

# COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION POLICY ON REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION RTP DOCUMENT**
  - A. Preamble
  - B. Commitment and Purpose
  - C. RTP Guidelines
  - D. Narrative Requirements
  
- II. INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY-RELATED ACTIVITIES**
  - A. An Instructor in the College of Business Administration
  - B. Instruction in the College of Business Administration
  - C. Course Design, Communication and Grading Policy
  - D. Student Response to Instruction
  - E. Other Instructionally-Related Activities
  
- III. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)**
  - A. RSCA in the College of Business Administration
  - B. RSCA Criteria for Reappointment
  - C. RSCA Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
  - D. RSCA Criteria for Promotion to Professor
  - E. Additional RSCA Contributions
  
- IV. SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY, IN THE COMMUNITY AND IN THE PROFESSION.**
  - A. Service in the College of Business Administration
  - B. Service Expectations and Standards
  - C. Service Evaluative Criteria
  - D. The Candidate's Responsibilities
  
- V. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**
  
- VI. COMPOSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF CBA RTP COMMITTEES**
  - A. Committee Membership Criteria
  - B. Promotions
  - C. Department Chair
  
- VII. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**
  
- VIII. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA AND EVALUATION OF RTP CANDIDATES**
  
- IX. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**
  
- X. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**
  
- XI. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**
  
- XII. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENTS**

## I . COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION RTP DOCUMENT

**A. Preamble.** The College of Business Administration (“College”) views the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (“RTP”) documents from all three levels of evaluation (the individual department, the College and the University) as a single interlocking continuous RTP document varying only in the level of specificity of standards and guidelines to be used in evaluating a Candidate for reappointment, tenure and promotion (“Candidate”). All parties shall refer to these three documents for a full understanding of the philosophy, intent, and specific RTP standards. In this College RTP document, portions of the University RTP document that are critical for clarity and emphasis are inserted. All University RTP document insertions in the College RTP document are presented in italics and labeled (PS 09-10) to clearly distinguish between the University and College documents. Portions of the University document not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the original University document.

### ***(PS 09-10) 1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES***

#### ***1.1 University Mission and Vision***

*California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world.*

#### ***1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion***

***1.2.1*** *A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the university’s articulated mission and vision. CSULB faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.*

***1.2.2*** *Decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.*

**1.2.3** *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) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.*

**1.2.4** *This policy should not be construed to prevent innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; department and college needs; and university mission.*

## **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

*Colleges, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.*

**B. Commitment and Purpose.** The College is committed to providing an instructional program of high quality for all of its students. A strong faculty dedicated to excellence and who continue to grow professionally throughout their careers is necessary to fulfill that commitment. The broad purpose of this document is to encourage Candidates to develop in a manner that produces a culture within the College that values all aspects of active involvement in the University and its mission.

**C. RTP Guidelines.** College and department RTP documents are to be used as guidelines by Candidates and their mentors in assessing progress through the various stages of the RTP process. They are also to be used by RTP committees in evaluating Candidates. Consequently, the documents define the standards by which Candidates will be evaluated. The documents specify the level of performance which is expected for a positive recommendation at each step of the RTP process. The quality and on-going nature of a Candidate's performance are the most important elements to consider in evaluating individual achievement. As noted in the University RTP Policy, "The College RTP Committee shall take into serious account the [individual] department's specific standards for evaluating [its Candidates]" (PS 09-10 §3.6).

**D. Narrative Requirements.** In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, Candidates are required to present a written narrative with supporting materials describing the extent and quality of their work in each of the categories to be evaluated: Instruction, RSCA, and Service. Specifically, in their narrative, Candidates must demonstrate the value and quality of their contributions in each of these three areas. The narrative also should serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional goals and values as they relate to the mission of the

department, the College, and the University. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained.

## II. INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY-RELATED ACTIVITIES

### ***(PS 09-10) 2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities***

*Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally-related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally-related activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student research and fieldwork, direction of student performances and exhibitions, 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**

*Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.*

#### **2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes**

*Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials should clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.*

#### **2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction**

In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting 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.

**A. An Instructor in the College of Business Administration.** In addition to providing excellent classroom and classroom-related instruction, a Candidate is expected to be a scholarly role model and to provide ethical leadership and advising to undergraduate and graduate students. He or she should strive to excel in the classroom, maintain instructional relevance and currency, strive to attain high evaluations while ensuring that students reach course learning goals and garner peer respect. Candidates should strive to continuously improve instruction and to implement pedagogies that engage students and provide meaningful learning experiences.

