

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY
ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
POLICY EFFECTIVE SPRING 2011**

CSULB is a teaching-intensive, research-driven university that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global perspectives. The Department of Economics Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for California State University, Long Beach establishes the criteria by which the work of probationary and tenured faculty shall be evaluated within this context. The department expects all probationary and tenured faculty to demonstrate a sustained, high-quality record in: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and (3) service contributions.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.1.1 The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the college. The Department of Economics RTP Policy provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the Department.

1.1.2 Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and department policies.

1.1.3 The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed work for specified periods of review.

1.1.4 Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As such, all statements made by candidates and all materials put forth for consideration in RTP matters must abide by the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this basic principle. Such issues shall be referred to Academic Affairs.

1.1.5 Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner organized according to the policy requirements and instructions.

1.1.6 Candidates' narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as detailed on the Professional Data Sheet.

1.1.7 The Department Chair will assign all new faculty members a Faculty Mentor in the first semester of appointment. The Faculty Mentor will provide, in

47 a timely fashion, examples of appropriate documentation for future review. The
48 Department will elect an RTP Committee as indicated in the bylaws.
49

50 **1.1.8** Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on
51 criteria and procedures delineated in university, college, or department RTP
52 policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on unprofessional sources such
53 as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., Facebook,
54 RateMyProfessors.com, Pick-a-Professor.com), petitions, and anonymous letters.
55

56 **1.1.9** As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other
57 materials obtained during open period are to be considered as part of the
58 evaluation of a candidate.
59

60 **1.1.10** Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more
61 areas of evaluation. Multi-faceted activities may be broken into components and
62 discussed where appropriate. Components discussed or listed under one area of
63 evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.
64

65 **1.2 File Requirements**

66
67 **1.2.1** All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:

68 a. Professional Data Sheet labeled according to university requirements
69 and with the following CLA specifications:

70 1. Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:

71 a. By semester, list formal academic advising
72 activities and associated duties.

73 b. By semester, list activities for which units are
74 assigned (e.g., assigned time or other), such as
75 involvement in student mentoring, supervision of
76 student research, projects, and/or fieldwork.

77 c. By semester, include other instructional activities
78 outside of the classroom. Such activities include,
79 but are not limited to: (1) supervision of student
80 independent research projects; (2) supervision of
81 student research assistants; (3) chairing or serving
82 on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees;
83 and (4) supervision of student teachers.

84 2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA):

85 1. For all RSCA that does not appear under Works in
86 Progress, candidate must:

87 a. Label according to CLA definitions for
88 publication status and peer-review.

89 b. Place all previously-claimed work under the
90 double line.

91 c. List RSCA-related external grants.

92 d. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication

- 93 listed with the following:
- 94 i. Description of publication venue (e.g.,
- 95 journal, media, or volume) vis-à-vis the
- 96 discipline and/or subfield;
- 97 ii. Rationale for publication venue choice;
- 98 iii. Explanation of candidate's contribution
- 99 to co- and multi-authored RSCA.
- 100 3. Service activities, including dates of service, offices held,
- 101 degree of participation, and responsibilities.
- 102 b. Narrative addressing the three areas of evaluation (instruction and
- 103 instructionally-related activities; RSCA; and service). This three-part
- 104 narrative shall be submitted via the Candidate Statement Form*, which
- 105 allows up to 3,000 words.
- 106 c. Workload Assignment Form.*
- 107 d. Academic Advisor Report[†] (as appropriate).
- 108 e. All peer-reviewed publications for the period of review, including (for
- 109 each):
- 110 1. Proof of peer-review for peer-reviewed publications;
- 111 2. Proof of publication status for all in press, forthcoming, and
- 112 accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.
- 113 f. Student course evaluation summaries for each course taught for which
- 114 formal student course evaluations were required during the period of
- 115 review. Candidates must request copies of these materials through the
- 116 *Department RTP Committee Chair* at least 5 days before the
- 117 candidate's deadline to turn in the file to the RTP Committee.
- 118 g. For each course taught during the period of review:
- 119 1. One (1) representative syllabus;
- 120 2. One (1) sample learning assessment tool;
- 121 3. One (1) sample of representative course materials not to exceed
- 122 four (4) pages.
- 123 h. All prior RTP reviews, periodic evaluations, and evidence of
- 124 mentoring (i.e., mini-review evaluations or other) over the full review
- 125 period, including the candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any. For
- 126 promotion to rank of Professor, evaluations for promotion to Associate
- 127 Professor shall be included.
- 128 i. Index of all materials prepared by the candidate except the index of
- 129 open period materials, which shall be prepared by the *Department RTP*
- 130 *Committee Chair or designee*.

131

132 **1.2.2** With the exception of optional written student evaluations as per 2.1.7.3,

133 materials in excess of the above requirements will be returned to the candidate.

