College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Department of Physics and Astronomy
Policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.0 Guiding Principles and Preamble
The Department of Physics and Astronomy fully endorses the standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) that are articulated in the CNSM and CSULB RTP policies.

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

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

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

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

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities
The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses Articles 2.1.1 through 2.1.3 of the CNSM RTP Policy, with the following emphases and clarifications.

Given the department’s mission, the faculty members are expected to provide high-quality instruction and produce ideas that contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning. The department RTP committee will evaluate the candidate’s contributions in a) teaching lecture or laboratory classes, with consideration of all courses at every level taken into the analysis and b) the quality of mentoring that students receive in research and directed
study. These contributions will be the most important factors in assessing instruction and instructionally related activities in the department.

i. Candidates will specify student learning outcomes for the courses being evaluated. For course assessment purposes, an analysis of student performance on any examination that requires a significant calculation and physical argument for its successful accomplishment will suffice to document the achievement of these outcomes. Assessments of 100-level courses may include pre-instruction/post-instruction scores on multiple-choice instruments recognized and validated by the physics education research community (e.g., the Force Concept Inventory).

ii. Candidates and evaluators will analyze the standard university course evaluations in the context of department and college means and should comment on any qualitative factors affecting these evaluations. Important factors to consider are the number of multiple preparations for different courses in a given semester, the enrollment of the courses involved, if a course is being newly taught in a given semester, and any other factor strongly affecting the effort required to teach a given assignment.

iii. Mentoring research students means substantial participation, evaluated in quality and quantity, in the supervision of student research, thesis research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation of such research, in addition to successfully bringing such research to a form of reportable conclusion in a reasonable time.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities
Given the department’s mission, candidates are expected to conduct scholarly research on an ongoing basis. Each candidate for tenure or promotion is required to have a record of publication that provides evidence of

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

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

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

3.0. Responsibilities and Procedures in the RTP Process
The Department of Physics and Astronomy recognizes and endorses all of Article 3.0 of the CNSM RTP Policy. We particularly re-emphasize to candidates the advice that the narrative includes
both a record of the adjustments the candidate has made in response to earlier reviews, if any, and, further, a plan for ongoing professional growth.

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

i. The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research and scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and 3) service to the university, college, department, community, or disciplinary organizations. The candidate must write in her/his narrative a description of her/his teaching efforts including ongoing professional development as a teacher and in the discipline citing evidence. The candidate will clearly describe the overall goals and progress of the scholarly research, the nature of student involvement, the candidate’s professional development, and service.

ii. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate’s responses or rebuttals, if any.

iii. The availability of resources, such as assigned time, from the university, the college, or the department may be addressed by the candidate in her/his narrative.

iv. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials.

v. The documentation should include a description of total teaching assignment each semester, which includes consideration of the official number of WTUs of student contact each semester during the period of review, the level of the courses (100-level to 600-level), and the total number of students.

vi. The candidate is responsible for providing the documentation as well as the context of the achievements.

### 4.0 Timelines

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

### 5.0 Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria

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

#### 5.0.1 Criteria for a “Competent” or “Excellent” Rating in the Area of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

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

A “Competent” rating in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities is characterized by university student evaluations reasonably consistent with or exceeding departmental norms for the same or comparable courses, courses conducted of the appropriate rigor and content meeting the needs of students to progress in their studies, and effective guidance of supervised research students. Each course should prepare the students for more advanced courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite and build on previous courses in the department. The material presented should be appropriately chosen and current. Course policies and grading practices shall comply with those of the university and college and must
be clearly conveyed to students in a timely fashion. The results of grading practices should be consistent with department norms for the same or comparable courses.

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

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

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

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

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

5.0.2.2 An “Excellent” rating in the area of research, scholarly, and creative activities requires a record of peer-reviewed publication in the period of review over and above that required for the “Competent” rating. In addition, other RSCA contributions are required. These may include successfully funded grant awards in which the candidate appears as an author or PI and has made a major contribution to the work.
The department also places particular value on bringing student-involved research to a form of reportable conclusion.

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

i. applications for external funds to support ongoing scholarly and creative work;

ii. peer-reviewed research publications and awards in the area of physics education research; and

iii. colloquia on the candidate’s research presented at universities or government or commercial laboratories.

5.0.3 Criteria for a “Competent” or “Excellent” Rating in the Area of Service

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

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

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

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

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

5.4 For Promotion to Professor (Article 5.4 of the CNSM RTP Policy): A recommendation that a candidate be promoted to the rank of professor indicates that, in the department’s judgment, the candidate is a significant scholar and educator with a track record clearly showing growth and important contributions to all aspects of the department’s
core mission. To achieve a positive recommendation from the departmental level, the quality
of the candidate’s contributions must be judged at least “Competent” in all areas of review and
must be judged as “Excellent” in at least one area.

i. To merit a rating of “Excellent” in instructionally related activity, a candidate must
meet the standards set forth in 5.0.1.2 and have a clear record of effectively using
course assessments to address the quality of both teaching and learning.

ii. To merit a rating of “Excellent” in RSCA, the candidate’s program of research must
be ongoing and productive at a level significantly higher than that set forth in
5.0.2.2. Activities drawn from contributions in Article 2.3.3 of the CNSM RTP Policy
and Article 5.0.2.2 of this policy may be cited as evidence in support of a rating of
“Excellent”.

iii. To merit a rating of “Excellent” in service, a candidate must have displayed
sustained leadership within the department, meeting the standards set forth in
5.0.3.2, and must have served as an elected officer of a standing or ad hoc
committee at the university or college level, or by serving as an elected officer of a
professional physics organization.

6.0 Amendments

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