

1                                   **COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS**  
2                                   **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH**  
3                                   **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**  
4  
5

6 The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the College of Natural  
7 Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) establishes college-wide standards of excellence  
8 and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members  
9 within the college for sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 of the university RTP policy (PS 09-  
10 10), but readers should still consult the university policy for these sections.<sup>1</sup>  
11

12 **1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**  
13 **(RTP)**  
14

15 CNSM faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the  
16 impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and  
17 instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);  
18 and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.  
19 All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three  
20 areas.  
21

22 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three  
23 areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate  
24 demonstrating a sustained record of quality performance over the period of review and  
25 evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making productive  
26 contributions in all three areas of evaluation. Reappointment decisions are based on  
27 evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing a record of evidence  
28 that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.  
29

30 **2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**  
31

32 Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of  
33 excellence in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly,  
34 and creative activities; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the  
35 community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for  
36 reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP  
37 policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards.  
38 Candidates for RTP recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in  
39 each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific  
40 standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent and competent in each area of  
41 evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. A candidate will not receive a  
42 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet  
43 requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or  
44 promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area

---

<sup>1</sup> Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This policy should not be considered as a substitute, however, for those parts of the agreement that affect RTP matters.

45 of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly  
46 and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to  
47 professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of  
48 evaluation.

49

## 50 **2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

51 Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers and provide evidence of this  
52 effectiveness in their files. Instruction and instructionally related activities include  
53 teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom (classroom,  
54 laboratory, and field). Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to,  
55 curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student  
56 research and fieldwork, and related activities involving student learning and student  
57 engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to,  
58 student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

59

### 60 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

61 Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject  
62 matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty  
63 members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and on ways  
64 to assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning, which may lead to  
65 adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-  
66 classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent  
67 with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate individual student learning  
68 styles.

69

#### 70 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and method

71 The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses  
72 taught by other tenured/probationary faculty members in the discipline. Course  
73 materials and teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to  
74 the topic, and be of value in facilitating learning. Materials submitted by a candidate in  
75 her/his file should include at least course syllabi and assessment materials. Teaching  
76 materials, such as samples of student work with instructor feedback, should also be  
77 submitted when available. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the  
78 learning goals and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader  
79 discipline. At a minimum, each course taught by the candidate should prepare the  
80 students for later courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite. Course  
81 policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to students, and the results of  
82 grading practices should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same  
83 or comparable courses taught by other tenured/probationary faculty members. The  
84 most recent syllabus from each course taught during the evaluation period must be  
85 included.

86

#### 87 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher

88 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing  
89 her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches  
90 used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should  
91 be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the  
92 candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward

93 a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time  
94 should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant  
95 materials. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy,  
96 classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the  
97 Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or  
98 conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that  
99 contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

#### 100 101 2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes

102 Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices  
103 and course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and  
104 goals. Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with  
105 course goals.

#### 106 107 2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction

108 In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and  
109 university RTP policies, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student  
110 response to instruction. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all  
111 courses evaluated during the period under review. Note that evaluations for  
112 independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department  
113 seminar/colloquium courses should not be included in the candidate's file. Student  
114 course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.  
115 Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing  
116 student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item  
117 on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does  
118 not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

119  
120 Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means  
121 and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and  
122 material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical  
123 ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the  
124 instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to  
125 student needs.

### 126 127 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

128 Assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be based on peer evaluation of appropriate  
129 materials in the candidate's RTP file, peer observation of teaching, and on student  
130 course evaluation forms for all courses evaluated since the last promotion or since  
131 appointment. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be based on the quality  
132 of teaching performance over time across all of the courses assigned to the candidate.

133  
134 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to  
135 suggestions for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations),  
136 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of  
137 circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4)  
138 any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the  
139 candidate's teaching effectiveness.

140  
141 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly  
142 rigor of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses  
143 taught by tenured/probationary faculty members.

144  
145 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness,  
146 including a critical analysis of all student input. This analysis must assess the  
147 significance of the candidate's student course evaluation data.

148  
149 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and  
150 content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating  
151 the learning process.

152  
153 2.2.5. As part of the review process, a minimum of four class visits shall be made by  
154 at least two members of the department RTP committee. These class visits must be  
155 conducted during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is  
156 not teaching at CSULB that semester; in this case, the visitations from the prior year  
157 shall be used). The candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur  
158 during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to  
159 the start of the classroom visit period, which will normally occur over a two to three  
160 week period. The candidate may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the RTP  
161 committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee to  
162 choose most appropriate days for visits. The committee members' evaluations of the  
163 candidate in the classroom should address such factors as instructional clarity,  
164 communication with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use  
165 of classroom time, currency and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course  
166 materials, and, if used, audiovisual and electronic media or demonstrations. Written  
167 reports based on class visits must be placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to  
168 the candidate. The signed reports must include times and dates of the visits.

