CSULB is a teaching-intensive, research-driven university that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global perspectives. The Department of Economics Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the criteria by which the work of probationary and tenured faculty shall be evaluated within this context. The department expects all probationary and tenured faculty to demonstrate a sustained, high-quality record in: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and (3) service contributions.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

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

1.1.1 The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the college. The Department of Economics RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the Department.

1.1.2 Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and department policies.

1.1.3 The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed work for specified periods of review.

1.1.4 Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As such, all statements made by candidates and all materials put forth for consideration in RTP matters must abide by the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this basic principle. Such issues shall be referred to Academic Affairs.

1.1.5 Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner organized according to the policy requirements and instructions.

1.1.6 Candidates’ narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as detailed on the Professional Data Sheet.

1.1.7 The Department Chair will assign all new faculty members a Faculty Mentor in the first semester of appointment. The Faculty Mentor will provide, in
a timely fashion, examples of appropriate documentation for future review. The 
Department will elect an RTP Committee as indicated in the bylaws.

1.1.8 Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on 
criteria and procedures delineated in university, college, or department RTP 
policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on unprofessional sources such 
as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., Facebook, 
RateMyProfessors.com, Pick-a-Professor.com), petitions, and anonymous letters.

1.1.9 As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other 
materials obtained during open period are to be considered as part of the 
evaluation of a candidate.

1.1.10 Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more 
areas of evaluation. Multi-faceted activities may be broken into components and 
discussed where appropriate. Components discussed or listed under one area of 
evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.

1.2 File Requirements

1.2.1 All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:

a. Professional Data Sheet labeled according to university requirements 
and with the following CLA specifications:

1. Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:
   a. By semester, list formal academic advising 
      activities and associated duties.
   b. By semester, list activities for which units are 
      assigned (e.g., assigned time or other), such as 
      involvement in student mentoring, supervision of 
      student research, projects, and/or fieldwork.
   c. By semester, include other instructional activities 
      outside of the classroom. Such activities include, 
      but are not limited to: (1) supervision of student 
      independent research projects; (2) supervision of 
      student research assistants; (3) chairing or serving 
      on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees; 
      and (4) supervision of student teachers.

2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA):
   1. For all RSCA that does not appear under Works in 
      Progress, candidate must:
      a. Label according to CLA definitions for 
         publication status and peer-review.
      b. Place all previously-claimed work under the 
         double line.
      c. List RSCA-related external grants.
      d. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication
i. Description of publication venue (e.g., journal, media, or volume) vis-à-vis the discipline and/or subfield;

ii. Rationale for publication venue choice;

iii. Explanation of candidate’s contribution to co- and multi-authored RSCA.

3. Service activities, including dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.

b. Narrative addressing the three areas of evaluation (instruction and instructionally-related activities; RSCA; and service). This three-part narrative shall be submitted via the Candidate Statement Form*, which allows up to 3,000 words.

c. Workload Assignment Form.*

d. Academic Advisor Report† (as appropriate).

e. All peer-reviewed publications for the period of review, including (for each):

   1. Proof of peer-review for peer-reviewed publications;

   2. Proof of publication status for all in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.

f. Student course evaluation summaries for each course taught for which formal student course evaluations were required during the period of review. Candidates must request copies of these materials through the Department RTP Committee Chair at least 5 days before the candidate’s deadline to turn in the file to the RTP Committee.

g. For each course taught during the period of review:

   1. One (1) representative syllabus;

   2. One (1) sample learning assessment tool;

   3. One (1) sample of representative course materials not to exceed four (4) pages.

h. All prior RTP reviews, periodic evaluations, and evidence of mentoring (i.e., mini-review evaluations or other) over the full review period, including the candidate’s responses or rebuttals, if any. For promotion to rank of Professor, evaluations for promotion to Associate Professor shall be included.

i. Index of all materials prepared by the candidate except the index of open period materials, which shall be prepared by the Department RTP Committee Chair or designee.

1.2.2 With the exception of optional written student evaluations as per 2.1.7.3, materials in excess of the above requirements will be returned to the candidate.

