

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

College of Health and Human Services

Department of Health Science

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

Approved by Department Faculty:

Approved by College RTP Committee:

Approved by College Dean:

Approved by Provost and Senior Vice president for Academic Affairs:

Department of Health Science

College of Health and Human Services

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

Preamble

In its quest to achieve its mission, the Health Science Department and its faculty members values high quality instruction, research, and service activities. Although excellence in instruction is one of the primary activities of departmental faculty, research in the form of peer reviewed publications, grants, contracts, and research proposals are an essential part of the faculty activity with the Health Science Department. In addition, the nature of the practice of public health education necessitates that faculty participate in the development of training and program grants and other activities such as evaluative research and service. With respect to service, the departmental mission extends the activities of its faculty members to public health and community agencies and to other organizations engaged in the areas of health and human service. Accordingly, collaborative service activities within the department as well as among department and the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), the university, and the larger community are valued and recognized for all departmental levels of review for RTP.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 The Mission and Vision of the Health Science Department

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.

The mission of the Health Science Department and its undergraduate and graduate programs are to aid and encourage students' development into competent professionals and life-long learners who are responsible for community and public health disciplines, including health education and related areas. The program fosters the development of health professionals who are person-centered and sensitive to the diverse qualities and the changing face of the health care delivery system of our society. Upon graduation, our students are able to facilitate the physical, psychological, and social well-being of people individually and collectively in a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic metropolitan context. Within this mission, the goals of the department are to: (1) contribute to the development of a competent student body and faculty; (2) develop strong teaching and research or scholarship programs; and (3) maintain linkages with professionals, academics, and the community at large.

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

- 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 Department of Health Science (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 the Department of Health Science, 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; the Department of Health Science 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 Department of Health Science, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior.*

1.3. Governing Documents

1.3.1 Adoption

The Department adopts this document pursuant to the mandates of the Section 3.5 of both the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 09-10) and the CHHS 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, the university RTP policy, or the CHHS RTP policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.*

1.3.2 Specific Role of this Departmental Policy

This departmental-level policy serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the policies and procedures set forth in these other RTP policies specified in Section 1.3.1 in a manner that provides concrete guidance to faculty in the Health Science Department within the Department's discipline-specific framework. As such, it is intended to provide guidance to faculty members in the Health Science Department rely both as candidates and in their role assigning candidates' files.

1.4 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and department RTP policies.

1.4.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Start Process

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

1.4.2 Completeness of Candidate's File

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

1.4.3 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the Department of Health Science are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which Department RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating the evidence to support its recommendations.

1.5 Department 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 excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation must also be guided by the following expectations that apply to all Department faculty members at all ranks:

1.5.1 Staying Current

Faculty members shall stay current in literature and developments in the field of health science that are relevant to their teaching and research interest(s).

1.5.2 Involvement in the Profession

Faculty members are expected to attend and participate in the annual meetings of professional organizations related to public health such as the American Public Health Association (and affiliates) and the Society for Public Health Education.

1.5.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing

Faculty members must pursue an active research and publishing agenda relevant to one or more of the following types of scholarship, all of which are equally valued regardless of reliance on quantitative, qualitative, or other discipline-appropriate methodologies, including the following:

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

1.5.4 High-Quality Instruction

Faculty members shall deliver high quality instruction and encourage active learning among students through:

- A. Their own examples of service to the Health Science Department; the College of Health and Human Services; the university; professional organizations; and in the community at large;
- B. Collaborative research that engages students in the processes of critical inquiry and discovery;
- C. Engaging students in service learning projects;
- D. Directed readings and independent research projects;
- E. the ongoing process of socializing students into a culture of intellectual

discovery and professional communication via both group and one-on-one interactions in classes, at conferences, in co-curricular activities (especially through Eta Sigma Gamma, the Health Science Student Association, and Graduate Student Association).

