are expected to participate as secondary readers on graduate  
312 research projects, beginning in their fourth year in consultation with the  
313 Department chair.  
314

- 315 D. Faculty may choose to sponsor students in the annual student research  
316 competitions at CSULB or other local or national competitions. This type of  
317 activity is encouraged by the HCA department and recognition of efforts to  
318 support student research at such competitions will be valued whether students win  
319 or not.  
320

- 321 G. All probationary faculty should elicit feedback from senior faculty and the  
322 department chair in the form of classroom visitations and written feedback based  
323 on observations no less than once per semester. The Peer Evaluation Form in  
324 Appendix A should be used for this feedback. Classroom visitations shall be  
325 scheduled in advance with faculty member and selection of classes for visitation  
326 should be done in consultation with the department chair.  
327

#### 328 **2.1.1.f. Policy on Syllabi**

- 329  
330 A. At minimum, all course syllabi shall comply with the requirements of CSULB's official  
331 syllabi policy. Pursuant to that policy, all syllabi must set forth course meetings times  
332 and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information;  
333 required books and other resources; an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy;  
334 an explanation of how the instructor will interpret and apply the University's course  
335 withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty  
336 member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a  
337 course outline or schedule. Excellent syllabi, however, also contain other types of  
338 information. For example:  
339  
340 B. The measurable learning goals of the course should be conveyed to students in  
341 measurable, behavioral terms. All courses should link learning outcomes to the  
342 accrediting agency competencies.



- 343  
344 C. Grading practices, standards, and criteria must be articulated clearly.  
345  
346 D. Instructional methods must be appropriate to the courses taught, and materials should be  
347 up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and,  
348  
349 E. Assigned readings must be up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and be selected to  
350 enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of the Department of Health Care  
351 Administration, assigned readings that enhance the interdisciplinary and/or comparative  
352 nature of a course are particularly valued.  
353  
354 F. The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes evidence  
355 that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence  
356 this Policy is designed to facilitate.  
357

### 358 **2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes**

359 *Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning.*  
360 *Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student*  
361 *outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.*  
362

363 To this end, faculty shall:

- 364  
365 A. Clearly convey to students in measurable, behavioral terms the expected student learning  
366 outcomes for each course taught.  
367  
368 B. Clearly convey to students the relationship of the course to the major and education  
369 goals.  
370  
371 C. Prepare lessons and course materials that enhance student learning associated with the  
372 student learning outcomes for a course.  
373  
374

### 375 **2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction**

376 In accordance with CHHS RTP Policy, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate  
377 student response to instruction. As stated in 2.1.1.d above.

378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417

## **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. Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to: journal articles that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly book chapters, authored or edited textbooks, software and electronically published documents, presentations and grants and contracts submitted and awarded.*

### **2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines**

This HCA document addresses CHHS RTP policy section 2.2.1.

#### **2.2.1b Variations Due to Service Roles**

There may be some years when the level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in teaching or service, such as serving as the department chair, associate chair, graduate advisor, undergraduate advisor, 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.

### **2.2.2 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, as well as other scholarly and creative activities consistent with the specific requirements in the RTP policy of their academic units.*

- A. *As used in this document, "research" involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment or qualitative research methods.*
- 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 investigative research conducted by the candidate.*

- 418 C. Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued  
 419 contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the  
 420 College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members  
 421 are encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity  
 422 (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for  
 423 nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for  
 424 reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank.  
 425
- 426 D. Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with editorial or reviewer  
 427 assignments in recognized professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or  
 428 electronic media; appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts,  
 429 awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or electronic documents,  
 430 especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.  
 431

### 432 **2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA**

433 *Consistent with the university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for reappointment,*  
 434 *tenure, and/or promotion are required to disseminate their research and other scholarly and*  
 435 *creative activities to appropriate audiences through discipline-specific (or relevant*  
 436 *interdisciplinary), peer reviewed publications and scholarly presentations.*  
 437