**B. Instruction in the College of Business Administration.** Due to the diversity of the subject matter within the various functional areas of business, College faculty employ a variety of different teaching pedagogies including small and large lectures, discussions and presentations, teams and project groups, case studies, computer-based approaches and combination formats. The instructional methods employed by a Candidate should be appropriate for the course taught, and materials should be up-to-date and relevant to the course.

1. Departments within the College may wish to establish criteria appropriate for evaluating the application of different pedagogical approaches and methods used by their Candidates. The criteria may vary according to the pedagogical approach used by the Candidates as well as the level of the class (e.g., graduate, upper division, lower division).
2. Each department may also establish a “peer review” process to consider pedagogical factors and develop processes for class-room visits and review of materials.
3. Consistent with University teaching philosophy, Candidates are encouraged to develop new approaches to teaching, where appropriate. Evaluation of new approaches to teaching shall recognize the experimental nature of the pedagogy. In addition, favorable consideration shall be given by reviewers when the pedagogy is carefully planned and thoughtfully implemented.

**C. Course Design, Communication and Grading Policy.** When examining a Candidate’s teaching effectiveness, the Candidate’s adherence to department and College standards and policies in the following areas should be considered:

1. A Candidate’s syllabus and other course documents should meet relevant department, College, and University standards and policies (e.g., PS 04-05). Candidates are urged to consult with their department chair and/or other senior colleagues with respect to the department’s standards regarding syllabi and other course documents.

2. The grading practices of a Candidate must be consistent with those of the department and the College. Candidates are urged to consult with their department chair and/or other senior colleagues with respect to the department's grading standards. The grade point average of the course taught is expected to be in line with that of other sections of the course and, when appropriate, other courses at the same level. In instances where GPA's may not be consistent with these guidelines, it is incumbent on the Candidate to specify in his or her narrative the reasons for any differences. In all cases, the most important criterion for evaluation of a Candidate is the quality of teaching and the achievement of course learning objectives by students.
3. A Candidate should cover all the learning objectives included in the Standard Course Outline (SCO) developed for that course where available.

**D. Student Response to Instruction.** The Candidate must follow University, College and Department policies regarding student evaluations of courses. If the Candidate has fewer than all of his or her class sections evaluated during a semester, he or she should ensure that the courses evaluated are representative of all the courses taught. Candidates may provide an interpretation of evaluation scores.

1. Student evaluations of instructors shall initially be interpreted on a comparable course basis. Following careful comparison at the appropriate level, general comparisons should then be made across different course types and levels. In addition to considering the performance levels in various courses, student evaluations of a Candidate's teaching performance shall be considered with respect to the trend of performance over time. All items on the student evaluation forms shall be considered.
2. Each department in the College shall provide appropriate information that can be used in making the evaluation and comparison described above.

**E. Other Instructionally-Related Activities.** In addition to the design and delivery of classroom courses, Candidates will also be evaluated on other instructionally-related activities that take place outside the traditional classroom. These activities should be clearly presented and discussed in the Candidate's narrative.

Efforts to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness are expected of faculty. This improvement should be described in the Candidate's narrative and supported by exemplary materials. These actions may include:

1. Regular interactions with colleagues regarding various pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development.

2. Development of innovative approaches to teaching, fostering increased student learning in the classroom, and participating in the evaluation of instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction.
3. Involvement in programs of the CSULB Center for Faculty Development; participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the department, College, University or relevant professional organizations; giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching and other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.
4. Development of new curriculum, instructional programs or materials, including electronic or multimedia instructional software or new advising materials or programs.

### III. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)

#### ***(PS 09-10) 2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)***

*Departments and colleges shall develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA. The University RTP policy provides a guiding framework for this charge.*

*Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies.*

*Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments includes, but is not limited to, publications of merit reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, fellowships, grants, contracts, scholarship of engagement, and artistic exhibits and performances. These achievements must be reviewed by professional peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences.*

**A. RSCA in the College of Business Administration.** Faculty are expected to remain abreast of their field and to be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship or creative activity that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time. Candidates are expected to produce a portfolio of quality scholarly and/or creative achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline (or interdisciplinary studies).

**Standard of Recognized Quality.** Candidates are required to concentrate their research efforts on publication of articles in academic journals of recognized quality (or professional journals of recognized quality when designated as appropriate by an individual department).

Journals of “Recognized Quality” are journals that are recognized within a discipline as having a significant favorable impact on the scholarship or pedagogy of that discipline. The quality of any journal is to be indicated by the Candidate in their narrative by using readily recognizable criteria, such as widely accepted journal rankings, impact factors such as: (i) the Social Science Citation Index/Science Citation Index (SSCI/SCI), (ii) substantial citation of the journal in Google Scholar, (iii) reputation of the journal’s publisher, (iv) comparable measures recognized within a academic discipline or academia as a whole, and (iv) other criteria that indicate level of journal quality (*e.g.*, quality of journal editorial boards and peer and external review, although a peer-reviewed journal is normally a necessary, but not a sufficient, criterion for quality designation of articles published). In the case of co-authored RSCA, Candidates must specify the type and level of their contribution to a particular article, however, the value of their contribution remains a function of the quality and impact of the article.