- F. Assigning meaningful work in the discipline, and by interacting with students both in and out of class in a manner that fosters the development of broadly-applicable intellectual habits necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship.

1.5.5 Meaningful, Collegial Service

Faculty members are expected to serve the Department of Health Science, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession as a meaningfully contributing citizen.

- A. CSULB depends on faculty contributions to ensure that it achieves its educational mission through effective and efficient operations. The university's commitment to participatory governance and the needs of academic programs and units necessitate a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all faculty members in the Department of Health Science are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in professional organizations.
- B. The level and extent of faculty members' contributions to service are expected to increase directly with their professorial rank and length of service to the university. This means that faculty members are expected to accept more significant service responsibilities over time during the probationary period, and then even more at each higher rank.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

Candidates for Reappointment, tenure and promotion shall be evaluated based upon specific criteria. Each review level shall utilize the same criteria when evaluating candidates. Specific criteria may be found in Section 1.5. *Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank.* The Department's expectations for achieving CSULB's mission and the standards contained in Sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.5 vary by rank. The specific criteria applicable to each academic rank are integrated throughout Section 2.0 of this Policy and its subsections.

1.7 Candidate's 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. As explained in sections 3.1 of this policy (which mirrors the language used in the RTP Policy of the CHHS), the narrative should range from between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font (Times New Roman) with one-inch margins.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

In addition to following the 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.* Section 2.0 and its subsections 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.

Candidates shall be evaluated for advancement based upon the quality of their performance of the foregoing three categories. The following Sections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 elaborate on items that are considered when evaluating the candidates. In each instance, the items are illustrative and not all inclusive. Further, the items listed are not granted equal weight as, logically, certain items qualitatively have differing value to and impact on the contributions to one's discipline.

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; 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.

To help evaluate candidate's instructional philosophy and practice/teaching

effectiveness, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit four types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: student evaluations, peer evaluations, course syllabi, and grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy. Additionally, candidates may (but are not required to) submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher.

A. Hallmarks of High-Quality Teaching. Hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and practice that 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.
- 5) Positive teaching evaluations as assessed by peers who visit the classroom to observe teaching style, breadth, depth, and overall effectiveness. Such evaluations of classroom performance may be conducted by peers from the Department of Health Science, the Department of Health Science RTP Committee, the director or chair of the Department of Health Science, and/or faculty from other academic units with relevant expertise who are approved by the Department of Health Science RTP Committee.
 - 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. Requirements for Ongoing Professional Development as Teachers. 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 Department of Health Science, 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.

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, participation in 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.

To this end, faculty shall:

- A. Clearly convey to students in measurable, behavioral terms the expected student learning outcomes for each course taught.
- B. Clearly convey to students the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education goals.
- C. Prepare lessons and course materials that enhance student learning associated

with the student learning outcomes for a course.

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. Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with the requirements of the RTP Policy of the Department of Health Science.

- A. Required Documentation. Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are required to submit copies of all student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of non-supervision based courses¹ taught each semester for the period of review.
- B. Evaluation by RTP Committee. Quantitative ratings from student evaluations of instruction must reflect generally positive perceptions among students regarding of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and overall teaching effectiveness. Moreover, a faculty member's mean scores on item #8 in particular (i.e. overall teaching effectiveness) shall compare favorably to those of the Department and College.
- 1) Candidates for initial reappointment shall provide documentary evidence of the following:
 - a) Continued improvement in teaching in response to feedback from peers and students; or
 - b) Effective teaching, as indicated by student and peer evaluation.
 - 2) Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall provide documentary evidence of a sustained level of high teaching proficiency.
 - 3) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor shall provide documentary evidence that a consistent level of teaching excellence has been attained.
- C. Student Ratings of Instruction. Although, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the Department of Health Science and/or the college for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative, overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be

¹ Because supervision-based classes (e.g., internships, directed research projects, independent studies, theses, etc.) are not evaluated, no student ratings need be submitted for any such courses.

comparable to the Department of Health Science and college averages. Academic units within the college shall articulate this criterion.