### 438 **HCA Department Publication Criteria**

- 439
- 440 A. HCA RTP Committee members doing mini-reviews must be mindful of the fact in the  
 441 early probationary years, faculty are likely to just be starting to advance a research  
 442 agenda. Thus, in the first year or two, new faculty might be more likely to publish book  
 443 reviews, invited essays, monographs, grant proposals, than to be publishing articles in  
 444 peer-reviewed journals. New faculty, however, are expected to be working on writing  
 445 and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals for editorial consideration in their first  
 446 two years. New faculty members are especially encouraged to try transforming their  
 447 dissertations into at least one peer-reviewed journal article. Candidates for RTP process  
 448 are encouraged to indicate their individual contributions to publications that have more  
 449 than one author in the following manner consistent with the American Psychological  
 450 Association Publication Manual 6<sup>th</sup> edition, which states: “Authorship encompasses,  
 451 therefore, not only those who do the actual writing, but also those who have made  
 452 substantial scientific contributions to the study. Substantial professional contributions  
 453 may include formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the experimental design,  
 454 organizing and conducting the statistical analysis, interpreting the results, or writing a  
 455 major portion of the paper.”  
 456
- 457 B. By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment in the third probationary year, it  
 458 is expected that the candidate will have at least one peer-reviewed journal article either  
 459 in-print or formally accepted for publication. Exceeding this baseline expectation shall be  
 460 evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.  
 461
- 462 C. After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period (years four  
 463 through six), faculty should be publishing regularly in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates

464 for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least four to six  
 465 scholarly articles in refereed venues (an average of roughly one publication per year).  
 466 Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Candidates RTP Narrative should  
 467 describe their contribution to the articles that have more than one author. Thus, for  
 468 example, a dozen publications of questionable significance are unlikely to be sufficient to  
 469 support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing three or  
 470 four articles in top-tier journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way  
 471 may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.  
 472

473 D. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their  
 474 scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant  
 475 projects to fruition by having published them in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals.  
 476 Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have  
 477 produced, on average, at least one scholarly publication per year since the last promotion.  
 478 As with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, however, quality is more important  
 479 than quantity. Thus, multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in  
 480 a meaningful manner are not likely to result in a favorable recommendation for  
 481 promotion. Conversely, three or four publications in top-tier journals, or a book or two  
 482 with a well-respected scholarly press or leading commercial publishing house may  
 483 warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor.  
 484

485 E. The HCA Department requires that all faculty, probationary and tenured, submit a  
 486 minimum average of one peer-reviewed publication per academic year; faculty should  
 487 provide evidence of paper and/or electronic publication, including the Impact Factor\* of  
 488 the journal publishing the work and/or the acceptance rate, when available.  
 489

490 F. The HCA Department requires that all faculty, probationary and tenured, submit an  
 491 average of one abstract per year for presentation at a local, national or international  
 492 conference reflecting research efforts.  
 493

494 G. Exceeding the baseline expectations listed in a-f above shall be evaluated as constituting  
 495 strong evidence of scholarly achievement.  
 496

#### 497 **\*Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of the Impact of RSCA**

498  
 499 A. Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary  
 500 impact includes the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological  
 501 innovation, application) for disciplinary progress and typically includes dissemination in  
 502 peer-reviewed disciplinary journals. Candidates should provide quality indicators such as  
 503 impact factors and acceptance rates in their RTP documentation.  
 504

505 B. Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact  
 506 students. The Department of Health Care Administration evaluates impact accordingly in  
 507 terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars  
 508 and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work;  
 509 co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the

510 research process and research findings in courses). Publications and presentations that  
 511 include student co-authors are highly valued.

512

513 C. Community Impact – The HCA Department recognizes impact in various types of  
 514 community (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at different  
 515 levels of community effort (local, state, national, and international communities).

516

517 The impact of scholarship on students and the community is more difficult to demonstrate  
 518 tangibly than the impact on the discipline. Nevertheless these are highly-valued areas of impact.  
 519 There are no clearly-established criteria for scholarly contributions in these areas.

520 Documentation of this type of impact is thus particularly important. Indicators may include  
 521 student co-authorship on presentations/publications, undergraduate research mentee pursuit of  
 522 graduate training, scholarship used to provide community testimony on use of technical reports  
 523 or consultation to address issues of public policy, expert review or letters about the quality and  
 524 impact of applied work, and external evaluation of engaged scholarship.

525

### 526 **2.3 Service**

527 *Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of*  
 528 *programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession.*

529

#### 530 **2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments**

531 All HCA faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully  
 532 in the process of faculty governance through service to the HCA Department, the college, and  
 533 the University. Additionally, faculty members are expected to provide quality service and  
 534 leadership in the community and/or to the profession.