1. In all cases, it is incumbent on the Candidate to specify and support the quality of his or her journal publications using the above-stated criteria and/or additional relevant measures of quality.
2. A Candidate’s RSCA portfolio should demonstrate that the Candidate will continue his or her RSCA after the review period.
3. Normally, the majority of the articles published, or accepted for publication, at the time of submittal of a faculty member’s RTP file, will show the candidate’s affiliation with the College of Business Administration/CSULB. However, all articles published during any years granted to the candidate towards RTP are included in the candidates RSCA portfolio.
4. Conference proceedings and presentations strengthen a Candidate’s scholarly portfolio, but do not substitute for journal articles.
5. This same standard of “Recognized Quality” applies to all types of RTP recommendations (reappointment, tenure and promotion to professor).
6. Although a journal may not constitute a journal of “Recognized Quality,” it is possible, in rare instances, for a Candidate to argue that a particular article is of substantial quality (*e.g.*, by demonstrating that it has been widely and favorably cited). If such quality is demonstrated, then the article shall be deemed to be published in a journal of “Recognized Quality” for purposes of this document.

**B. RSCA Criteria for Reappointment.** Reappointment is critical as it indicates the University’s and the College’s potential long-term commitment to the Candidate. The College requires that the Candidate must show the reasonable likelihood that he or she will be able to meet the RSCA requirements for tenure. Candidates should note that reappointment does not guarantee a favorable recommendation for tenure.

1. Normally, a Candidate will have at least one journal publication indicating his or her affiliation with the College/University, published or accepted for publication without major revisions, in a journal of “Recognized Quality” (as defined in Section III.A above). In addition, the Candidate is expected to have multiple research projects in progress.
2. Tenure-track faculty represent a substantial investment by the College and must demonstrate satisfactory RSCA progress toward tenure before being reappointed. In all cases, the Dean shall have the authority to recommend granting reappointment for one, two, or three year periods or to recommend not granting reappointment.

**C. RSCA Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor.** For a positive recommendation on tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, the College requires at least three journal publications of “Recognized Quality” (as defined in Section III.A above), published or accepted for publication without major revisions, during the Candidate’s probationary period inclusive of service credit year(s). However, the quality of a Candidate’s publications can affect the quantity of publications required. For example, a Candidate could receive a favorable RSCA tenure evaluation with as few as two journal publications provided that those publications are in the highest quality journals in the Candidate’s discipline, or in a related discipline. In all cases, a balance between quality and quantity must be maintained with quantity never substituting for minimally acceptable quality.

In addition to intellectual accomplishments, a Candidate’s portfolio shall contain works-in-progress that clearly show a strong likelihood of continued research productivity and output after being awarded tenure.

**D. RSCA Criteria for Promotion to Professor.** Full professor is the highest rank a faculty member can achieve. Promotion to professor shall not be an automatic advancement over time, but an earned honor based on performance. For promotion to professor, a Candidate must have at least three journal articles published in refereed Journals of “Recognized Quality” (as defined in Section III.A above), within the preceding six years or, if a shorter period, since his/her last promotion. Normally, manuscripts accepted for publication without major revisions could be included in the minimum requirement. In addition to intellectual accomplishments, a Candidate’s portfolio shall contain works-in-progress that clearly show a strong likelihood of continued research productivity and output after being promoted.

**E. Additional RSCA Contributions.** A Candidate can enhance the strength of his/her RTP file by additional activities that include, but are not limited to substantial records of peer reviewed professional activities and products. Such activities and products may include books, articles in professional journals (that are not included in Section III.A), conference proceedings, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, and successful grants,

fellowships, and contracts, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers.

#### **IV. SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY, IN THE COMMUNITY AND IN THE PROFESSION.**

##### **(PS 09-10) 2.3 Service**

*Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of faculty governance and to maintain active engagement within the university, community, and profession through quality service contributions and activities throughout their career. Meaningful service should be related to the academic expertise and rank of the faculty member.*

*Departments and colleges shall develop their own standards and criteria for the evaluation of quality service. These standards and criteria shall be based in a comparative evaluation of responsibility and commitment across service obligations at the department, college, and university levels. Departments and colleges shall then make clear to the candidate what types of service are appropriate to faculty rank and experience. Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to, leadership roles in faculty governance activities and committees; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures; ongoing advising of student groups; service or leadership activities for professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community organizations.*

**A. Service in the College of Business Administration.** Faculty should consider themselves to be representatives and envoys of their department, College, University and profession when conducting service engagements both internal and external to the University. Candidates should not only represent their department and the College in a professional and collegial manner, but must also ensure that service activities and outcomes are reported to and shared, where appropriate, with College and department committees. A Candidate's service may be contributed to the University, the community, and the discipline, but it must be clearly related to the academic expertise of the Candidate. It is incumbent on the Candidate to ask the department if potential service is consistent with the College and/or University mission.