2.1.4 Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. 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. These additional materials serve to help the Department RTP Committee contextualize student ratings.

- A. Required Documentation. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit *at least* three (3) peer evaluations conducted within the three years prior to the application. Ideally, a candidate will ask for peer evaluations for each course topic they teach and such evaluations will be conducted by different tenured colleagues (unless there is a lack of sufficient tenured personnel to achieve this goal). Moreover, to show growth in response to feedback from peers, candidates are encouraged to seek a second peer evaluation from the same tenured colleague in a subsequent semester.
- B. Evaluation by RTP Committee. Peer evaluations must be based on observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. Peer evaluations must document whether: instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; content is up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and overall effectiveness of ways in which information is communicated to students in the classroom. To the maximum extent possible, peer evaluators should endeavor to learn as much as possible in order to be able to comment from an informed perspective about as many of the criteria of excellence in teaching listed in Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of this Policy. Peer evaluators should also evaluate the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials.

2.1.5 Syllabi

At minimum, all course syllabi must comply with the requirements of the current senate policy. Pursuant to that policy, all syllabi must set forth course meetings times and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information; required books and other resources; an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy; an explanation of how the instructor will apply the university's course withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or schedule. Excellent syllabi, however,

also contain other types of information, such as:

- A. The measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
- B. Clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
- C. Instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and
- D. Readings and assignments that are up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of the Department of Health Science, assigned readings from primary sources that enhance the interdisciplinary and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.

The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence this Policy is designed to facilitate.

2.1.6 Grade Distributions

Although there is no “ideal” grade distribution, the distribution of an instructor’s grades can help to contextualize students’ evaluations and assist in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Thus, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor’s teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be expected in larger undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques might justify a grading distribution of all A’s and B’s in small, upper-level or graduate seminars.

2.1.7 Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above in Section 2.1.1(A) and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher as set forth in Section 2.1.1(B). If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee shall review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Research and scholarly/creative activities (RSCA) represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and beneficial components of the professorial role for several reasons. First, advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one’s knowledge has the potential for improving the quality education by keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline. Second, RSCA bring prestige and visibility to the University

and the Department. The most respected and successful universities support and encourage the acquisition of knowledge, which increases the likelihood that the Department will attract high quality students and faculty. Devotion to the acquisition of knowledge also increases the likelihood of obtaining grants, equipment, and other financial support from the community, industry, and government agencies. Third, RSCA enhance teaching effectiveness and enrich the education of students. Fourth, RSCA, especially when funded, bring equipment, technology, and professional development opportunities to the Department and its students. This, in turn, increases the likelihood that students will be well-trained and competitive when seeking employment. Finally, professional survival requires that members generate a large portion of the knowledge upon which their profession is based. Scholarly activities enable professions to shape their own destiny, rather than allowing others to dominate the course of events.

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. Accordingly, faculty members in the Department of Health Science must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of public health, health education, and related fields as well as other disciplines represented in the department (e.g., radiation therapy).

2.2.1 Standards for the Production of Scholarly Research and Creative Activities

Standards. The following provide the foundation for delineating our discipline-specific standards for teacher-scholar excellence and, therefore, shall be used for evaluating candidates' RSCA:

- 1) High-quality work as judged by one's peers;
- 2) Scope of recognition at the national, regional, or local level;
- 3) Sustained effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment; and
- 4) The impact of one's research and scholarly activities.

2.2.2 Types of RSCA

All faculty members in the Department of Health Science are *required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative, theoretical, and/or other discipline-appropriate scholarly research* (such as design of community surveys, health interventions, and program evaluations), *as well as other scholarly and creative activities consistent with the provisions of this Policy.* Copies of all such scholarly work must be submitted so that the Department RTP Committee may review the quality of the research.

