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The Department of RGRLL houses language and literature programs that are aligned with the Modern Language Association’s best practices guidelines, which recommend that programs educate students to have “deep translingual and transcultural competence.” As such, the department expects all probationary and tenured faculty to engage in high quality teaching, research, and service that support its programs, goals, and related professional associations.

The department has adopted the College RTP Policy. In addition, our policy includes what is specified below. Candidates and evaluators therefore should follow the department policy within the context of the College RTP Policy and the University RTP Policy.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES
All guiding principles are the same with the following exception:

1.2 File Requirements
The candidate’s narrative (maximum of 3,000 words) normally shall be distributed evenly across the three areas of evaluation. Candidates are encouraged to distribute their narrative accordingly to ensure sufficient discussion of all areas of evaluation.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION
The following categories of evaluation are required by the University and College RTP policies.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities
The Department of RGRLL prides itself on teaching excellence, which is required for the success of our programs. The department therefore expects that faculty will be effective, engaged teachers who are able to teach across the curriculum as per program and student needs.

In addition to requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy, the department complies with the University RTP Policy with regard to the following requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

a) Reappointment: Only candidates who demonstrate an effective performance in teaching and clear potential for improvement shall be recommended for reappointment.

b) Tenure and/or promotion: Only candidates who demonstrate sustained and high quality teaching in the overall record shall be recommended for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

c) Promotion to Rank of Professor: Only candidates who demonstrate excellent, highly effective teaching shall be recommended for promotion to Professor.

Candidates are encouraged to take these minimal department standards into account when constructing their RTP files and writing their narratives.

### 2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The Department of RGRLL has identified high-quality RSCA as the foundation of our collective professional profile as engaged teachers and scholars. The department values RSCA related to all of the areas of expertise of faculty members, including pedagogy.

#### 2.2.1 Requirements:
In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy, the department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

a. **Reappointment:** Candidates for reappointment must demonstrate an ongoing effort to build a scholarly portfolio. By the time candidates turn in their files for reappointment, they are expected to have at least one substantive, original article accepted by a peer-reviewed venue (e.g., journal or other) and to have another article under consideration. Candidates whose RSCA falls outside these parameters for reappointment need to make the case that their records meet the requirements for quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy. Other supporting professional activities might include activities such as book reviews, peer-reviewed conference presentations, and external research grant proposals, but these activities should not be prioritized over the goal of publication.

To meet these requirements, recent PhDs in their first three (3) years of appointment are strongly encouraged to use their dissertations as the basis for at least two (2) publications during the initial appointment period and to present papers at conferences. Candidates who are more advanced in their careers during the reappointment period are encouraged to continue to further develop their RSCA programs.

b. **Tenure and/or promotion:** Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate an increasingly strong record of publications. The department values sustained quality over quantity. A record of multiple publications that are not original or that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way is unlikely to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. Publications (or their RSCA equivalent) may be published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted as per the definitions and allowances provided in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.1).

In recognition of the diversity of possible RSCA records a candidate may develop, the department has articulated various scenarios (see below). These scenarios represent the department's expectations for a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. All scenarios involve peer-reviewed publication in a variety of venues (e.g., different journals). Candidates whose RSCA records fall outside these scenarios for tenure and/or promotion need to make the case that their records meet the requirements for
quantity and quality addressed throughout the RTP policy.

To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, candidates must demonstrate:

1. Ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and/or non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations).

2. A record of peer-reviewed RSCA aligned with one of the following scenarios. In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate quality and impact of RSCA.
   a. Three (3) high-quality, original, substantive peer-reviewed articles in different high-quality, prestigious venues. Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way. In this scenario, the candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the prestige of the venues (e.g., based on acceptance rates, rankings, or other similar data), and originality of RSCA to make the case for quality over quantity.
   b. Four (4) substantive, original article-length, peer-reviewed publications in different venues. In this scenario, the prestige of publication venues, acceptance rates, and rigor of review process are less important.
   c. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.
   d. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored monograph in which the candidate played a significant, demonstrable role in the authorship. In such cases, the candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted peer-reviewed, substantive, original articles in different venues. Textbooks related to the candidate's discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate's contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can be shown to advance scholarship in the discipline.
   e. Externally-funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships that support the candidate's research agenda may also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements. In such cases, the candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted substantive, original articles and must make the case that the externally-funded grant should be considered the equivalent of a peer-reviewed publication in terms of the weight it should be given in the RSCA evaluation.