**B. Service Expectations and Standards.** Candidates are expected to participate actively in the collegial processes of faculty governance, as well as in appropriate professional organizations and/or activities. Candidates are expected to provide quality service, where in addition to regular committee attendance they show initiative and leadership by actively engaging and participating in department, College, and/or University initiatives. Examples of service include, but are not limited to:

**1. Service to the University.** Service to the University includes:

- (a) Active involvement on committees at all levels of the University and the university system, with emphasis upon the departmental and College levels for assistant and associate professors.
- (b) Authorship of documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or department mission and/or procedures.
- (c) Sponsoring student groups and supporting student recruiting and retention activities.
- (d) Participation in the College's AACSB accreditation efforts (*e.g.*, preparation of AACSB reports and the assessment of College programs).

**2. Service to the Profession.** The Candidate is expected to provide services to his or her profession through active involvement and participation in discipline-oriented activities such as:

- (a) Holding an office in a professional society or association at local, state, national, and/or international levels.
- (b) Serving on the editorial board for an academic or professional journal.
- (c) Reviewing manuscripts for academic or professional journals and conferences.
- (d) Serving as conference program organizers, session chair or paper discussant for academic conferences or meetings.
- (e) Serving on selection panels for grants, fellowships, and contract awards.

**3. Service to the Community.** In addition to service to the University and the profession, Candidates may participate in community activities requiring their academic expertise and professional skills. These may include:

- (a) Giving speeches or media interviews.
- (b) Serving on committees or providing pro bono seminars or workshops.
- (c) Providing pro bono consultantships to public schools, local government, and community service organizations.

**C. Service Evaluative Criteria.** The evaluation of service shall be based on:

- (a) The quality and significance of the service activity itself.
- (b) The degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, College, and/or department.
- (c) The quality and the extent of the Candidate's involvement and contribution to the service activity.

(d) The degree of the Candidate's leadership in the service activity.

**D. The Candidate's Responsibilities.** The Candidate must provide a documented narrative of his or her service contributions and it is incumbent on the Candidate in this narrative to describe in detail the above evaluative criteria. The Candidate, in addition to describing and documenting membership and attendance, shall describe contributions.

1. Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance in addition to documenting their attendance and participation. The Candidate may provide an estimate of the hours of work per semester or per year that a particular service commitment required.
2. Candidates shall also include documentation of participation in collegial processes of faculty governance by including an appendix in their file of supplemental documents including the first page of minutes of council and committee meetings in order that the frequency of meetings and the Candidate's attendance and contributions can be assessed.
3. Candidates shall provide official correspondence from professional societies and associations attesting to the Candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in the organization.
4. All committee chairpersons or reporting members shall record and note in written minutes, after each meeting, the names of all committee members who were present (inclusive of ex-officio and guests), as well as recording by name all excused and unexcused absences.

## **V. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 09-10) – Section 3.0.

## **VI. COMPOSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF CBA RTP COMMITTEES**

**A. Committee Membership Criteria.** A department-level RTP Committee must consist of at least three members. The College-level RTP Committee must consist of one member from each of the departments of the College. All Committee members must be tenured, full-time faculty. A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President (Collective Bargaining Agreement 15.2). However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of which, are FERP participants.

**B. Promotions.** In all promotion cases, members of the committee must have a rank higher than or equal to the rank for which a Candidate is being considered.

**C. Department Chair.** This same requirement applies to a Department Chair if he/she reviews the faculty member for promotion.

#### **VII. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 09-10) – Section 4.0.

#### **VIII. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA AND EVALUATION OF RTP CANDIDATES**

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 09-10) – Section 5.0.

#### **IX. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS.**

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 09-10) – Section 6.0.

#### **X. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 09-10) – Section 7.0.

#### **XI. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

Please refer to the University RTP Document (PS 09-10) – Section 8.0.

#### **XII. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENTS**

This policy may be amended as provided in the CBA Constitution. Any amendment must be approved by: (i) a majority of the College's tenured and tenure track faculty voting in a secret mail ballot, (ii) the Dean and (iii) the Provost."