- 1) Required Types of RSCA

a) Publication of scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals is required of all candidates at all levels of review. Specific publication requirements are set forth below in subsections C(2), D(1), and D(2).

(i) *“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. This type of data-based research is the most highly valued type of scholarly activity for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Health Science..*

(ii) Under appropriate circumstances, such as publication of articles or original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully advance theory, theoretically-based scholarly writing may also constitute “research,” depending on the candidate’s area of expertise, even if it does not include the quantitative or qualitative examination of empirical data. Articles published in journals such as the *American Journal of Public Health*, for example, would clearly satisfy the departmental requirement for scholarly research. Under no circumstances, however, shall this provision be interpreted as allowing literature reviews, book reviews, scholarly article reviews, or encyclopedia entries to satisfy the departmental requirement for “scholarly research.”

b) All RTP candidates are expected to present their research at relevant academic conferences (see subsection 2.2.2 D(6), below). Conference proceedings and presentations, however, strengthen a candidate’s scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank. Conference proceedings and presentations do not, however, substitute for the requirement that candidates publish scholarly research in peer reviewed journals as set forth in specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

2) Additional Expectations for Types of RSCA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion are expected to have performed one of the types of activities described in the following sections:

a) *Although other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, article reviews, encyclopedia entries, op-ed pieces, etc.) are valued (and therefore are detailed below in subsection D) these types of scholarly and creative activities alone are insufficient to meet the department or CHHS RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate. In other words,*

these other forms of scholarly activity strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

- b) *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.* These forms of scholarly activity strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
- c) Candidates may also strengthen their required program of RSCA by writing or editing books. Books strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

Evolution of RSCA. Although scholarly activities take many forms, faculty members must develop a scholarly research agenda and a record of scholarly publication that flows from the pursuit of that research agenda. Hallmarks of scholarly activity include:

- (1) Scholarly Research Agenda. Teacher-scholars in the Department of Health Science are expected to establish and maintain an ongoing program of scholarship that is marked by continued scholarly research activity and dissemination.

An important element of all RTP reviews is the teacher-scholar's future plans and goals. While the primary focus is clearly on accomplished contributions during the probationary years, it is important to respect and support the continued vibrancy of scholarly activity after the award of tenure and promotion. As a community of vibrant teacher-scholars, we are committed to recognizing, valuing, and supporting each others' unique paths of professional growth. Toward these ends:

- a) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members are expected to formulate and pursue a scholarly research agenda.
- b) Reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require evidence that the candidate's scholarly research has

been productive as evidenced by publications in professional, scholarly venues. Moreover, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be able to demonstrate how their research agenda is both continuing and evolving.

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

(2) Scholarly Publications. The quality of work is defined by its significance in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to validate the work's significance. Normally, the finished works will be published and/or presented in a respected venue consistent with accepted disciplinary standards.

- a) RTP Committee members conducting mini-reviews must be mindful of the fact that in the early probationary years, faculty are likely to just be starting to advance a research agenda. Thus, in the first year, new faculty might be more likely to publish book reviews, encyclopedia entries, invited essays, monographs, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. Prior to initial reappointment, probationary faculty members are expected to be working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed journals for editorial consideration in their first two years.
- b) By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected that the candidate will have at least evidence of peer-reviewed scholarly work either in-print or formally accepted for publication. Examples of this evidence may include journal articles, and peer-reviewed conference abstracts. Quality however, is more important than quantity. Exceeding these baseline expectations by a greater publishing output shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- c) After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period (typically years four through six), faculty should be publishing in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least four scholarly articles in refereed venues. As in other evaluative areas, quality, however, is more important than quantity. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- d) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have

demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have a record of productivity greater than what is expected at the Associate Professor rank. In addition, promotion to the rank of Professor will be strongly supported by production of a greater number of scholarly publications in a refereed journal since the last promotion. Quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, or press, whether a publication is an article or a note and whether a research presentation is regional, national, or international in scope) and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work. Candidates for promotion to full professor will have published one peer reviewed article for each year of service in the rank of associate professor on the standard timeline.

