

1 **College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics**
2 **Department of Physics and Astronomy**
3 **Policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)**
4

5 **1.0 Guiding Principles and Preamble**

6 The Department of Physics and Astronomy fully endorses the standards for reappointment,
7 tenure, and promotion (RTP) that are articulated in the CNSM and CSULB RTP policies.
8

9 The faculty of the department is dedicated to a mission whose major components are:

- 10 * to provide high-quality instruction by faculty, for whom excellent teaching is a high priority
11 and who produce ideas and innovations that continually improve teaching and learning;
12 * to conduct original research that leads to new knowledge, and to publish and present
13 scholarly and creative works that advance all fields of physics and physics education;
14 * to provide opportunities for students to participate in research projects with faculty, who
15 consider continuing scholarly activity a responsibility both to their students and discipline;
16 * to seek external funding from public and private sources in support of our mission;
17 * to provide students and faculty with high-quality learning and teaching environments,
18 respectively, and to foster an atmosphere that encourages and supports collegial
19 interaction, personal growth, and intellectual achievement;
20 * to support a diversity of emphasis and expertise in faculty assignments, because the
21 department's goals are most fully realized when each faculty member maximizes her/his
22 contribution, though those contributions may differ in area and emphasis.
23

24 Evaluators must recognize the difference in setup speed for productive research accomplishments
25 in modern experimental science, in contrast to areas of physics that do not require complicated,
26 expensive, made-to-order laboratory instruments. The initial setup time in modern experimental
27 laboratories can stretch out to two years or more. A circumstance like this must be described in
28 the narrative by the candidate and factored into the decisions of evaluators.
29

30 **2.0 Criteria Related to Areas of Evaluation**

31 The RTP areas of consideration are defined in the CNSM CSULB RTP Policy in Article 2.0. If not
32 specifically designated in the university or college RTP policies, a candidate must identify the
33 area—instruction and instructionally related activities; research, scholarly and creative activities
34 (RSCA); service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession—in
35 which a given contribution is to be considered. The specified contribution will only be considered
36 for evaluation in the one identified area and will be excluded from consideration in the other two
37 areas. If the committee decides that a contribution belongs in another area, the committee will
38 provide written justification.
39

40 In addition to assessing the quality and quantity of specified requirements for ratings of
41 “Competent” and “Excellent”, the evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive
42 approach when assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate's
43 accomplishments in each area of evaluation.
44

45 **2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

46 The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses Articles 2.1.1 through
47 2.1.3 of the CNSM RTP Policy, with the following emphases and clarifications.
48

49 Given the department's mission, the faculty members are expected to provide high-quality
50 instruction and produce ideas that contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning.
51 The department RTP committee will evaluate the candidate's contributions in a) teaching
52 lecture or laboratory classes, with consideration of all courses at every level taken into the
53 analysis and b) the quality of mentoring that students receive in research and directed

54 study. These contributions will be the most important factors in assessing instruction and
55 instructionally related activities in the department.
56

- 57 i. Candidates will specify student learning outcomes for the courses being evaluated.
58 For course assessment purposes, an analysis of student performance on any
59 examination that requires a significant calculation and physical argument for its
60 successful accomplishment will suffice to document the achievement of these
61 outcomes. Assessments of 100-level courses may include pre-instruction/post-
62 instruction scores on multiple-choice instruments recognized and validated by the
63 physics education research community (e.g., the Force Concept Inventory).
- 64 ii. Candidates and evaluators will analyze the standard university course evaluations in
65 the context of department and college means and should comment on any qualitative
66 factors affecting these evaluations. Important factors to consider are the number of
67 multiple preparations for different courses in a given semester, the enrollment of the
68 courses involved, if a course is being newly taught in a given semester, and any other
69 factor strongly affecting the effort required to teach a given assignment.
- 70 iii. Mentoring research students means substantial participation, evaluated in quality and
71 quantity, in the supervision of student research, thesis research supervision, and the
72 preparation of students for the presentation of such research, in addition to successfully
73 bringing such research to a form of reportable conclusion in a reasonable time.
74