535

536 **2.3.1.a. Department meetings:** The HCA Department requires that all probationary and tenured  
 537 faculty participate in monthly faculty meetings and contribute to the faculty governance of the  
 538 department. **2.3.1.b. Service to the University, College and Department**

539

540 A. All faculty members are expected to serve the Department of Health Care  
 541 Administration as demonstrated by any of the following:

542

543 1) advising student and alumni organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;

544

545 2) participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees;

546

547 3) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the  
 548 Department;

549

550 4) attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;

551

552 5) attending and meaningfully participating in professional development  
 553 opportunities sponsored by the Department, the College, the University,  
 554 and professional organizations; and

555

- 556                   6) actively participating in student and alumni programs.  
557
- 558           B. Probationary faculty may but are not required to participate in College service  
559 activities after the first year of appointment Participation in college committees is decided  
560 in consultation with the department chair, taking into account other faculty commitments  
561 in teaching and research.  
562  
563
- 564           C. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are  
565 required to make quality service contributions to both the Department of Health Care  
566 Administration (as discussed above) and to service contributions to the effective  
567 operation and growth of the College of Health and Human Services, such as serving  
568 on college-wide committees and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials  
569 pertinent to the College. Similarly University-level service is desirable, but not  
570 required.  
571
- 572           D. For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to  
573 demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership at the  
574 Department, College, and University levels. In doing so, they must contribute  
575 significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution, including, but not  
576 limited to:  
577
- 578                   1) chairing the Department, serving as the Graduate Advisor, or directing the  
579 Department's certificate or distance-learning degree programs;
  - 580
  - 581                   2) chairing major departmental committees;
  - 582
  - 583                   3) holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or  
584 university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
  - 585
  - 586                   4) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the  
587 University, College, or Department;
  - 588
  - 589                   5) creating or significantly revising entire department/program curricula.

591 **2.3.1.c. Service to the Community and/or the Profession**

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

594           A. Community Service – If a faculty member engages in service to the community, this  
595 service must directly involve the academic expertise of the faculty member such that  
596 he or she applies academic skills and experience to the solution of local, regional,  
597 national, or international problems.  
598

- 599                   (1) For reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate  
600 Professor, such community service may include but is not limited to:  
601

- 602 (a) consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and  
603 organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments;  
604 and/or community organizations.  
605
- 606 (b) helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic  
607 organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to  
608 the candidate's professional expertise; and/or  
609
- 610 (c) acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations)  
611 for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.  
612
- 613 (2) For promotion to the rank of full Professor, such community service is  
614 expected to include a record of meaningful service in the community  
615 (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus,  
616 local, national, or international problems), such as, but not limited to:  
617
- 618 (a) taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or  
619 workshops;  
620
- 621 (b) holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations  
622 related to the candidate's professional expertise;  
623
- 624 (c) consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations,  
625 government, business, industry, or community service  
626 organizations;  
627
- 628 (d) serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or  
629
- 630 (e) engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to Health  
631 Care Administration; serving as a media consultant (by giving  
632 interviews or otherwise) for health care related events or news  
633 stories; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with justice-  
634 related missions; writing justice-relevant editorials in  
635 newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding  
636 professional or civil office.  
637
- 638 B. Professional Service – Service to the profession may include leadership positions,  
639 workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; and/or elected  
640 offices in a health care management, administrative, policy or other related  
641 professional organization.

642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674

### **2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments and Participation**

*The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements specified above in section 2.3.1. Accordingly, the RTP Committee must not merely summarize the breadth and/or quantity of a candidate's service contributions, but rather must evaluate the depth, quality, and significance of service activities. In doing so, the Committee should consider:*

- A. the nature of the service commitment in terms of the time, energy, and dedication it takes to participate meaningfully in the particular service activities;
- B. the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, the College, and/or to the Department of Health Care Administration;
- C. the significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual, and social life of the university, college, and/or department, including participation on committees and/or with student organizations;
- D. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional, and prospective students;
- E. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the department's ability to retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;
- F. the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers his/her services; and
- G. the degree of leadership exhibited by the candidate. The RTP Committee must be mindful of the fact that leadership is not exclusively defined by one's position in a hierarchical structure, but rather is something that can be demonstrated at all levels by influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the group in which they serve.