169  
170 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the  
171 candidate in supervisory courses.

172  
173 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned  
174 time for this activity, he/she should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this  
175 effort and should address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in  
176 meeting student needs.

177  
178 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities  
179 The college recognizes that there is a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and  
180 complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. The list  
181 below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the  
182 possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category.

183  
184 2.2.8.1. Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching;

185  
186 2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;

187

- 188 2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis  
189 research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation  
190 of such research;  
191
- 192 2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional  
193 laboratories;  
194
- 195 2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the  
196 candidate's assigned workload, and mentoring of students;  
197
- 198 2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;  
199
- 200 2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and  
201 computer-based materials;  
202
- 203 2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for  
204 Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of  
205 improving instruction; and  
206
- 207 2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other  
208 forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of  
209 novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.  
210
- 211 2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:  
212
- 213 2.2.9.1. Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;  
214
- 215 2.2.9.2. Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the  
216 same course unless the course has significantly changed over time);  
217
- 218 2.2.9.3. Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and  
219 homework sets; and,  
220
- 221 2.2.9.4. If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to  
222 students (e.g. a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).  
223
- 224 2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.  
225
- 226 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline  
227 Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the  
228 discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most  
229 directly achieved through maintaining an active program of research or scholarly  
230 activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific conferences and reading of  
231 appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.  
232
- 233 **2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**  
234
- 235 2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA

236  
237 College faculty members must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA  
238 that demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty  
239 members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute  
240 to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are  
241 disseminated to appropriate audiences. Candidates should refer to their respective  
242 department policies for definitions and criteria for evaluation of RSCA. Department  
243 standards may be higher than college-level standards. Candidates for tenure must  
244 develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed  
245 publications in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator. The  
246 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the  
247 candidate's scholarly activity and this narrative must identify the candidate's  
248 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. A candidate's  
249 research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the  
250 faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged and departments must  
251 define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement. The  
252 department RTP policy shall provide specific additional departmental requirements in  
253 research and shall list discipline-specific criteria used in evaluating RSCA. Candidates  
254 for promotion to professor must have a record of RSCA activity after their promotion to  
255 associate professor that results in peer-reviewed RSCA products.

### 256 257 2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA 258

259 2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA  
260 element to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The  
261 candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The  
262 evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific  
263 RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The candidate's  
264 documentation and the review of it will focus on continuing professional development,  
265 and this theme should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative.  
266 The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to evaluators in understanding  
267 the candidate's intellectual and professional achievements in this category, the nature of  
268 student involvement in the candidate's RSCA (if applicable), and how the candidate  
269 places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the department,  
270 college, and university RTP policies.

271  
272 2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted,  
273 examples of the candidate's best work along with an explanation of why these materials  
274 should be regarded as significant contributions. Reviewers will give particular  
275 consideration to the quality of these examples. For jointly authored activities the  
276 candidate must identify the specific extent of her/his participation. Documentation from  
277 at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if  
278 the candidate only has co-authored publications.

279  
280 2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The  
281 documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP  
282 review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the  
283 supplementary documentation binder.

284  
285 2.3.2.4. External evaluations of the candidate's contributions to the discipline will  
286 be considered, consistent with the provisions of the current CBA and university policy.  
287

288 2.3.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to RSCA

289 Candidates are expected to be involved in multiple RSCA related activities beyond the  
290 peer review publication expectations defined by the departments for tenure and  
291 promotion. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor  
292 exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by RTP evaluators in this  
293 category. Peer-reviewed RSCA products are given greater weight than non peer-  
294 reviewed products.

295  
296 2.3.3.1. Publication of additional peer-reviewed paper(s) in established journals in  
297 the area of expertise;  
298

299 2.3.3.2. Publication of a peer-reviewed book or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book;  
300

301 2.3.3.3. Successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship  
302 of publications and presentations with students as evidenced by student  
303 presentations at scientific meetings;  
304

305 2.3.3.4. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings and conferences;  
306

307 2.3.3.5. Awards of peer-reviewed applications for external funding;  
308

309 2.3.3.6. Applications for external funds to support ongoing RSCA;  
310

311 2.3.3.7. Citations of the candidate's work in other authors' peer-reviewed works  
312 or in books;  
313

314 2.3.3.8. Applied research or professional activity to address problems of  
315 importance to the disciplines and society;  
316

317 2.3.3.9. Awards of internal grants;  
318

319 2.3.3.10. Editorial/reviewer assignments with recognized professional publications  
320 or review panels for research grants calling for professional expertise;  
321

322 2.3.3.11. Textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses  
323 beyond the candidate's own personal teaching; or  
324

325 2.3.3.12. Patents that resulted from the candidate's research or professional  
326 activity.  
327

328 The department RTP policy shall list specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental  
329 criteria for tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as  
330 appropriate, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant  
331 contributions to the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies.