75 **2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities**

76 Given the department's mission, candidates are expected to conduct scholarly research on
77 an ongoing basis. Each candidate for tenure or promotion is required to have a record of
78 publication that provides evidence of
79

- 80 i. the quality of his or her scholarly activity, and
- 81 ii. a sustained research program that involves students.
82

83 The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses Article 2.3 of the CNSM
84 RTP Policy, with the following very important clarification. Article 2.3.1 refers to peer-
85 reviewed publications "in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator". We
86 fully support the intent of the CNSM requirement. However, the general physics community
87 and the CSULB Department of Physics and Astronomy do not employ the phrase "senior
88 investigator" to characterize authors or authors' contributions. For purposes of alignment
89 with the intent of the CNSM policy, the Department of Physics and Astronomy defines the
90 phrase "identified as a senior investigator", as used in paragraph 2.3.1 of the CNSM RTP
91 Policy, to mean that the candidate appears as an author on the publication *and* that the
92 candidate has made a major contribution to the work presented in the publication as
93 described in the candidate's narrative and assessed by evaluators. This interpretation of
94 "senior investigator" holds for assessing any solicitation of comments by the candidate to
95 support the candidate's narrative concerning her/his estimate of her/his contribution to a
96 particular peer-reviewed work.
97

98 **2.3 Service**

99 Service includes service to the discipline, the department, the college, the university, and the
100 professional community. Meaningful service must be clearly related to the mission of the
101 university. The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses all parts of
102 Article 2.4 of the CNSM RTP Policy.
103

104 **3.0. Responsibilities and Procedures in the RTP Process**

105 The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses all of Article 3.0 of the CNSM
106 RTP Policy. We particularly re-emphasize to candidates the advice that the narrative includes

107 both a record of the adjustments the candidate has made in response to earlier reviews, if any,
108 and, further, a plan for ongoing professional growth.

109
110 A major responsibility of the candidate is to make her/his narrative as clear and cogent as
111 possible to colleagues whose special expertise lies outside the disciplines of the department.
112 These colleagues serve at every level of the RTP decision-making process.

- 113
114 i. The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments
115 during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and
116 significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and
117 instructionally related activities; 2) research and scholarly and creative activities
118 (RSCA); and 3) service to the university, college, department, community, or
119 disciplinary organizations. The candidate must write in her/his narrative a
120 description of her/his teaching efforts including ongoing professional development
121 as a teacher and in the discipline citing evidence. The candidate will clearly
122 describe the overall goals and progress of the scholarly research, the nature of
123 student involvement, the candidate's professional development, and service.
- 124 ii. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the
125 full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.
- 126 iii. The availability of resources, such as assigned time, from the university, the college, or
127 the department may be addressed by the candidate in her/his narrative.
- 128 iv. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including
129 summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials.
- 130 v. The documentation should include a description of total teaching assignment each
131 semester, which includes consideration of the official number of WTUs of student
132 contact each semester during the period of review, the level of the courses (100-
133 level to 600-level), and the total number of students.
- 134 vi. The candidate is responsible for providing the documentation as well as the
135 context of the achievements.

136 137 **4.0 Timelines**

138 Candidates and committees are responsible for following the timelines for this process as laid
139 out in the relevant instructional memo.

140 141 **5.0 Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria**

142 The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses Articles 5.0 through 5.5 of
143 the CNSM RTP Policy, with the following definitions, criteria, and clarifications.

144 145 **5.0.1 Criteria for a "Competent" or "Excellent" Rating in the Area of Instruction and** 146 **Instructionally Related Activities**

147 A rating of "Excellent" in a given area indicates that the candidate has significantly exceeded the
148 standards of a "Competent" rating for that area. In each area, the quality of the overall
149 achievement of the candidate is paramount.

