The purpose of this policy is to describe the process and standards that shall be used to evaluate candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Psychology Department at California State University, Long Beach. The standards set forth are intended to affirm and develop the principles expressed in both the University-level and College-level RTP documents. By setting clear standards, the Psychology Department expects that each candidate will realize the high promise that is characteristic of its faculty members.

It is expected that each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will have a unique profile regarding accomplishments in (a) Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities, (b) Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), and (c) Service. The standards in this document are intended to provide clear criteria for evaluation while maintaining some flexibility for candidates to meet them. This document is not intended to provide a simple checklist for success. Rather, candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence relative to the stated criteria. Members of the Psychology Department RTP committee are expected to use their best professional judgment in applying the criteria and evaluating all candidates consistently.

I. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. The candidate is responsible for addressing RTP standards established in the University-level, College-level, and Department-level RTP documents. The candidate also has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of accomplishments. Candidates should take special care to prepare a succinct and clear narrative that presents the case for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. In addition, candidates should make every effort to participate in the mentoring process and seek guidance from a variety of sources, including the Department chair, Department RTP committee, the College Dean, and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs to fully understand the process and standards.

B. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring effective mentoring and support for candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars, and members of the University community. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the RTP procedures established by the University (e.g., Office of Academic Affairs) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding evaluation of candidates are followed. The Department Chair is encouraged to submit an independent evaluation of each candidate except where prohibited by College or University RTP documents.

C. The Department RTP Committee has primary responsibility for evaluating the candidates’ materials and makes the initial recommendation to the College and University regarding
reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department RTP committee shall consider both expectations and other highly valued activities specified in this document in deriving a recommendation.

1. Formation of Department RTP Committees. Normally, two committees composed of five voting members will be formed, which may have overlapping members. The committee considering actions of (a) promotion to Professor, (b) reappointment or tenure of an Associate Professor, or (c) reappointment or tenure of a Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor. The committee considering actions of (a) reappointment of an Assistant Professor or (b) tenure and/or promotion of an Assistant Professor shall be restricted to tenured faculty with the rank of at least Associate Professor who are themselves not being evaluated in the RTP process that year. If it is not possible to obtain five-member committees of Psychology Department faculty members, the committee shall consist of at least three members. In all cases, the committee is responsible for forming a majority decision.

2. Eligibility. All eligible faculty members as described above, in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and in Academic Senate Policy are candidates for RTP committees with the restriction that a faculty member who serves one year at either the Departmental or College RTP committee level may choose to not be listed on the ballot the following year. Faculty members on sabbatical during the time of review may choose not to serve but should normally be listed on the ballot the next year. As stated in the University RTP document, faculty members participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are eligible for service on the department RTP committee, if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

3. Election Procedure. Election of each RTP committee shall be by majority vote of eligible faculty members as determined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The election procedure will be as follows: On all ballots all nominees shall be listed in random order. There will be two parts on all ballots. On the first part, voters will vote for all those nominees that they consider acceptable for membership on the committee. On the second part, eligible faculty members will vote for up to five that they would most prefer. If five or more nominees receive a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, the five receiving the greatest number of votes on the second part of the ballot shall be elected. If a vacancy occurs prior to the commencement of the RTP process, the person receiving the next highest numbers of votes (in addition to at least 50% acceptance) shall serve as a replacement. If only three or four nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, then these individuals will comprise the committee. If less than three nominees achieve a vote of acceptance on 50% or more of the ballots cast, then the Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate(s), shall identify qualified faculty members from outside the department to stand for election to the Psychology RTP committee(s). Once the outside candidates have been identified, the normal election procedure shall occur.

D. All Department tenured and probationary faculty members are encouraged to provide effective support and mentoring to candidates in their efforts to develop as teachers, scholars,
and members of the University community. Faculty members are encouraged to voluntarily archive electronic copies of their past Professional Data Sheet and Narrative with the Department for the express purpose of making these documents available to future candidates engaged in the RTP process. Faculty members may also choose to share supporting documents from their previous RTP files with candidates.

II. EXPECTATIONS BY RANK

Reappointment, Tenure and/or Promotion Decisions

The Expectations specified in sections III, IV and V are used for decisions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In recognition of the divergent academic profiles among excellent faculty members, candidates for tenure and promotion are further expected to provide evidence of engagement in at least two Additional Highly Valued Activities in one area of evaluation (Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities, RSCA, or Service Activities). These Additional Highly Valued Activities cannot substitute for Expectations but can provide evidence that the candidate maintains a productive instructional, scholarly, or service profile. Specific factors that provide context for the evaluation of Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities are listed in sections III, IV, and V.

For reappointment, the Psychology Department accepts the standards articulated in the College and University RTP documents. Specifically, a candidate must demonstrate that he/she is making significant progress towards tenure. Regarding service expectations, most service activities are expected to be at the Department level and the overall service load should be appropriate to a new faculty member who is acclimating to the university. Evidence for achievement of additional highly valued activities is not required.

For tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, sections III, IV and V specify the expectations and additional highly valued activities. Additionally, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) RTP policy specifies that in order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must make high-quality service contributions to the department and to either the college or the university.

For promotion to Professor, sections III, IV and V specify the expectations and additional highly valued activities. The Psychology Department notes that the University RTP document calls for higher performance standards than those used for decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In the area of teaching, candidates must sustain a high level of performance as specified in section III. The Psychology Department adopts the standards for RSCA and Service specified in the CLA RTP policy regarding promotion to Professor. The CLA RTP policy specifies that successful candidates for promotion to Professor will demonstrate high-quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. Moreover, the candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed work at the national and/or international levels. The CLA RTP document specifies that a successful candidate for promotion to Professor will have a substantive record of service that includes: (a) service at the department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership in the University; and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.
Early Tenure and/or Early Promotion Decisions

For early tenure and/or early promotion, the Psychology Department acknowledges that the University RTP document calls for higher standards than those for decisions of tenure and/or promotion conducted following the normal time interval. In addition, for cases of early tenure the record of distinction must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

With regard to the Psychology Department Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities outlined in sections III, IV, and V, candidates must provide compelling evidence of distinction in the areas of Instructional, RSCA, and Service that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements for tenure and/or promotion. Furthermore, under the RSCA category, any candidate for early tenure and/or early promotion must achieve six or more RSCA accomplishments listed under the expectations. Of the minimum six accomplishments expected, at least four must be peer-reviewed journal articles. Candidates within the Psychology Department seeking early tenure and/or early promotion are encouraged to initially seek guidance from the Dean, Department Chair, and Department RTP committee.

III. INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Faculty members are expected to provide effective instruction in their discipline. Consistent with University-level and College-level RTP documents, the Psychology Department recognizes that effective instruction occurs both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting. The relevance of both the Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities below is specified in Section II, Expectations by Rank.

A. Expectations. Candidates must provide convincing evidence that they have satisfied each of the following five expectations.

1. Effective instructional strategies as evidenced by:
   - Statement of a well-reasoned teaching philosophy. In particular, candidates should discuss instructional goals and how these goals are manifested in their instructional activities, materials, and outcomes.
   - Course syllabi consistent with catalog description, course level, and Academic Senate guidelines and policies. For each course instructed during the period of review, candidates should submit one (1) representative syllabus. For no more than two (2) selected courses, candidates may submit an additional syllabus to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation.
   - Representative high-quality instructional materials (e.g., sample lecture, handout, activity, etc.). For each course instructed during the period of review, candidates should submit one (1) representative sample of instructional materials, not to exceed four (4) pages.
   - Student course evaluation statistical summaries from each course in which the department required formal student evaluations during the period of review.
   - (Optional) Written comments on student course evaluations
   - (Optional) Peer observation of teaching
2. Effective use of assessment techniques as evidenced by:
   - Representative high-quality assessment materials (e.g., sample tests, paper assignments, reflection logs, etc.). For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one (1) sample of an appropriate assessment of student learning outcomes.
   - Grade distributions from all courses taught during the period of review.
3. Active engagement in two or more of the following items:
   - Supervision of undergraduate student independent research projects
   - Supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate student research assistants
   - Chairing graduate student thesis committees
   - Membership on graduate student thesis committees
4. Efforts to develop as a teacher as evidenced by activities such as course revision and updating, instructionally-related workshop attendance, reading books and literature on teaching, consultations with instructional experts, etc.
5. Contributions to Academic Advising, if applicable.
   - Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal academic advising must submit a report of their activities per a procedure approved by the Dean or designee.

B. Additional Highly Valued Activities.
   1. Publication or presentation of teaching techniques
   2. Teaching awards
   3. Innovations in teaching (e.g., service learning, team learning, novel use of technology, etc.)
   4. Creation or substantial revision of standard course outlines
   5. Creation of new courses or other substantial curriculum development
   6. Exceptional degree of student mentoring
   7. Student accomplishments (e.g., awards, presentations, graduate school admissions etc.) directly related to work supervised

C. The following factors may be considered in evaluating the quality of the candidate’s instruction and instructionally-related activities. The Psychology Department does not make any a priori judgments about the value of each of the following factors. Candidates may address any of the following factors that are helpful in making the best case for their file.
   1. Level of courses taught (100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600)
   2. Size of classes taught
   3. Intensity of writing in courses
   4. Number of new preparations during period of review
   5. Number of different courses taught during period of review
   6. Candidate’s experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness
   7. Trends over time
   8. Department norms

IV. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)
Faculty members are expected to remain engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship that
demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the field of Psychology over time. All
faculty members are expected to produce scholarly achievements that contribute to the
knowledge-base of the discipline, are disseminated to appropriate audiences, and receive
favorable review from professional peers prior to dissemination. Because the field of psychology
is multi-disciplinary, the RTP committee is encouraged to pay careful attention to the unique
value of each candidate’s accomplishments. The relevance of both the Expectations and
Additional Highly Valued Activities below is specified in Section II, Expectations by Rank.