- 3) Significance of Scholarly Engagement of Students and/or Community – In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, the Department of Health Science values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to our role in serving the communities in which we work and live. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends shall be considered enhancing evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement.
- 4) Sponsored Research – *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, Department of Health Science, 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. Securing such sponsored research opportunities, though, shall constitute a significantly enhancing criterion that is given extremely positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.*
 - a) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the entirety of the probationary period, merely applying for sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills.

- b) During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related scholarly activities, allowances should be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly journal articles. Such allowances must recognize that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming and, therefore, publication of the results of such research may be delayed until after an extensive data-collection and analysis process. Candidates for promotion to full professor are encouraged to provide evidence of externally funded grants.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA

A. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of **Dissemination** of RSCA. The following tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality can be used to guide choices of scholarship dissemination outlets.

- 1) Authorship – Sole-authored and first-authored works, as well as works published with student collaborators, are evaluated most positively. For multiple-authored works, the amount or nature of author contributions should be specified. Absent unusual circumstances (such as using a unique methodology or participating in long-term grant research with other scholars, etc.), all RTP candidates who contribute to multiple-authored works are expected to balance such collaborative research projects with research and publication of their own, independent research.
- (2) Refereed Journal Articles – The following criteria should guide the RTP Committee’s assessment of articles: peer-review; acceptance/rejection rates for the journal; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal; status of the journal within the subfield; status of the members of the journal editorial board within the subfield; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and/or citations to the article.

Venues – Refereed articles that are accepted and published in public health journals, journals from related disciplines, and relevant electronic media are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The degree of value, however, depends on the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published, the degree of the candidate’s contribution to the publication, and the impact of the publication on the discipline must always be taken into account when assessing the significance of any publication.

- 3) Books – The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.
 - a) Both scholarly books and textbooks are valued for RTP purposes.

- b) Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.
- 4) Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.
- 5) Invited Publications and/or Presentations – The stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.
- 6) Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – A peer review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local). Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Rather, conference presentations represent a form of scholarly activity that enhances, but does not supplant, the requirement that candidate’s produce peer-reviewed publications in discipline-appropriate venues.
- 7) Editorial Roles – Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer on journal submissions; membership on a grant-review panel; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications. Such roles augment faculty members’ required program of RSCA, but are insufficient to meet the Department RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.
- 8) Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of activities supported by sabbaticals, and other forms of support for scholarly research funded by CSULB.

B. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of the **Impact** of RSCA

- 1) Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary

progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary journals. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).

- 2) Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. The Department of Health Science evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students’ development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses). Publications and presentations that include student co-authors are highly valued.
- 3) Community Impact – We recognize the impact of RSCA in various types of community settings (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at different levels of community effort (local, state, national, and international communities).

Documentation of the impact of scholarship on students and the community should be provided. Indicators may include student co-authorship on presentations/publications, undergraduate research mentee pursuit of graduate training, scholarship used to provide community testimony on use of technical reports or consultation to address issues of public policy, expert review or letters about the quality and impact of applied work, and external evaluation of engaged scholarship.

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 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. The expectations regarding the depth of service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are required to have made quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership either in the community or to the profession as described in this subsection.

A. Service within the University

- 1) *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in university or college service; however, they are expected to perform quality service within the Health Science Department as demonstrated by:*
 - a) Advising student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies such as graduate and/or undergraduate student associations, Radiation Therapy student association, and Eta Sigma Gama Honorary Society.
 - b) Participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees, (especially by chairing a department committee such as the research, continuing education, curriculum, or graduate or undergraduate committees);
 - c) Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department such as preparing program reviews, accreditation reports, or certification;
 - d) Attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;
 - e) Attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the department, the college, the university, and professional organizations; and
 - f) Actively participating in student programs.
- 2) *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to both the Department (as discussed above) and to service contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, such as serving on college-wide committees and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the college. University-level service is desirable, but not required.*
- 3) *For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership at the department, college, and university levels. In doing so, they must contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution. Examples of service contributions are listed below. Note that the following list is not all inclusive, and does not exclude other examples of significant contributions to service.*
 - a) Chairing the department, serving as the graduate advisor or undergraduate advisor, chair program reviews or accreditation review

process;

- b) Chairing major departmental committees;
- c) Holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
- d) Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the university, college, or department;
- e) Creating or significantly revising entire department/program curricula or developing new courses.