## **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 document their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance.
- 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.*



688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725

### **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.*

*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.*

726 **3.2 Academic Unit RTP Policy**

727 *Each academic unit shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be*  
 728 *applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Academic unit*  
 729 *standards shall not be lower than the university- and college-level standards. The RTP*  
 730 *policy of each academic unit is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and*  
 731 *probationary faculty members in the specific academic unit and to approval by the*  
 732 *college faculty council, the Dean, and the Provost. Academic unit RTP policies shall be*  
 733 *subject to regular review by the academic unit's tenured and probationary faculty.*  
 734

735 **3.3 Academic Unit RTP Committee**

736 *The academic unit RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the*  
 737 *candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee*  
 738 *regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Academic unit RTP committee*  
 739 *members are responsible for critically analyzing the candidate's performance by*  
 740 *applying the criteria of the academic unit. The committee shall forward its evaluation*  
 741 *and recommendation with supporting materials to the college RTP committee for review*  
 742 *by that committee and the Dean.*  
 743

744 **3.3.1 Election of Committee**

745 *The tenured and probationary faculty members of an academic unit elect*  
 746 *representatives to their unit's RTP committee.*  
 747

748 A. *The committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty*  
 749 *members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or*  
 750 *promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be comprised of tenured*  
 751 *Associate and Full Professors. Committees reviewing applications for promotion*  
 752 *to the rank of Professor must be comprised of tenured Full Professors.*  
 753

754 B. *Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic*  
 755 *year may serve on an academic unit RTP committee.*  
 756

757 C. *Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve*  
 758 *on the RTP committees of academic units if elected by a majority vote of tenured*  
 759 *and probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the*  
 760 *President. However, academic unit RTP committees may not be made up solely*  
 761 *of faculty participating in the FERP.*  
 762

763 D. *Chairs or directors of academic units may serve as members of their unit RTP*  
 764 *committee, if elected. However, if they serve as a member of the academic unit*  
 765 *RTP committee, they may not make a separate recommendation pursuant to*  
 766 *Section 3.4 of this document. Moreover, to avoid conflicts of interest, chairs or*  
 767 *directors of academic units may not sit with an academic unit RTP committee*  
 768 *during the time that it is considering his or her own materials for reappointment,*  
 769 *tenure, or promotion.*  
 770

### 3.3.2 Committee Composition

- 771  
772  
773 A. *Members of academic unit RTP committees who participate in promotion*  
774 *recommendations must not only be tenured, but also must have a higher rank than*  
775 *the candidate(s) being considered. Moreover, they must not themselves be*  
776 *candidates for promotion.*
- 777 B. *Within each academic unit, all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the*  
778 *same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds*  
779 *of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members*  
780 *at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the*  
781 *academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the*  
782 *rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty*  
783 *members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for*  
784 *promotion to the rank of Professor.*

### 3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

- 785  
786  
787  
788 A. *The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines*  
789 *rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and*  
790 *relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in*  
791 *accordance with established deadlines.*
- 792 B. *Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the*  
793 *academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit.*  
794 *Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these*  
795 *recommendations before they are forwarded from the academic unit to the*  
796 *college-level RTP committee and/or the Dean.*

#### 3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

797  
798  
799 *No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in*  
800 *more than one level of review.*

#### 3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

801  
802 *If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit*  
803 *RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, then additional*  
804 *members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the*  
805 *following procedure:*

- 806  
807  
808 A. *Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided*  
809 *that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of*  
810 *expertise.*
- 811 B. *After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election*  
812 *to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all*  
813 *candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an*  
814 *election.*
- 815

816 **3.3.6 Joint Appointments**

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

822

823 **3.4 Chair or Director of the Academic Unit**

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

830

831 **3.4.1 Meeting with Committee**

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

835

836 **3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by Director or Chair**

837 *Directors or chairs of academic units may write independent evaluations of all*  
 838 *RTP candidates unless the director or chair is elected to the RTP committee of*  
 839 *their academic unit. However, in promotion considerations, a director or chair*  
 840 *must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in*  
 841 *order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may*  
 842 *a director or chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more*  
 843 *than one level of review.*