* Denotes official form available from the College of Liberal Arts.
† Academic Advisor form available from the College of Liberal Arts and only required of faculty who receive unit compensation for advising activities.
The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The Department of Economics requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines for each area of evaluation below.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities
This section specifies criteria for the evaluation of a faculty member’s instruction and instructionally-related activities. Further, this section delineates the type and amount of documentation regarding a candidate’s instructional effectiveness.

2.1.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities File
Candidates must submit:
   a. Narrative written on the fillable form.
   b. Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal student course evaluations were required during the period of review.
   c. For each course taught during the period of review:
      1. One (1) representative course syllabus.
      2. One (1) sample of an appropriate assessment of student learning outcomes.
      3. One (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages.
   d. Academic Advisor Report, if applicable.

2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice
The candidate’s narrative of instructional philosophy and practice provides the context necessary for understanding and interpreting the candidate’s instructional goals, materials, and accomplishments.

This narrative, as further evidenced by submitted materials, shall address the following:
   a. The over-arching goals of the candidate’s instructional practices.
   b. Relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to instruction.
   c. Teaching methodologies and their links to student assessment and learning outcomes.
   d. Student course evaluations relative to level.
   e. Grade distributions relative to level.
   f. Reflection on course evolution in response to feedback from mini reviews and previous RTP actions, professional development activities, and/or experimentation with instructional methodologies or assessments.

Furthermore, the narrative shall address the following as appropriate:
   g. Student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms, relative to level.
   h. Grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.
2.1.3 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Materials

For each course taught during the period under review candidates will include only: (a) one (1) representative syllabus; (b) one (1) assessment tool for student learning; and (c) one (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages.

2.1.3.1 Syllabi

A representative syllabus for each course instructed during the period of review must be submitted. For courses taught more than once in the period of review (e.g., GEOG444), only the most recent syllabus shall be submitted. Candidates may, however, include an additional syllabus for no more than two (2) selected courses to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation. Evaluation will consider syllabi content relative to course level and catalog description. Syllabi must reflect currency in the discipline, compliance with the course’s Standard Course Outline on file with the candidate’s department, and consistency with current Academic Senate syllabus policies.

2.1.3.2 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one assessment tool of student learning (e.g., comprehensive final assignment, exam, lab, paper assignment, or project assignment). Evaluation will consider appropriateness relative to course content, student learning goals and objectives, course level, and number of enrolled students.

2.1.3.3 Instructional Materials

For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages. Instructional materials include, but are not limited to, class handouts, lecture notes, web page printouts, and PowerPoint slides. Media containing instructional materials (e.g., CDs and DVDs) can be discussed in the narrative but may not be submitted.

2.1.4 Peer Observation of Instruction

At least one member of the Department RTP Committee will perform a classroom observation. The evaluation will adhere to the CBA and comply with a departmental rubric or procedure. Candidates will be given at least five (5) days notice before a classroom visit. The subsequent evaluation will be incorporated into the department RTP evaluation.

2.1.5 Grade Distributions

Differentiation among levels of student learning is an important responsibility of any teacher. Grade distributions provide a measure of grade leniency and severity. Further, they provide a useful measure for contextualizing assessment of student learning and student course evaluations. As grades in a class necessarily differ from one group of students to another, evaluation will consider the overall trend in grade distributions.
2.1.6 Academic Advisor Report
Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal student academic advising shall report on their activities per a consistent procedure approved by the Dean or designee. For RTP purposes, the report serves to document instructionally-related activities for which assigned time is granted.

2.1.7 Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction
Student course evaluations complement the information obtained in the criteria stated above.

2.1.7.1. Evaluation Relative to Context
As per the college RTP document, committees, chairs, and the dean shall evaluate student response to instruction relative to context, including:

   a. Class characteristics
      1. Course level
      2. Number of enrolled students
      3. Whether this was a new course preparation

   b. Candidate’s teaching assignment
      1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of evaluation
      2. Total number of different course preparations

   c. Candidate’s experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness

   d. Trends over time

2.1.7.2 Course Evaluation Summaries
Course evaluation summaries that are consistent with department and college means provide one measure of effective instruction. Course evaluation summaries must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations are required during the period of review.