   - Promotion to Professor: Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate evidence of sustained and consistent RSCA that has resulted in publications in high-quality, peer-reviewed venues for the review period (i.e., since the last personnel action). The following two
requirements must be met for candidates to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor:

1. Candidates must demonstrate ongoing engagement in the profession (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and/or non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations).

2. Candidates must have four (4) substantive, original article-length, peer-reviewed publications or their equivalent to be eligible for promotion to Professor. These publications need to appear in a variety of venues. They may be published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted as per the definitions and allowances provided in the CLA RTP Policy (section 2.2.1).

Since the department values quality over quantity, multiple publications that are not original or that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way are unlikely to receive a positive recommendation for promotion.

The following examples represent some of the other possible scenarios that merit a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor. As with tenure and/or promotion to Associate, all of these scenarios require that the candidate provide evidence of ongoing engagement in the profession as per the above requirements (e.g., publication of book reviews and/or non peer-reviewed articles; peer-reviewed conference presentations; and non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations). In all scenarios, the candidate must demonstrate quality and impact of RSCA.

1. Three (3) high-quality, original, substantive peer-reviewed articles in different high-quality, prestigious publication venues. Publications must be shown to clearly advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way. In this scenario, the candidate must provide evidence of the rigor of the review process, the prestige of the venues, and originality of RSCA to make the case for quality over quantity.

2. Externally-funded, competitive extramural grants or fellowships that support the candidate’s research agenda may also be considered as partially fulfilling the RSCA requirements. In such cases, the candidate must have a minimum of two (2) published, in press, forthcoming, or accepted peer-reviewed, substantive, original articles and must make the case that the externally-funded grant should be considered the equivalent of a peer-reviewed publication in terms of the weight it should be given in the RSCA evaluation.

3. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.

4. Publication of an edited volume, a textbook, or a co-authored monograph in which the candidate played a significant, demonstrable role in the authorship. Textbooks related to the candidate’s discipline shall be considered vis-à-vis candidate’s
contribution to the textbook and extent to which textbook can be shown to advance scholarship in the discipline. As with all RSCA, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate quality and impact on the field.

2.2.2 Departmental Definitions

All definitions stated in the CLA RTP Policy apply. For the purposes of the Department RTP Policy, the following additional definitions apply:

a. ‘Substantive’ is defined as an article-length publication. Such publications often range from fifteen (15) to twenty-five (25) manuscript pages. Regardless of length, candidates need to articulate impact and substance of RSCA in the narrative. Review or state-of-the-field articles meeting these criteria are considered substantive.

b. ‘Original’ is defined as RSCA that makes an argument that is not reiterative of other research published by the candidate or other scholars.

c. Peer-reviewed conferences are those for which abstracts are reviewed by a selection committee.

d. Non peer-reviewed lectures or presentations usually are those given by invitation, but also might include a lecture given in a colleague’s class or lecture series.

e. A funded external grant refers to a funded external grant proposal, not to an application for such a grant.

2.3 Service

The programs in Department of RGRLL require ongoing service activities for their success at the university. As such, the department has high service expectations for its faculty.

2.3.1 Service requirements and opportunities

In addition to file and narrative requirements stated in the CLA RTP Policy (2.3), the department has the following minimal requirements for candidates in the RTP process:

2.3.1.a Baseline service requirements

In addition to the CLA RTP Policy requirement that faculty participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues, the Department of RGRLL has defined the following baseline service requirements of all faculty: active participation in faculty meetings, section meetings, LOTE interviews, and assessment. Evaluators in the RTP process shall evaluate baseline service requirements and shall state when such service requirements have not been met. Service at the baseline level is necessary but not sufficient for meeting the minimum expectation for department service.

