

1 **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH**
2 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**
3 **COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**
4 **DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION**
5 **EFFECTIVE FALL 2010**
6

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

15
16 **1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES**
17

18 **1.1 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)**
19

20 **1.1.1** The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP
21 procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy
22 provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the
23 college.
24

25 **1.1.2** All departments in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) are required to have
26 an RTP Policy. Department RTP standards shall not be lower than college-level
27 standards. Departments may adopt the college policy as their own. In all cases,
28 basic principles of shared governance must be followed in the creation, adoption,
29 and emendation of such policies.
30

31 **1.1.3** Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and
32 department policies.
33

34 **1.1.4** The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed
35 work for specified periods of review.
36

37 **1.1.5** Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As
38 such, all statements made by candidates and all materials put forth for
39 consideration in RTP matters must abide by the highest standards of academic
40 honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or
41 misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this basic
42 principle. Such issues shall be referred to Academic Affairs.
43

44 **1.1.6** Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner
45 organized according to the policy requirements and instructions.
46

47 **1.1.7** Candidates' narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as
48 detailed on the Professional Data Sheet.

49
50 **1.1.8** The CLA RTP policy requires mentoring of candidates and candidates'
51 participation in the mentoring process. While mentoring provides ongoing
52 evaluative feedback for candidates, the RTP process constitutes the formal
53 mechanism for evaluation of probationary and tenured faculty.

54
55 **1.1.9** Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on
56 criteria and procedures delineated in university, college, or department RTP
57 policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on unprofessional sources such
58 as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., Facebook,
59 RateMyProfessors.com, Pick-a-Professor.com), petitions and anonymous letters.

60
61 **1.1.10** As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other
62 materials obtained during open period are to be considered as part of the
63 evaluation of a candidate.

64
65 **1.1.11** Concision and accuracy guide the RTP process at all levels. The CLA RTP
66 Policy requires a streamlined approach to candidates' files. Forms shall be fillable
67 to ensure compliance with word limits.

68
69 **1.1.12** Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more
70 areas of evaluation. Multi-faceted activities may be broken into components and
71 discussed where appropriate. Components discussed or listed under one area of
72 evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.

73 74 **1.2 File Requirements**

75
76 **1.2.1** All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:

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

79 1. Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:

80 a. By semester, list formal academic advising
81 activities and associated duties.

82 b. By semester, list activities for which units are
83 assigned (e.g., assigned time or other), such as
84 involvement in student mentoring, supervision of
85 student research, projects, and/or fieldwork.

86 c. By semester, include other instructional activities
87 outside of the classroom. Such activities include,
88 but are not limited to: (1) supervision of student
89 independent research projects; (2) supervision of
90 student research assistants; (3) chairing or serving
91 on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees;
92 and (4) supervision of student teachers.

- 93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
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. List RSCA-related external grants;
 - c. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication listed with the following:
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - i. Index of all materials prepared by the candidate except the index of open period materials, which shall be prepared by department RTP committee chair or designee.

1.2.2 With the exception of optional written student evaluations as per 2.1.7.3,

* 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.

136 materials in excess of the above requirements will be returned to the candidate.

137

138 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

139 The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The College
140 of Liberal Arts requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines
141 for each area of evaluation below.

142

143 **2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities**

144 Effective instruction and instructionally-related activities within the College of Liberal Arts
145 encompass a wide range of tasks and responsibilities. This section specifies criteria for the
146 evaluation of a faculty member's instruction and instructionally-related activities. Further, this
147 section delineates the type and amount of documentation regarding a candidate's instructional
148 effectiveness.

149

150 **2.1.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities File**

151 Candidates **must** submit:

152

- 153 a. Narrative written on the fillable form.
- 154 b. Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal
155 student course evaluations were required during the period of review.
- 156 c. For each course taught during the period of review:
 - 157 1. One (1) representative course syllabus.
 - 158 2. One (1) sample of an appropriate assessment of student learning
159 outcomes.
 - 160 3. One (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to
161 exceed four (4) pages.
- 162 d. Academic Advisor Report, if applicable.

163

164 **2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

165 The candidate's narrative of instructional philosophy and practice provides the context
166 necessary for understanding and interpreting the candidate's instructional goals,
167 materials, and accomplishments.

