

Letter of Interpretation by the Faculty Council, 26 February 2003

In accordance with section II.E. of the College of Liberal Arts Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policies and Procedures, the Faculty Council has the responsibility for interpretation of the RTP policies and procedures. Based upon the advice of two separate ad hoc subcommittees of the Faculty Council that investigated the RTP document and process over the previous two years, the Council adopts the following interpretations of the CLA RTP policies and procedures.

1. Teaching materials:

- For each course taught more than once during the period under review, the following materials should be included in the file from the most recent semester the course was taught: a course syllabus, the final exam (or substitute comprehensive final assignment) and selected additional course materials (candidate's discretion).
- Candidates should not provide course materials for two semesters of the same course unless teaching issues have been highlighted as an area of concern in a prior review.
- The file may include selected materials from web sites that instructors have created for the course, but need not include a printout of the entire web site.

2. The college RTP policies and procedures specify two essential criteria for scholarly and creative activities, peer-reviewed publications (section IV.A.2.a) and evidence of ongoing scholarly activity (section IV.A.2.a). The candidate, in the narrative and in the Professional Data Sheet, and the Dept RTP committee in the Dept Evaluation form, should both use the following language in the section on scholarly and creative activity (IV.A.2.a in the College RTP document).

Section IV.A.2.a ~~III.A.1~~ Evidence of peer reviewed publication.

In both cases below, the Department RTP committee has the responsibility to judge the evidence and conclude whether or not to include the accomplishment as published or ongoing, taking into consideration cases where letters of acceptance did not lead to publication. The Department RTP committee also has the responsibility to judge the evidence of the review process if any, and conclude whether to evaluate the accomplishment as a peer-reviewed publication under Essential Criteria (section IV.A.2.a of the College RTP document), or under Enhancing Criteria (section IV.A.2.b) as a non-reviewed publication.

- A. "Accepted" refers to a manuscript for which the publisher has agreed to publish the manuscript without further changes. Evidence is a letter on letterhead from the publisher and evidence regarding the review process of the publisher, and the manuscript.
- B. "In press" refers to page proofs prior to publication. Evidence is page proofs and written communication from the publisher accompanying the page proofs, and evidence regarding the review process of the publisher.

Section IV.A.2.a Evidence of ongoing scholarly activity:

The following represent the best evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. We do not encourage filling the file with conference programs, evidence of conference attendance, or other presentations.

- A. “Under contract” means that there is a contract from a publisher to produce a publication, whether or not a draft exists. Evidence is a letter from the publisher.
 - B. “Submitted” means only that a manuscript has been completed and submitted to a publisher for consideration to be published as an article or book or book chapter. Evidence is the manuscript with a written communication acknowledging receipt from the publisher.
 - C. “Revise and resubmit” refers to a manuscript for consideration as an article/book/book chapter that has been reviewed by a publisher, and the publisher has communicated with the author indicating a willingness to look at a revised version of the product without a promise that the manuscript will be published. Evidence is a written communication from the publisher with an invitation to revise, including the referee reports, and the manuscript.
 - D. “Conditionally Accepted” refers to a manuscript for which the publisher has agreed to publish the manuscript conditional on minor corrections. Evidence is a letter from the publisher and the manuscript.
3. The college council interprets Section III.E. of the CLA RTP document to require the College RTP committee to hold a meeting – with a quorum (and with the Candidate’s file at hand) – with the Department RTP committee (and the Department Chairperson, if the Chairperson has exercised the option to write a recommendation) prior to making a recommendation that may differ with the recommendation of the Department RTP Committee or the Department Chairperson. Similarly, the Dean shall hold a meeting with the College RTP committee – with a quorum (and with the Candidate’s file at hand) – prior to making a recommendation that differs with the recommendation of the College RTP Committee. The purpose of such meetings is to ensure that all levels of evaluation are making recommendations based upon the information in the file, without overlooking evidence in the file or making recommendations based upon information not contained in the file.
4. The curriculum vitae and the Professional Data Sheet are interpreted to be one and the same, providing that all the information specified in the CLA RTP document (Section III.C.2) is included. The information must include the years when all higher degrees were granted, the year of appointment to a tenure-track position at CSULB, effective date of tenure at CSULB if any, and effective date of promotion at CSULB if any.
5. The Candidate’s Statement is ideally between 5 to 10 pages.