332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379

## **2.4. Service**

Service consists of activities other than teaching and RSCA that result from the candidate's academic expertise and contribute to the mission of the university. It includes service to the discipline, the department, the college, the university, and the community. The college recognizes that the departments have different expectations with regard to service. However, after reappointment, candidates are expected to expand the scope of participation beyond their department, and candidates for promotion to professor are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect of service.

The candidate's narrative should address the nature, the outcomes, and the contributions of this service to the missions of the university, the college, or the department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise.

### **2.4.1. Criteria for Service**

Faculty members must participate actively in faculty governance through active involvement on committees at the department and college levels to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor. A faculty member being considered for promotion to full professor must demonstrate significant service at the college, university, or CSU system level. A candidate's service to her/his respective profession will be given consideration. The quality of service is the primary consideration, rather than mere membership on a number of committees.

### **2.4.2. Evaluation of Service**

The emphasis in the evaluation of service shall be on: 1) the quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions of the university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and level of the candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward service. Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence, which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.

### **2.4.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Service**

The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as service. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category.

2.4.3.1. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department, the college, or the university;

2.4.3.2. Sponsoring student groups;

2.4.3.3. Actively engaging in institutional educational and research programs;

2.4.3.4. Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing);



- 380  
381 2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international  
382 levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees,  
383 workshops, speeches, and media interviews;  
384  
385 2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments,  
386 and community service organizations;  
387  
388 2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants,  
389 fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for  
390 general expertise in the discipline.  
391

### 392 **3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

393 Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.  
394

395 **3.1.** The CNSM candidate's narrative should also include plans and goals for the  
396 coming five years and a discussion of how the candidate has addressed suggestions  
397 made during previous reviews. It is recommended that the narrative not exceed 23,000  
398 words or 45 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins.  
399

400 **3.2.** Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write evaluations of all RTP  
401 candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee.  
402 Such chair evaluations must be independent of the department RTP committee's  
403 evaluation. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a  
404 higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a  
405 review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair  
406 participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.  
407

### 408 **4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

409 Consult the university RTP policy.  
410

### 411 **5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

#### 412 **5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

413  
414  
415 5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based  
416 upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for  
417 reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.  
418

419 5.1.2. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective  
420 teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse body of students and to  
421 the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in  
422 her/his program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative  
423 achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily  
424 at the departmental level consistent with departmental and college service expectations.  
425

#### 426 **5.2. Awarding of Tenure**

427 Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is  
428 awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and increasingly distinguished  
429 professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure  
430 recommendations are based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's  
431 overall record of accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the  
432 continuation of this record.

433

### 434 **5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

435

436 5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate  
437 professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty  
438 members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction  
439 and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service. A candidate will not receive a  
440 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area. For a positive  
441 recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a  
442 rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the  
443 area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

444

445 5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to  
446 be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in  
447 Section 2.2.8 of this policy.

448

449 5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate  
450 that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in  
451 RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in Section 2.3.3 of  
452 this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for  
453 tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the departmental standards for  
454 assessment of the quality of the candidate's accomplishments. All levels of review will  
455 use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.

456

457 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to  
458 the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in  
459 service are listed in Section 2.4.3 of this policy.

460

### 461 **5.4. Promotion to Professor**

462

463 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for  
464 tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the  
465 departmental RTP policy. A professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record  
466 of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular  
467 development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that  
468 includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of  
469 her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have  
470 disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international  
471 level. In addition, a professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at  
472 the university and in the community or the profession.

473

474 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if  
475 deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a  
476 candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.  
477

#### 478 **5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

479 Consult the university RTP policy.  
480

### 481 **6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

482 Consult the university RTP policy.  
483

### 484 **7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

485  
486 All information in this policy applies to a faculty member appointed jointly to two or more  
487 departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for  
488 tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must  
489 be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the  
490 departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the  
491 dean(s).  
492

### 493 **8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

494  
495 **8.1.** Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of  
496 changes to the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural  
497 changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,  
498 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty members.  
499

500 **8.2.** The tenured/probationary faculty members of the college, voting by secret ballot  
501 (with pro and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy  
502 and evaluation criteria section of this policy.  
503

504 **8.3.** Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:  
505

506 8.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured/  
507 probationary faculty members or  
508

509 8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.  
510

511 **8.4.** Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for  
512 the faculty members called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt  
513 and shall be distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty members at  
514 least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.  
515

516 **8.5.** Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a  
517 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members voting in a  
518 secret ballot conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the  
519 public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university  
520 president or designee.  
521

522 Approved by Academic Affairs August, 2016.  
523  
524 Effective: Fall 2016