168

169 This narrative, as further evidenced by submitted materials, shall address the following:

170

- 171 a. The over-arching goals of the candidate's instructional practices.
- 172 b. Relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to instruction.
- 173 c. Teaching methodologies and their links to student assessment and learning
174 outcomes.
- 175 d. Student course evaluations relative to level.
- 176 e. Grade distributions relative to level.
- 177 f. Reflection on course evolution in response to feedback, professional
178 development activities, and/or experimentation with instructional
methodologies or assessments.

Furthermore, the narrative shall address the following *as appropriate*:

179 g. Student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms,
180 relative to level.

181 h. Grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

182 **2.1.3 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Materials**

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

186

187 **2.1.3.1 Syllabi**

188 A representative syllabus for each course instructed during the period of review
189 must be submitted. Candidates may include an additional syllabus for no more
190 than two selected courses to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation.
191 Evaluation will consider syllabi content relative to course level and catalog
192 description. Syllabi must reflect currency in the discipline and be consistent with
193 current Academic Senate syllabus policies.

194

195 **2.1.3.2 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

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

201

202 **2.1.3.3 Instructional Materials**

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

209

210 **2.1.4 Peer Observation of Instruction**

211 As part of the department RTP evaluation, the department committee may choose
212 to perform a classroom observation or a candidate may choose to request such an
213 observation. If performed, the evaluation must adhere to the CBA and comply
214 with a consistent departmental rubric or procedure, including compliance with the
215 requirement that notice be given at least five (5) days before a classroom visit.
216 The subsequent evaluation may be incorporated into the department RTP
217 evaluation and/or submitted as a separate document during the open period.

218

219 **2.1.5 Grade Distributions**

220 Differentiation among levels of student learning is an important responsibility of
221 any teacher. Grade distributions provide a measure of grade leniency and severity.
222 Further, they provide a useful measure for contextualizing assessment of student
223 learning and student course evaluations. Therefore department chairs or designees
224 are expected to make grade distributions available to all faculty members annually

225 so that faculty can reflect, as appropriate, on these numbers. As grades in a class
226 necessarily differ from one group of students to another, evaluation will consider
227 the overall trend in grade distributions.
228

2.1.6 Academic Advisor Report

229 Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal student academic
230 advising shall report on their activities per a consistent procedure approved by the
231 Dean or designee. For RTP purposes, the report serves to document
232 instructionally-related activities for which assigned time is granted.
233
234

2.1.7 Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

235 Student course evaluations complement the information obtained in the criteria stated
236 above.
237
238

2.1.7.1. Evaluation Relative to Context

239 Committees, chairs, and the dean shall evaluate student response to instruction
240 relative to context, including:
241

- 242 a. Class characteristics
 - 243 1. Course level
 - 244 2. Number of enrolled students
 - 245 3. Whether this was a new course preparation
- 246 b. Candidate's teaching assignment
 - 247 1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of
248 evaluation
 - 249 2. Total number of different course preparations
- 250 c. Candidate's experimentation with methodologies in attempting to
251 improve teaching effectiveness
- 252 d. Trends over time

2.1.7.2 Course Evaluation Summaries

253
254 Course evaluation summaries that are consistent with department and college
255 means provide one measure of effective instruction. Course evaluation summaries
256 must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations
257 are required during the period of review.
258
259

2.1.7.3 Written Remarks on Student Course Evaluations

260 The inclusion of written remarks from student course evaluations is optional.
261 Candidates may include written remarks for a course if such remarks help clarify
262 or explain an ambiguity on the course evaluation summaries. In such cases, all
263 original student evaluations for the selected course, including those evaluations
264 without student comments, must be included.
265
266
267

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

268 The College of Liberal Arts requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)
269 of all faculty members. CLA recognizes the diversity of fields represented within the
270

271 college. Traditional scholarship and emerging scholarly fields, such as the scholarship of
272 engagement and multi-media RSCA, fall under this rubric. This section outlines the
273 criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities
274 regarding RTP files and materials.
275