2.3.1.b Department service opportunities
For RTP purposes, there are many ways to give service to the department. These include, but are not limited to: service on department standing and ad-hoc committees (e.g., Curriculum, Personnel, LOTE Advisory, Scholarship, Grade Appeals Committees, Advisory Council, Personnel/RTP Committees, Textbook Selection Committees); curriculum development; professional development workshops for graduate and undergraduate students; acting as official advisor to student organizations and clubs; and organizing cultural events. As per the CLA RTP Policy, all activities for which assigned time is given must be listed under Instruction and Instructional Activities and not under Service.

### 2.3.1.c College service opportunities

College service opportunities include, but are not limited to, the following committees and councils: Faculty Council, Grade Appeals, EPCC, RTP, Budget, and ad-hoc committees.

### 2.3.1.d University service opportunities

University service opportunities include, but are not limited to: serving on Academic Senate or its numerous councils and committees; volunteering to serve on WASC or other university-level councils and taskforces; participation in University by the Sea and other similar initiatives.

### 2.3.2 Service expectations by rank

For all ranks, candidates for RTP actions are expected to be engaged in ongoing, substantive service that demonstrates an active engagement with the processes of faculty governance. As with the college policy (2.3.2), 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.

#### 2.3.2.a Reappointment

Faculty in their first three years of appointment are expected to perform service above the baseline requirement in the department. Such service can include, but is not limited to serving on department committees or performing other service as per 2.3.1.b above.

#### 2.3.2.b Tenure and/or promotion

Candidates coming up for tenure and/or promotion are expected to have diversified and increased their service profiles during the probationary period. In addition to active participation in department service opportunities delineated in 2.3.1.b above, candidates for tenure and/or promotion also are expected to perform service at the college or university level as per the CLA RTP Policy (2.3.2.1).

#### 2.3.2.c Promotion to rank of Professor

Successful candidates shall have, as per the CLA and University RTP Policies, a significant, substantive record of service at department, college, and university levels; a record of leadership at the university; and a record of service in the community and/or the profession. The only additional requirement in the Department of RGRLL is that candidates also must have a sustained, ongoing record of meeting the baseline service requirements to the department as per 2.3.1.a above.
3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

3.4 Department RTP Committee
Procedures for elections of the Department RTP Committee are outlined in the CLA RTP Policy. As per the CLA RTP Policy (3.4.2), at least three (3) members of the department RTP committee or sub-committee must evaluate each candidate.

3.5 Mentoring
Both the University and College RTP Policies emphasize the importance of mentoring for the RTP process.

3.5.1 Designation of a mentor
In the Department of RGRLL, newly hired untenured faculty shall work with the department chair to identify whether the chair or a mutually-agreed upon mentor shall act in this capacity.

3.5.2 Communication and structure
Mentors and mentees shall have ongoing communication about progress toward success in the RTP process.

3.5.3 Tenured faculty and mentoring
All faculty are encouraged to seek input from a broad range of knowledgeable colleagues throughout their careers. Tenured faculty members are encouraged but not required to participate in the mentoring process. If tenured faculty members elect to participate in the mentoring process, they shall work with the department chair to identify their mentoring needs and to identify a mutually-agreed upon mentor.

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
The University and College RTP Policies delineate the criteria for appointment and promotion. Candidates are encouraged to read both policies for these important criteria.

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 and CLA policies delineate the additional processes applicable to RTP.

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY
Changes to any RTP policy at CSULB may occur as a result of changes to the CSU-CFA CBA. In general, changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.
The University RTP Policy stipulates (3.2) that all department RTP policies are subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the Provost.

The tenured and probationary faculty of the department, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of this policy.

Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

1. A direct faculty action via petition from twenty-five percent (25%) of the tenured and probationary faculty to the chair of the department.

2. By a motion made by the Advisory Council to the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department.

Amendments shall be discussed in a faculty meeting before a vote is taken. Once a vote by secret ballot has been taken on the proposed amendments to the policy and the amendments are recommended by a majority of those who cast a vote, then the revised document shall be sent to Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost for final approval. Amendments shall become effective in the academic year after the amendments are approved.
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