2.1.7.3 Written Remarks on Student Course Evaluations
The inclusion of written remarks from student course evaluations is optional. Candidates may include written remarks for a course if such remarks help clarify or explain an ambiguity on the course evaluation summaries. In such cases, all original student evaluations for the selected course, including those evaluations without student comments, must be included.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)
The Department of Economics requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) of all faculty members. This section outlines the criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

2.2.1 RSCA File
2.2.1.1 Required Materials
Candidate’s files must include:
a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.
b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative
activities for the review period only. RSCA claimed in prior
actions cannot be included. Published peer-reviewed research is
defined under 2.2.3.1. Such materials shall be placed in the binder
or, in the case of books and other materials that do not fit in the
binder, shall be submitted with the file. Furthermore, candidates
have the option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming
RSCA as per the following guidelines:

1. Candidates may include accepted, in press, or forthcoming
RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it
beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such
materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates
decide to withhold these materials, such items must be
listed under Works in Progress on the PDS.

2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only
include publications and all in press, forthcoming, or
accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a
prior successful action.

c. For candidates who author externally-funded RSCA grants and
choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, file
must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2)
length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award;
(5) brief description of candidate’s role in authorship and
implementation.

d. Proof of publication status as per policy (below) for all in press,
forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.

e. Proof of peer review as per 2.2.3.

2.2.1.2 Optional Materials
The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews) is
optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as
negative for any candidate.

2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials
Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g.,
works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures). Listing
such items on the PDS is sufficient.

2.2.2 RSCA Narrative
The RSCA narrative for the period of review must address:

a. Focus and sustained nature of the candidate’s research,
scholarly, and creative activities.
b. Significance and impact of the candidate’s RSCA.
c. Candidate’s role in authorship for co- and multi-authored
RSCA.
d. Significance and impact of non peer-reviewed RSCA included in the candidate’s RTP file.

2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition

In the Department of Economics, the primary requirement for a candidate’s research, scholarly, and creative activities is peer review.

2.2.3.1 Definition

Peer review is typically defined as a process by which qualified experts in the discipline impartially evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities. For the purposes of this policy, the term peer review encompasses the terms ‘juried’ and ‘refereed,’ which may be used for all RSCA impartially evaluated by qualified experts in specific disciplines.

2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement

For each RSCA item on the Professional Data Sheet, candidates are required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using consistent labels of “Peer Reviewed,” “Refereed,” or “Juried” as appropriate to the field.

2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status

RSCA not yet in print or otherwise in the public domain must be labeled on the Professional Data Sheet according to the following definitions of publication status:

a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable, except when a DOI (digital object identifier) has been issued. Both refer to an accepted work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-publication state. A work is considered published after a DOI has been issued.

b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has agreed to publish without major changes.

c. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be published.

d. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.

e. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.

f. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.

g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.

2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status

For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file,
candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.

2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest

2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process
Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such proof must be provided in English.

Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:
   a. A printout of the venue’s editorial policy.
   b. Copies of reader reports.
   c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.

2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns
Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.

Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest; monetary payment to secure publication; and duplicate publication:

   a. **Conflicts of interest**: Conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to serving contemporaneously on the editorial, advisory, or executive board of the press or journal with which one has published.

   b. **Monetary contributions**: Publications in venues to which an author is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure publication (e.g., for-profit presses and vanity presses) shall be considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images).

   c. **Duplicate publication**: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprints must be labeled as such.

2.3 Service
High-quality, sustained service contributions to the University as well as to the profession and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts. Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty member.

In keeping with the self-governance tenets that inform our campus, service contributions must be performed at the department, college, and/or university levels. This section delineates service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.
2.3.1 Service File
Candidates must submit:
   a. Narrative written on the fillable form. The narrative shall address significance and impact of service identified on the PDS.
   b. Professional Data Sheet. As per university guidelines, the PDS must address dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.

2.3.2 Service Expectations
All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues. Candidates should discuss service opportunities with their mentors. At all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates serve.

Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to: faculty governance activities and committees; program development; sponsorship of student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and projects; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures; mentoring of students; service or leadership activities for university committees, professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; peer review for scholarly journals; organization of conferences; and consulting in federal, state and local government, and community organizations.