276 **2.2.1 RSCA File**

277 **2.2.1.1 Required Materials**

278 Candidate's files **must** include:

- 279 a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.
- 280 b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative
281 activities for the review period only. Published peer-reviewed
282 research includes, but is not limited to: books, articles, films, and
283 other media. Such materials shall be placed in the binder or, in the
284 case of books and other materials that do not fit in the binder, shall
285 be submitted with the file. Furthermore, candidates have the
286 option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per
287 the following guidelines:
 - 288 1. Candidates may include accepted, in press, or forthcoming
289 RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it
290 beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such
291 materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates
292 decide to withhold these materials, such items must be
293 listed under Works in Progress on the PDS.
 - 294 2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only
295 include publications and all in press, forthcoming, or
296 accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a
297 prior successful action.
- 298 c. For candidates who author externally-funded RSCA grants and
299 choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, file
300 must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2)
301 length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award;
302 (5) brief description of candidate's role in authorship and
303 implementation.
- 304 d. Proof of publication status as per policy (below) for all in press,
305 forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.
- 306 e. Proof of peer review as per 2.2.3.

307 **2.2.1.2 Optional Materials**

308 The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews,
309 conference proceedings or materials not subjected to professional editing)
310 is optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as
311 negative for any candidate.
312

313 **2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials**

314 Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g.,
315 works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures). Listing
316

317 such items on the PDS is sufficient.

318
319 **2.2.2 RSCA Narrative**

320 The RSCA narrative for the period of review must address:

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

328
329 **2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition**

330 In the College of Liberal Arts, peer review is the primary requirement for the
331 majority of a candidate's research, scholarly, and creative activities.

332
333 **2.2.3.1 Definition**

334 Peer review is typically defined as a process by which experts in the
335 discipline evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research,
336 scholarly, and creative activities. For the purposes of this policy, the term
337 peer review encompasses the terms 'juried,' 'edited' and 'refereed,' which
338 may be used for all RSCA evaluated by experts in specific disciplines.
339 'Edited' means that the materials have been subjected to a review and
340 approved for publication/dissemination by experts in the field, such as, but
341 not limited to, editor(s) in a newspaper, producer(s) at a television station,
342 or campaign manager(s).

343
344 Peer review is also defined as:

- 345 a. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the
346 publishing venues of non-academic sectors such as but not limited
347 to news stories in edited media, columns, features, multimedia
348 presentations, documentaries, political and public relations
349 campaigns and related materials.
- 350 b. The process of evaluation of extramural RSCA grant proposals
351 by granting agencies or organizations.
- 352 c. A process leading to performances or exhibits.

353
354 **2.2.3.2. Balance of academic and non-academic publications**

355 Candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion in the Department of
356 Journalism and Mass Communication are strongly encouraged to
357 contribute peer-reviewed work to non-academic sectors in addition to
358 pursuing academic publishing. Non-academic peer-reviewed publishing is
359 considered essential to staying current in the field and practicing many of
360 the same skills that we teach to students. Non-academic publishing by
361 candidates is not, however, a substitute for developing a sustained research
362 agenda and pursuing scholarly publications in the field of journalism and

363 mass communication.

364

365 **2.2.3.3. Evaluating contributions to the field and the context of**
366 **publications**

367 The Department of Journalism and Mass Communication recognizes the
368 value and relevance of interdisciplinary and international research and
369 publications by its faculty. The RTP committee will use resources and
370 guidelines provided by the top organizations in the field of journalism,
371 mass communication and related disciplines to evaluate the merit and
372 contribution of the candidates' peer-reviewed publications. Faculty should
373 provide all relevant materials that will help the RTP committee understand
374 the context and importance of their contribution to the field.

375

376 **2.2.3.4. Online vs. traditional outlets**

377 The departmental RTP committee should weigh the relative merit of peer-
378 reviewed academic and non-academic publications based on their
379 contribution to the field with the understanding that online-only outlets
380 have become a viable segment of contemporary academic publishing and
381 media. By no means should the format of the publication (e.g., online) be
382 used as a sole criterion in the evaluation of a candidate's contribution.

383

384 **2.2.3.5 Labeling Requirement**

385 For each RSCA item on the Professional Data Sheet, candidates are
386 required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using
387 consistent labels of "Peer Reviewed," "Refereed," or "Juried/Edited" as
388 appropriate to the field.