844

845 **3.4.3 Candidate’s Rights**

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

854

855 **3.5 Health Care Administration RTP Policy**

856 *This document serves as the official HCA RTP policy. It shall be interpreted to ensure*  
 857 *consistency of standards across the college to the maximum extent possible in light of the*  
 858 *breadth of disciplinary diversity and expertise within the academic unit.*

859

860

861

## **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 (“Mini-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 (“mini-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. See Appendix B for the streamlined procedures to be used for mini-reviews.*

#### **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. If reappointed for three years, probationary faculty shall continue to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process. If, however, candidates are reappointed for a shorter period of time, then they are to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process until such time as they undergo another formal reappointment review.*

### **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 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy.*

### 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 rank of Associate Professor. 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 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy.*

*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**

Section 5 of the university and CHHS RTP policies outline the general standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This RTP Policy elaborates on those policies by providing the specific criteria under which RTP candidates from the Department of Health Care Administration will be reviewed.

## **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

### ***6.1 Academic Affairs Sets Dates***

*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 Academic Affairs Notifies Candidates of Eligibility***

*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 Posting of Notice of Open Period***

*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 Preparation and Submission of RTP File***

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

950 **6.5 Review by Department RTP Committee**

951 *The RTP Committee of the Department of Health Care Administration reviews the*  
 952 *candidate's materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written*  
 953 *evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.*  
 954

955 **6.6 Review by Department Chair**

956 *The chair or director of the academic unit, if eligible and if not an elected member of the*  
 957 *academic unit RTP committee, may review the candidate's materials and may provide an*  
 958 *independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the*  
 959 *deadline.*  
 960

961 **6.7 Review College RTP Committee**

962 *The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an*  
 963 *independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the*  
 964 *deadline.*  
 965

966 **6.8 Review by Dean**

967 *The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review*  
 968 *and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.*  
 969

970 **6.9 Review by Provost**

971 *The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written*  
 972 *review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make*  
 973 *final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.*  
 974 *The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision*  
 975 *regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.*  
 976

977 **7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

978  
 979 **7.1 Withdrawal**

980 *Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice*  
 981 *from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to*  
 982 *candidates for early tenure.*  
 983

984 **7.2 Missing Documentation**

985 *If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is*  
 986 *discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite*  
 987 *documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely*  
 988 *manner.*  
 989

990 **7.3 Rebuttal**

991 *At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation,*  
 992 *which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the*  
 993 *recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right*  
 994 *to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following*

995 *receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall*  
 996 *be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as to any previous review levels.*

997

998 **7.4 External Review**

999 *The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation,*  
 1000 *consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations (see Policy 86-07 or its*  
 1001 *successor).*

1002

1003 **8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY**

1004

1005 **8.1 Ratification**

1006 *This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and*  
 1007 *probationary faculty members in the Department of Health Care Administration and to*  
 1008 *approval by the CHHS Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.*

1009

1010 **8.2 Amendments**

1011 *Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%)*  
 1012 *of the entire full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Health Care*  
 1013 *Administration. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Dean of the College (either*  
 1014 *directly or through the Department Chair as the Dean's designee) shall communicate the*  
 1015 *proposed amendment(s) to the faculty members in the Department of Health Care*  
 1016 *Administration at least two weeks (i.e., 14 calendar days) prior to voting.*

1017

1018 **8.2.1 Voting on Amendments**

1019 *Voting on amendments shall be by ballot prior to the close of the preceding*  
 1020 *academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the*  
 1021 *CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.*

1022

1023 **8.2.2 Majority Needed to Adopt**

1024 *To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the*  
 1025 *ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the Faculty Council, Dean and*  
 1026 *the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.*

1027

1028 **8.2.3 Voting Rights**

1029 *All tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Health Care*  
 1030 *Administration – including those on leave, sabbatical, and FERP – are eligible to*  
 1031 *vote on RTP policy matters.*


1032

1033



1034  
1035  
1036

APPENDIX A: PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM

	<p><b>COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b> <b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION</b></p> <p><b>EVALUATION REPORT FROM</b> <b>PEER-OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING</b></p>
---	---

1037

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME	
INSTRUCTOR'S RANK	
COURSE OBSERVED	
OBSERVATION DATE	
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PRESENT	
TIMEBASE	<input type="checkbox"/> PART-TIME <input type="checkbox"/> FULL-TIME
	Number of WTUs