- 150
151 **5.0.1.1. A "Competent" rating in the area of instruction and instructionally**
152 **related activities** is characterized by university student evaluations reasonably
153 consistent with or exceeding departmental norms for the same or comparable courses,
154 courses conducted of the appropriate rigor and content meeting the needs of students
155 to progress in their studies, and effective guidance of supervised research students.
156 Each course should prepare the students for more advanced courses for which the
157 course in question is a prerequisite and build on previous courses in the department.
158 The material presented should be appropriately chosen and current. Course policies
159 and grading practices shall comply with those of the university and college and must

160 be clearly conveyed to students in a timely fashion. The results of grading practices
161 should be consistent with department norms for the same or comparable courses.
162

163 | **5.0.1.2 An “Excellent” rating in the area of instruction and instructionally related**

164 **activities** indicates evidence of sustained success in teaching students and achieving
165 student learning outcomes. The department places particular value on mentoring
166 research students. Substantial participation, evaluated in quality and quantity, in the
167 supervision of student research, theses research supervision, and the preparation of
168 students for the presentation of such research, in addition to successfully bringing
169 such research to a form of reportable conclusion in a reasonable time, is an important
170 and vital function of teaching within the department. A strong performance that
171 includes peer-reviewed publication with a CSULB student as a significant contributor
172 and coauthor is an indicator for an “Excellent” rating.
173

174 We recognize that substantial contributions can be made in many areas of teaching
175 and mentoring, and examples of activities that may give rise to the level of a rating of
176 “Excellent” are given in the CNSM RTP Policy in Article 2.2.8. The list below
177 supplements the list of *Examples of Products/Activities* in Article 2.2.8, and is meant
178 to be illustrative of possible activities, neither ordered nor exhaustive of the
179 possibilities. What is determinative toward a rating of “Excellent” is not any particular
180 activity on the lists of examples. Rather, the committee shall look at the overall quality
181 and pattern of participation by the candidate during the period under review. The list
182 is as follows:
183

- 184 i. preparation of grant proposals for external funding for teaching projects or
185 instructional laboratories , particularly if funded through a peer-review process;
- 186 ii. development of a new course that is relevant to the curriculum;
- 187 iii. publication or presentation of pedagogical issues at professional meetings;
- 188 iv. organization of or chairing of sessions at meetings such as those of the AAPT;
- 189 v. assessment of one’s own teaching effectiveness to improve performance in the
190 classroom;
- 191 vi. organization and participation in special scholarly activities for students; mentoring
192 research of students from high schools, other colleges, or universities;
- 193 vii. support and mentorship of student organizations like the Society of Physics
194 Students (SPS), unless the candidate specifically wishes student organization
195 advising to be considered under service; and
- 196 viii. other activities that lead to an enhancement of teaching effectiveness, as described
197 and supported by materials in the candidate’s narrative and attachments.
198

199 **5.0.2 Criteria for a “Competent” or “Excellent” Rating in the Area of Research,**
200 **Scholarly, and Creative Activities**
201

202 **5.0.2.1. A “Competent” rating in the area of research, scholarly, and creative**
203 **activities** requires that the candidate has produced multiple peer-reviewed publications
204 during the review period. The candidate must make a significant contribution to the
205 publications, which must be a part of a research program created by the candidate while
206 a member of the faculty.
207

208 **5.0.2.2 An “Excellent” rating in the area of research, scholarly, and creative**
209 **activities** requires a record of peer-reviewed publication in the period of review over
210 and above that required for the “Competent” rating. In addition, other RSCA
211 contributions are required. These may include successfully funded grant awards in which
212 the candidate appears as an author or PI and has made a major contribution to the work.

213 The department also places particular value on bringing student-involved research to a
214 form of reportable conclusion.