389

390 **2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status**

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

394

- 395 a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable. Both refer to an
396 accepted work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-
397 publication state.
- 398 b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has
399 agreed to publish without major changes.
- 400 c. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed
401 and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity,
402 indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be
403 published.
- 404 d. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and
405 has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating
406 that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.
- 407 e. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.
- 408 f. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for
which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.

- 409 g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for
410 which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.
411

412 **2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status**

413 For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file,
414 candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the
415 publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation
416 (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.
417

418 **2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

419 **2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

420 Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such
421 proof must be provided in English, or in the original language with an
422 accompanying English translation.
423

424 Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:

- 425 a. A printout of the venue's editorial policy.
426 b. Copies of reader reports.
427 c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.
428

429 **2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns**

430 Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.
431

432 Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest;
433 monetary payment to secure publication; and duplicate publication:
434

- 435 a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include, but are not
436 limited to serving contemporaneously on the editorial, advisory, or
437 executive board of the press or journal with which one has
438 published.
439 b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author
440 is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure
441 publication (e.g., for-profit presses and vanity presses) shall be
442 considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection
443 process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to
444 offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for
445 publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images).
446 c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in
447 their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same
448 article published in different venues or in different languages.
449 Reprints must be labeled as such.
450

451 **2.3 Service**

452 High-quality, sustained service contributions to the University as well as to the profession
453 and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts.
454

455 Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty member.

456
457 In keeping with the self-governance tenets that inform our campus, service contributions
458 must be performed at the department, college, and/or university levels. It is understood
459 that all faculty members are expected to provide sustained and high quality service to the
460 Department of Journalism and Mass Communication throughout their CSULB careers.
461 Candidates are also expected to engage in service at college and university levels
462 appropriate to their rank and experience. Contribution to all levels of service will be used
463 to evaluate candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion. This section delineates
464 service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.

465 466 **2.3.1 Service File**

467 Candidates **must** submit:

- 468 a. Narrative written on the fillable form. The narrative shall address
469 significance and impact of service identified on the PDS.
- 470 b. Professional Data Sheet. As per university guidelines, the PDS must
471 address dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and
472 responsibilities.

473 474 **2.3.2 Service Expectations**

475 All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of
476 faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues.

477
478 At all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be
479 weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates
480 serve.

481
482 Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to: faculty
483 governance activities and committees; program development; sponsorship of
484 student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and projects;
485 authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or
486 department policies and procedures; mentoring of students outside of regular
487 academic advising; service or leadership activities for university committees,
488 professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations;
489 participating in the peer-review process for academic publications and
490 conferences; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community
491 organizations.

492 493 **2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank**

- 494 a. Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment
495 typically are expected to focus service activities at the department
496 level.
- 497 b. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor,
498 probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-
499 quality service contributions to their department, and to either the
500 college or the university.

- 501 c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates must
502 have a record of substantive service to the University, including
503 service at department, college, and university levels. Moreover, the
504 candidate must have a record of service to the profession and/or the
505 community. Candidates are required to have a record of leadership at
506 the University. Leadership may be demonstrated by a record of
507 holding formal offices (e.g., chair) and/or of active engagement in
508 faculty governance (e.g., committee chair, active participation in
509 accreditation or policy-writing processes).
510

511 **2.3.3 Evaluation of Service**

512 RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service
513 activities relative to department, college, and university RTP policies as well as
514 the CBA.
515

516 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

517 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process, and
518 emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.
519

520 **3.1 Candidate**

521 Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that
522 complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking
523 guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and
524 procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.
525

526 **3.1.1** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually
527 accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Academic Affairs.
528

529 **3.1.2** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required material is
530 included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.
531

532 **3.1.3** As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become
533 accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of material after the date of file
534 completion must have the approval of the college RTP committee, which is the
535 peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.
536

537 **3.2 Joint Appointments**

538 The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with
539 a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates
540 that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the
541 formation of an evaluation committee. This committee shall consist of members selected
542 from among the peer review committees of the departments within which the candidate
543 holds a joint appointment. For more details on joint appointments, see the university
544 policy.
545

546 **3.3 Department RTP Policy**

547 The University RTP Policy dictates that all departments shall have RTP policies. The
548 document also delineates ratification procedures and review requirements. All department
549 policies must then be ratified by the Faculty Council in a majority vote and must be
550 approved by the dean and the Provost.