1038

1039

1040

**A. Summary of Key Teaching Performance Indicators**

<b>The class session began with an overview of the lesson's objectives and then proceeded to meet those objectives through the delivery of instruction.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1041

<b>The lesson was well-organized.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1042

<b>The methods used to deliver the lesson during the observed class session were appropriate for meeting the learning objectives.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1043

<b>The instructor was well-prepared for class.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1044

<b>The instructor integrated content from sufficiently varied sources to add both breadth and depth to the lesson.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

<b>Information communicated by the instructor was accurate and up-to-date (i.e., the instructor's subject mastery and currency were evident).</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1045

<b>The instructor was effective in presenting subject content and materials in the class session.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1046

<b>The instructor was enthusiastic and/or was able to arouse student interest, curiosity, motivation, and/or participation.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1047

<b>The instructor fostered an effective educational environment that facilitated creative expression, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and/or student engagement.</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

1048

1049 **B. Course Syllabus Construction**

1050

<b>1. Consistent with CSULB policy, the syllabus adequately sets forth:</b>		
course meeting times and location	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

the instructor's office location and office hours	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
the instructor's contact information	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
required books and resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
an explanation of how the instructor will enforce the university's withdrawal policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
course requirements that form the basis of the assessment of student performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
a statement on academic integrity	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
a course outline or schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
<b>2. Other syllabus evaluation criteria:</b>				
The learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education are clearly conveyed to students in behavioral terms.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
Grading practices, standards, and criteria are clearly articulated.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
Instructional methods used in the course are explained and are appropriate to the course taught.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
Course assignments are explained and are appropriate to/for the course taught.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
Course content appears to be up-to-date, appropriate to the course topic, and enhancing of student learning.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	
The course appears to integrate materials that are interdisciplinary and/or comparative.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

1051  
1052

1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095

### C. Qualitative Feedback on Teaching

1. Describe the lesson taught, including the subject, objectives, and methods used.
2. Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, currency, breadth, and depth.
3. How well organized and clear was the presentation?
4. How effective were the methods of instruction used for this presentation?
5. Describe the level of student interest and participation.
6. What were the instructor's major strengths? Weaknesses?
7. What specific and constructive recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's teaching in this class?

1096 **D. Overall Rating of Teaching**

1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101

On the basis of the evidence provided in Sections A, B, and C, I rate the instructor's overall teaching as:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>

1102

SIGNATURE OF PEER-EVALUATOR: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF PEER EVALUATOR	TITLE OF PEER EVALUATOR	DATE

1103  
1104

SIGNATURE OF EMPLOYEE	
I have read the above evaluation. My signature indicates neither agreement nor disagreement with it.	
EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE	DATE

1105

## APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR MINI-REVIEWS

Mini-Reviews of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the Department of Health Care Administration RTP Committee, the Department Chair (optional), and the College Dean. The standard form for evaluation must be used. Pursuant to that form, a candidate's activities are to be evaluated under the categories of: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. The dossier, however, for a mini-evaluation is not a full RTP evaluation file. Accordingly, candidates for mini-reviews are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini-evaluation or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).<sup>1</sup>

To assist the Department RTP Committee in conducting a mini-evaluation of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit an updated PDS which addresses: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. These updates are to be supported with the following documentation:

1. Narrative – The narrative for a mini-review should be in the form of a short letter (two to three pages) that reflects on a candidate's accomplishments in all three areas either since initial appointment (for new probationary faculty), since the last mini-review (for candidates in their second or fifth years), or since formal reappointment (for candidates in their fourth year).

In terms of the content of the narrative, two or three paragraphs should be devoted to reflection on one's teaching. Two or three paragraphs should discuss the candidate's scholarly activities; in these paragraphs, in accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy (and its subsections), candidates must identify their program of scholarly research. It is important that specific goals and plans – both current and future – be clearly articulated and documented because mere claims of intent are insufficient. 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, a paragraph or two should explain the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period.

2. Student Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.3(A)(1) of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review are strongly encouraged to submit all student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, from all sections of all courses they have had evaluated; In addition, candidates must submit a summary table of their student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught and evaluated since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by

---

<sup>1</sup> New probationary faculty should therefore submit materials from the date of appointment. However, if service credit was given at the time of appointment, candidates should also include materials for the credited years.

