COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

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

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)

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

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

2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

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

---

1 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.
of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of research, scholarly
and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to
professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of
evaluation.

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

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

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

2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher
There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing
her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches
used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should
be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the
candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward
a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant materials. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy, classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes
Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and goals. Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with course goals.

2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction
In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and university RTP policies, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all courses evaluated during the period under review. Note that evaluations for independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department seminar/colloquium courses should not be included in the candidate's file. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

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

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

2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to suggestions for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations), 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4) any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness.
2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly rigor of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses taught by tenured/probationary faculty members.

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities
The college recognizes that there is a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. 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.

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

2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;
2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation of such research;

2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories;

2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the candidate’s assigned workload, and mentoring of students;

2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;

2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-based materials;

2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of improving instruction; and

2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.

2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:

2.2.9.1. Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;

2.2.9.2. Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the same course unless the course has significantly changed over time);

2.2.9.3. Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and homework sets; and,

2.2.9.4. If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to students (e.g. a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).

2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.

2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most directly achieved through maintaining an active program of research or scholarly activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific conferences and reading of appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.

2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

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

2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA

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

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

2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the supplementary documentation binder.
2.3.2.4. External evaluations of the candidate's contributions to the discipline will be considered, consistent with the provisions of the current CBA and university policy.

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

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

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

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

2.3.3.4. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings and conferences;

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

2.3.3.6. Applications for external funds to support ongoing RSCA;

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

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

2.3.3.9. Awards of internal grants;

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

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

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

The department RTP policy shall list specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies.
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);
2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media interviews;

2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations;

2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.

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

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

4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

Consult the university RTP policy.

5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

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

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

5.2. Awarding of Tenure
Tenure represents the university’s long-term commitment to a faculty member and is awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession. 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. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

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

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

5.4. Promotion to Professor

5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to professor shall be higher than those for tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the departmental RTP policy. A professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent record of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international level. In addition, a professor shall have provided significant service and leadership at the university and in the community or the profession.
5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.

5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion
Consult the university RTP policy.

6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS
Consult the university RTP policy.

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

8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

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

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

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

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

8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.

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

8.5. Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty members voting in a secret ballot conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president or designee.
Approved by Academic Affairs August, 2016.

Effective: Fall 2016