2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank
   a. Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment typically are expected to focus service activities at the department level.
   b. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-quality service contributions to their department, and to either the college or the university.
   c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates are expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) a record of leadership at the University; and (3) a record of service in the community and/or the profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g., committee chair) and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g., active participation in accreditation or policy-writing processes).

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service
RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service activities relative to department, college, and university RTP policies as well as
the CBA. Candidates must describe the nature of the service activities in their narrative, providing the basic parameters for peer evaluation.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS
The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process, and emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.

3.1 Candidate
Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.

3.1.1 It is the candidate’s responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Academic Affairs.

3.1.2 It is the candidate’s responsibility to ensure that all required material is included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.

3.1.3 As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of material after the date of file completion must have the approval of the college RTP committee, which is the peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.

3.2 Joint Appointments
The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the formation of an evaluation committee. This committee shall consist of members selected from among the peer review committees of the departments within which the candidate holds a joint appointment. For more details on joint appointments, see the university policy.

3.3 Department RTP Committee
The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities for department RTP committees and stipulates that no one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.3.1 The Department RTP Committee Chair is responsible for protecting the confidentiality of RTP documents.

3.3.2 The Department RTP Committee Chair must inform all other committee members on the decisions of the Department Chair, CLA committee, Dean and Provost.

3.4 Department Chair Evaluations
In the Department of Economics the Chair will provide an independent evaluation of RTP candidates. That document usually will not exceed 500 words.
3.7 College and University Review

The college RTP committee reviews materials submitted by candidates, departmental committees, and department chairs. Evaluation by the college committee must take into account the RTP policy of the candidate’s department as well as the university and college RTP policies. The committee renders its own evaluation, which it forwards to the dean.

The Dean is charged with mentoring department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process. The dean also communicates standards and expectations and ensures the integrity of the RTP process across the college. The Dean writes an independent evaluation and recommendation for each candidate and forwards that evaluation to the Provost.

The Provost reviews the candidate’s file and all prior evaluations and makes a final recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.

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. Candidates shall demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any action.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the college and the candidate’s department, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

At minimum, this evidence must include demonstration of: (1) effective teaching; (2) research, scholarship, and/or creative activities that include initial publications or similar evidence of RSCA appropriate to rank, experience, and discipline; and (3) engagement in service at the department level.

The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The University RTP Policy delineates the meaning of tenure and the criteria for the awarding of tenure.
5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

The University RTP Policy states the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor, including the expectation that a candidate shall have a record of high-quality peer-reviewed work that has contributed to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition to the minimum standard stated in that policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the candidate to make high-quality service contributions to the department and to either the college or the university.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

The University RTP Policy states that standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than standards for promotion to associate professor.

In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include 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 a substantial record of peer-reviewed work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities. The candidate also is expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership at the University; and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

As outlined by the University RTP Policy, early tenure and/or early promotion are awarded in rare circumstances in which a candidate demonstrates a superior record of accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation. That policy states that candidates for early tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the university policy on external evaluation.

5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts

In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a potential candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources and mentors, including the department chair and dean.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the University RTP Policy.

In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall prepare the index of open period materials.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES
The University RTP Policy specifies that, 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.

The University RTP Policy and the CBA specify that 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. In the College of Liberal Arts, a timely manner is defined as no more than five business days.

In the College of Liberal Arts, committees, chairs, and deans cannot request additional material that is not specified by the college or department RTP policies unless such material is required to verify otherwise unsupported claims made in the file.

The University RTP Policy specifies that, 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 accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any previous review levels.

External evaluations of candidates are governed by the university policy on external evaluation and the CBA.

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

Amendments may be proposed by the Department RTP Committee or by a petition signed by 20 percent of the tenured and probationary faculty of the Department.

The Chairperson shall call a meeting of the Faculty to discuss proposed amendments.

Voting shall be consistent with the By-Laws of the Department of Economics.

Amendments are ratified by a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured and probationary faculty and approvals required by the CLA Faculty Council, the CLA Dean, and the Provost.

If any provision of this Document is in conflict with either (a) RTP provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement or (b) the University Policy on RTP, the Faculty shall approve changes to bring the provision into conformity, thereby amending this Document.