A. Expectations. Candidates are expected to actively engage in RSCA as evidenced by:

1. Peer-reviewed journal articles
2. Peer-reviewed authored books
3. Funded major external research grants or cooperative agreements (comparable to NIH
R03 grant or other external grants with substantial research components)

Ideally, candidates will achieve four or more RSCA accomplishments from the above list. No
positive evaluation can be made when a candidate achieves fewer than three RSCA
accomplishments. At least two of the RSCA accomplishments must be peer-reviewed journal
articles. In addition, the Department RTP committee will evaluate the quality of both individual
scholarly accomplishments and the overall body of work in determining whether to recommend a
positive or negative RTP action.

B. Additional Highly Valued Activities.

1. Other peer reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters, proceedings, abstracts, etc.)
2. Non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., book chapters, book reviews, editorials, etc.)
3. Edited books
4. Conference presentations (both oral and poster presentations)
5. Invited presentations
6. Manuscripts and/or external grant proposals currently in the peer review process
7. Unfunded major external grant proposals
8. Minor external research grants
9. Internal grants awarded
10. Technical reports/Program evaluation reports
11. Policy/Amicus briefs
12. Scholarship-related awards
13. Scholarship-related professional development (e.g., attending grant-writing workshops
or scholarly writing institutes)

C. The following factors will be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate’s RSCA
contributions. Candidates must address all of the following factors for each RSCA
accomplishment.

1. Magnitude of the candidate’s contribution to each scholarly work
2. Scope of research (e.g., amount of time and effort required)
3. Programmatic nature of research
4. Status of outlet (i.e., provide one indicator of status, such as rejection rates, impact
    factor, prestige of publisher, type of conference presentation, etc.)
5. Level of involvement of student co-authors, if any
6. For external grants (funded, under consideration, and/or unfunded):
   • Total budget
   • Length of grant period
   • Type of grant contract (e.g., subcontract, primary award)
   • Granting agency (e.g., Federal, State, private foundation, etc.)

D. The following evaluative factors shall not be considered in evaluating the quality of RSCA contributions.
   1. Involvement of former academic advisor(s)
   2. Institution at which the research was conducted
   3. Order of authorship. Note: magnitude of the candidate’s contribution is to be evaluated rather than mere order of authorship.

V. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

The Psychology Department recognizes that meaningful service by a faculty member varies by rank and can be manifested in a variety of ways. However, all faculty members are expected to actively engage in service appropriate to rank. The relevance of both the Expectations and Additional Highly Valued Activities below is specified in Section II, Expectations by Rank.

A. Expectations. Candidates are expected to actively engage in service as evidenced by:
   1. Participation in faculty governance and/or advising student organizations
   2. Participation in academic and/or professional service (e.g., ad hoc reviews, editorial board participation, professional association governance, etc.)

B. Additional Highly Valued Activities.
   1. Participation in research-related service to the community
   2. Participation in instructionally-related service to the community
   3. University citizenship (e.g., attending Department-sponsored events, judging research competitions)
   4. Service-related awards

C. The following factors may be utilized in evaluating the quality of a candidate’s contributions. Candidates may address any of the following factors that are helpful in making the best case for their file.
   1. Nature of the service assignment
      • Frequency of activity
      • Number of different activities
      • Length of service
      • Personal contributions
   2. Organizational level of service (Department, College, University)
   3. Selection procedure (voluntary, assigned, elected)
   4. Committee leadership (primarily in regard to promotion to Professor)

VI. MULTI-FACETED ACTIVITIES
Candidates for RTP actions in the Psychology Department frequently complete important activities that combine aspects of teaching, scholarship, and service. Candidates shall not repetitively list such activities in their materials. However, different components of a particular activity can be separated and listed in different sections. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department Chair or members of the RTP committee in such cases and then use their judgment to make the most persuasive case for their application.

VII. AMENDMENTS TO THIS POLICY

A. Amendments may be proposed by petition of at least three regular members of the Department.

B. Proposals shall be presented to the Department Chair. For this purpose, presentation to any of the office staff shall constitute notification of and presentation to the Chair.

C. Proposals shall be submitted to the faculty for discussion within three weeks, excluding holidays, following presentation to the Chair. Amendments may not be considered between the end of the Spring semester and the beginning of the subsequent Fall semester.

D. Proposed amendments shall be distributed in writing to the members of the department at least five working days, excluding holidays, prior to a Departmental forum to discuss any proposed amendments.

E. Amendments to this Policy shall become effective at the beginning of the next academic year if they receive a favorable secret-ballot vote of two-thirds of tenured and probationary Psychology department faculty members and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.