551
552 In the College of Liberal Arts, departments may adopt the college policy as their own.
553 All department RTP policies must be reviewed, at minimum, every five years by
554 probationary and tenured departmental faculty. If changes are made, the department
555 policy must then be ratified and approved as outlined above.

556 **3.4 Department RTP Committee**

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

560
561
562 **3.4.1** In the College of Liberal Arts, departments must elect no fewer than three
563 (3) tenured, full-time faculty members to department RTP committees. As per the
564 CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may
565 serve on RTP committees if elected by majority vote and approved by the
566 President, yet no RTP committee may comprise solely faculty participating in the
567 FERP. All elections must be done by secret ballot.

568
569 **3.4.2** Department constitutions or RTP policies may stipulate that larger
570 committees or separate committees may be elected for different actions (i.e.,
571 reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Professor). In all cases, at least three (3)
572 members of the department RTP committee must evaluate each candidate.

573
574 **3.4.3** As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a
575 higher rank than the candidate.

576
577 **3.4.4** Department RTP committees are encouraged to provide concise evaluative
578 commentary of candidates' files.

579
580 **3.4.5** As per the academic honesty clause of the College RTP policy,
581 misrepresentations, if detected, must be noted in the evaluation.

582 **3.5 Mentoring**

583 The College of Liberal Arts recognizes the importance of mentoring in the success of
584 RTP candidates and requires candidates to participate in ongoing mentoring activities,
585 which aim to help candidates maintain a clear trajectory of their professional
586 accomplishments and goals. The University RTP Policy identifies the department chair as
587 having the responsibility for communicating the department, college, and university
588 policies to candidates and for providing mentoring to candidates. In the College of
589 Liberal Arts, mentoring can be performed by the chair or a mutually agreed-upon
590 tenured, full-time faculty designee. Evidence of mentoring shall be included in the
591 candidate's file and can include, but is not limited to, feedback provided on mini-review
592

593 evaluations.

594

595 **3.6 Department Chair Evaluations**

596 The University RTP Policy stipulates that a department chair may write independent
597 evaluations of RTP candidates. In the College of Liberal Arts, the absence of such a letter
598 shall not be construed as a negative judgment on the candidate. If the chair elects to write
599 a separate evaluation, that document usually will not exceed 500 words.

600

601 **3.7 College RTP Policy**

602 The University RTP Policy specifies that the college RTP policy must be ratified by a
603 majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members and approved by the dean
604 and the Provost.

605

606 The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy is subject to review every five years and as
607 needed. The Faculty Council shall be charged with facilitating those reviews. Any
608 substantive change in the policy requires ratification as per the procedures outlined in this
609 policy.

610

611 **3.8 College RTP Committee**

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

617

618 **3.8.1 Election of the Committee**

619 The college RTP committee shall have ten (10) full-time, tenured faculty
620 members. The committee shall be constituted in the following way:

621

- 622 a. The committee must have seven (7) tenured, full-time faculty members
623 at the rank of Professor and three (3) additional members at the rank of
624 Associate Professor or Professor.
- 625 b. Additionally, one (1) alternate at the rank of Professor shall be elected
626 for one year. If the alternate does not serve on the committee, this
627 individual is eligible for election to the committee when the term ends.
- 628 c. Members shall be elected by secret ballot as per the election
629 procedures delineated in the CLA Constitution.
- 630 d. As per the CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement
631 Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if elected by majority
632 vote and approved by the President, yet no RTP committee may be
633 comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
- 634 e. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms and shall not be re-
635 elected for more than two (2) consecutive terms.
- 636 f. There shall be no more than one faculty member from any one
637 academic area.
- 638 g. Committee members may not serve on any other standing or ad hoc

RTP committee at the university.

3.8.2 Structure and Duties of the College RTP Committee

3.8.2.1 The RTP committee shall consist of two standing sub-committees:

- a. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of tenure and promotion. A minimum of five (5) committee members at the rank of Professor must serve on this committee.
- b. The Reappointment Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of reappointment. A minimum of three (3) committee members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must serve on this committee.