215
216 The list below supplements the list of *Examples of Products/Activities* in the CNSM RTP
217 Policy, is meant to be illustrative of other possible activities, and is neither ordered nor
218 exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered in this category. A rating of
219 "Excellent" is not warranted by any particular activity on the lists of examples, rather
220 the committee shall look at the overall quality and pattern of participation by the
221 candidate during the period under review in order to justify a rating of "Excellence".
222 These additional examples include:

- 223
- 224 i. applications for external funds to support ongoing scholarly and creative work;
 - 225 ii. peer-reviewed research publications and awards in the area of physics education
226 research; and
 - 227 iii. colloquia on the candidate's research presented at universities or government or
228 commercial laboratories.
- 229

230 **5.0.3 Criteria for a "Competent" or "Excellent" Rating in the Area of Service**

231

232 **5.0.3.1. A "Competent" rating in the area of service** indicates effective contributions
233 at the departmental level, which must be documented in the narrative. This
234 documentation will typically involve a description of achievements as a member of
235 various departmentally elected, standing, or *ad hoc* committees.

236

237 **5.0.3.2. An "Excellent" rating in the area of service** will be documented by
238 significant leadership within the department and activity at either the college,
239 university, or in the professional discipline community. The emphasis in the evaluation
240 shall be on the quality and significance of the service activities and the extent and
241 level of involvement. The quality of that service is the primary consideration. Service
242 contributions based on discipline-related, voluntary consultancies must be clearly
243 related to the university profession of the faculty member.

244

245 **5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty (Article 5.1 of the CNSM**
246 **RTP Policy):** The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses Article 5.1
247 in the CNSM RTP Policy.

248

249 **5.2 Awarding of Tenure (Article 5.2 of the CNSM RTP Policy):** A candidate must
250 receive a rating of "excellent" either in instruction and instructionally related activities or in
251 RSCA in order to merit a recommendation of tenure from the department committee, as well
252 as department chair if the chair chooses to write an evaluation. Tenure recommendations are
253 based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's overall record of
254 accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the continuation of this record.

255

256 **5.3 For Promotion to Associate Professor (Article 5.3 of the CNSM RTP Policy):**
257 A candidate must receive a rating of "excellent" either in instruction and instructionally related
258 activities or in research, scholarly and creative activity in order to merit a recommendation of
259 promotion from the department committee, as well as department chair if the chair chooses to
260 write an evaluation. The judgment is made essentially on the past record rather than on the
261 promise for future contributions.

262

263 **5.4 For Promotion to Professor (Article 5.4 of the CNSM RTP Policy):** A
264 recommendation that a candidate be promoted to the rank of professor indicates that, in
265 the department's judgment, the candidate is a significant scholar and educator with a track
266 record clearly showing growth and important contributions to all aspects of the department's

267 core mission. To achieve a positive recommendation from the departmental level, the quality
268 of the candidate's contributions must be judged at least "Competent" in all areas of review and
269 must be judged as "Excellent" in at least one area.

- 270
- 271 i. To merit a rating of "Excellent" in instructionally related activity, a candidate must
272 meet the standards set forth in 5.0.1.2 and have a clear record of effectively using
273 course assessments to address the quality of both teaching and learning.
 - 274 ii. To merit a rating of "Excellent" in RSCA, the candidate's program of research must
275 be ongoing and productive at a level significantly higher than that set forth in
276 5.0.2.2. Activities drawn from contributions in Article 2.3.3 of the CNSM RTP Policy
277 and Article 5.0.2.2 of this policy may be cited as evidence in support of a rating of
278 "Excellent".
 - 279 iii. To merit a rating of "Excellent" in service, a candidate must have displayed
280 sustained leadership within the department, meeting the standards set forth in
281 5.0.3.2, and must have served as an elected officer of a standing or *ad hoc*
282 committee at the university or college level, or by serving as an elected officer of a
283 professional physics organization.

284 285 **6.0 Amendments**

286 Amendments to this policy will be considered upon submission to the department with the
287 signatures of three tenured or probationary members of the faculty of the department.
288 Written notification to all tenured and probationary faculty members must be provided at
289 least five working days prior to the close of balloting. Affirmative votes by a majority of
290 the tenured and probationary faculty by secret ballot will be required to ratify the
291 amendment. This means a majority of the faculty eligible to cast ballots (not a majority
292 of the ballots cast) must vote in favor of the amendment. Amendments to this policy shall
293 become effective when they have received a favorable vote and they have the approval
294 of the college council, the college dean, and the provost.