B. Service to the Community and/or the Profession – *All faculty members are expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to the profession.*

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

a) For reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, such community service may include:

(i) *Consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments; and/or community organizations.*

(ii) Helping to organize or facilitate events for charities health and civic organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to the candidate's professional expertise; and/or

(iii) Acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations) for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.

b) For promotion to the rank of full Professor, such community service is expected to include a record of leadership in the community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international health problems), such as:

(i) Taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or workshops;

(ii) Holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations related to the candidate's professional expertise;

- (iii) Consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
 - (iv) Serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or
 - (v) Engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to public health; serving as a health related consultant; provide events or news stories; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with health-related missions; writing relevant health editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.
- 2) Professional Service – *Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected offices* in a health and public health related professional organization. Such professional service is most highly valued when it is performed for the American Public Health Association, Society for Public Health Education, Radiological Society, or other health related organizations.
 - 3) Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports; and the frequency and range of clients for consulting activities.
 - 4) Professional Honors, Awards, and Other Forms of Recognition – Election as an officer of a professional organization, including consideration of the scope of the organization (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); recognition through fellowship status in a professional organization, including consideration of the scope of the organization; awards, prizes, and other forms of recognition, including consideration of the scope of the organization presenting the award.

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, particularly in terms of the duration and impact;*
- B. *the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, the college, and/or to the Health Science Department;*

- 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. most importantly, the degree of leadership exhibited by the candidate. In evaluating this criterion, 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 and summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance in addition to documenting their attendance and participation. Provide an explanation of the quality and significance of their service domain (e.g. to the department, college, university, community, and the profession).
- 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.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the Department of Health Science, the Department of Health Science RTP committee, the chair or director of the Department of Health

Science, 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 (Times New Roman) with one-inch margins. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Academic Unit RTP Policy

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

3.3 Academic Unit RTP Committee

The academic unit RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's

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

3.3.1 Election of Committee

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

- A. The committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured 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.

3.3.2 Committee Composition

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

candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

- A. The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.
- B. *Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations.*

3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

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

3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

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

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

3.3.6 Joint Appointments

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

3.4 Chair of the Department of Health Science

The Chair of the Department of Health Science is responsible for communicating the departmental, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with departmental expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college and/or academic unit mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

3.4.1 Meeting with Committee

*The chair shall meet with the **Department of Health Science RTP committee** prior to the beginning of the department's evaluation process to review the department's, college, and university processes and procedures.*

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by the Chair of the Department of Health Science

***The Chair of the Department of Health Science** may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the chair is elected to the RTP committee of their academic unit. However, in promotion considerations, a 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 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.

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 Department of Health Science 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 of the Department of Health Science, if eligible and if not an elected member of the departmental RTP committee, may review the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.*
- 6.7 *The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.*
- 6.8 *The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.*
- 6.9 *The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.*

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

- 7.1 *Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.*
- 7.2 *If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.*
- 7.3 *At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as to any previous review levels.*
- 7.4 *The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation, consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.*

8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY

8.1 Ratification

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

8.2 Amendments

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

8.2.1 Voting on Amendments

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

8.2.2 Majority Needed to Adopt

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

8.2.3 Voting Rights

All tenured and probationary Department faculty members - including those on leave, sabbatical, and FERP – are eligible to vote.