3.8.2.2 At the first meeting of the CLA RTP Committee:

- a. The committee shall elect a chair who holds the rank of Professor. This chair also shall serve as chair of the Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee.
- b. Once elected, the CLA RTP Committee chair, in consultation with the members of the committee, shall determine the size and membership of the two sub-committees based on the relative number of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion actions to be considered.
- c. The entire CLA RTP Committee then shall elect a chair of the Reappointment Sub-Committee. The sub-committee chair shall report to the CLA RTP Committee chair.

3.8.3 The sub-committees are bound to the following rules:

- a. As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a higher rank than the candidate.
- b. No RTP sub-committee may be comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
- c. For each action, a majority recommendation must be made by the members of the sub-committee. A minority report may be submitted.

3.8.4 Evaluation and Recommendations

- a. The college RTP committee must make its own independent evaluation of each candidate.
- b. The college RTP recommendation usually shall not exceed 750 words.

3.9 Dean of the College

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.

685 **3.10 University-Level Review**

686 The Provost reviews the candidate's file and all prior evaluations and makes a final
687 recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions
688 for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President
689 may delegate this authority to the Provost.
690

691 **4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

692 The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review
693 requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.
694

695 **5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

696 Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1)
697 instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall
698 demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any
699 action.
700

701 **5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

702 The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must
703 demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the
704 college and the candidate's department, a candidate for reappointment must show
705 evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.
706

707 At minimum, this evidence must include demonstration of: (1) effective teaching; (2)
708 research, scholarship, and/or creative activities that include initial publications or similar
709 evidence of RSCA appropriate to rank, experience, and discipline; and (3) engagement in
710 service at the department level.
711

712 The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any
713 area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).
714

715 **5.2 Awarding of Tenure**

716 The University RTP Policy delineates the meaning of tenure and the criteria for the
717 awarding of tenure.
718

719 **5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor** The University RTP Policy states
720 the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to
721 the minimum standard stated in that policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the
722 candidate to make high-quality service contributions to the department and to the college.
723 University-level service is not required but can enhance a candidate's file.
724

725 **5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor**

726 The University RTP Policy states that standards for promotion to full professor shall be
727 higher than standards for promotion to associate professor.
728

729 In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor
730 must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The

731 successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include high-quality contributions to
732 the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary
733 fields of study. The candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed
734 work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to
735 Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities, as well as
736 substantial service, including a record of leadership at the University as well as a record
737 of service in the community or the profession.

738
739 **5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

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

745
746 **5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts**

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

751
752 **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

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

755
756 In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall
757 prepare the index of open period materials.

758
759 **7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

760
761 **7.1** The University RTP Policy specifies that, prior to the final decision, candidates for
762 promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review
763 (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

764
765 **7.2** The University RTP Policy and the CBA specify that if, at any time during the review
766 process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package
767 shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been
768 provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner. In the College of Liberal
769 Arts, a timely manner is defined as no more than five business days.

770
771 **7.3** In the College of Liberal Arts, committees, chairs, and deans cannot request
772 additional material that is not specified by the college or department RTP policies unless
773 such material is required to verify otherwise unsupported claims made in the file.

774
775 **7.4** The University RTP Policy specifies that, at each level of review, the candidate shall
776 be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the

777 recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The
778 candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten
779 (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the
780 candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any
781 previous review levels.

782
783 **7.5** The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external
784 evaluation, consistent with the university policy on external evaluations.
785

786 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

787 Changes to the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication RTP policy may occur as a
788 result of changes to the CSU-CFA CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain
789 procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,
790 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.
791

792 The tenured and probationary faculty of the Department of Journalism and Mass
793 Communication, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of
794 this document.
795

796 Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:
797

798 (1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty percent (20%) of the tenured and
799 probationary department faculty to the chair of the department.
800

801 (2) By the department chair.
802

803 Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called
804 within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair
805 of the department to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.
806

807 Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a
808 majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the
809 department within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the
810 concurrence of the CLA Faculty Council, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and the Provost.
811

812 Approved: April 27, 2010

813 Effective: Fall 2010