134

* Denotes official form available from the College of Liberal Arts.

† Academic Advisor form available from the College of Liberal Arts and only required of faculty who receive unit compensation for advising activities.

135 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

136 The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The
137 Department of Economics requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the
138 guidelines for each area of evaluation below.

139

140 **2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities**

141 This section specifies criteria for the evaluation of a faculty member's instruction and
142 instructionally-related activities. Further, this section delineates the type and amount of
143 documentation regarding a candidate's instructional effectiveness.

144

145 **2.1.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities File**

146 Candidates **must** submit:

- 147 a. Narrative written on the fillable form.
148 b. Student course evaluation summaries for each course for which formal
149 student course evaluations were required during the period of review.
150 c. For each course taught during the period of review:
151 1. One (1) representative course syllabus.
152 2. One (1) sample of an appropriate assessment of student learning
153 outcomes.
154 3. One (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to
155 exceed four (4) pages.
156 d. Academic Advisor Report, if applicable.

157

158 **2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

159 The candidate's narrative of instructional philosophy and practice provides the context
160 necessary for understanding and interpreting the candidate's instructional goals,
161 materials, and accomplishments.

162

163 This narrative, as further evidenced by submitted materials, shall address the following:

- 164 a. The over-arching goals of the candidate's instructional practices.
165 b. Relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to instruction.
166 c. Teaching methodologies and their links to student assessment and learning
167 outcomes.
168 d. Student course evaluations relative to level.
169 e. Grade distributions relative to level.
170 f. Reflection on course evolution in response to feedback from mini reviews and
171 previous RTP actions, professional development activities, and/or
172 experimentation with instructional methodologies or assessments.

173 Furthermore, the narrative shall address the following *as appropriate*:

- 174 g. Student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms,
175 relative to level.
176 h. Grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

177 **2.1.3 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Materials**

178 For each course taught during the period under review candidates will include only: (a)
179 one (1) representative syllabus; (b) one (1) assessment tool for student learning; and (c)
180 one (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages.

181
182 **2.1.3.1 Syllabi**

183 A representative syllabus for each course instructed during the period of review
184 must be submitted. For courses taught more than once in the period of review
185 (e.g., GEOG444), only the most recent syllabus shall be submitted. Candidates
186 may, however, include an additional syllabus for no more than two (2) selected
187 courses to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation. Evaluation will
188 consider syllabi content relative to course level and catalog description. Syllabi
189 must reflect currency in the discipline, compliance with the course's Standard
190 Course Outline on file with the candidate's department, and consistency with
191 current Academic Senate syllabus policies.

192
193 **2.1.3.2 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

194 For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one
195 assessment tool of student learning (e.g., comprehensive final assignment, exam,
196 lab, paper assignment, or project assignment). Evaluation will consider
197 appropriateness relative to course content, student learning goals and objectives,
198 course level, and number of enrolled students.

199
200 **2.1.3.3 Instructional Materials**

201 For each course taught during the period of review, candidates must submit one
202 (1) sample of representative instructional materials not to exceed four (4) pages.
203 Instructional materials include, but are not limited to, class handouts, lecture
204 notes, web page printouts, and PowerPoint slides. Media containing instructional
205 materials (e.g., CDs and DVDs) can be discussed in the narrative but may not be
206 submitted.

207
208 **2.1.4 Peer Observation of Instruction**

209 At least one member of the Department RTP Committee will perform a classroom
210 observation. The evaluation will adhere to the CBA and comply with a
211 departmental rubric or procedure. Candidates will be given at least five (5) days
212 notice before a classroom visit. The subsequent evaluation will be incorporated
213 into the department RTP evaluation.

214
215 **2.1.5 Grade Distributions**

216 Differentiation among levels of student learning is an important responsibility of
217 any teacher. Grade distributions provide a measure of grade leniency and severity.
218 Further, they provide a useful measure for contextualizing assessment of student
219 learning and student course evaluations. As grades in a class necessarily differ
220 from one group of students to another, evaluation will consider the overall trend
221 in grade distributions.

223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268

2.1.6 Academic Advisor Report

Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal student academic advising shall report on their activities per a consistent procedure approved by the Dean or designee. For RTP purposes, the report serves to document instructionally-related activities for which assigned time is granted.

2.1.7 Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations complement the information obtained in the criteria stated above.

2.1.7.1. Evaluation Relative to Context

As per the college RTP document, committees, chairs, and the dean shall evaluate student response to instruction relative to context, including:

- a. Class characteristics
 - 1. Course level
 - 2. Number of enrolled students
 - 3. Whether this was a new course preparation
- b. Candidate’s teaching assignment
 - 1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of evaluation
 - 2. Total number of different course preparations
- c. Candidate’s experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness
- d. Trends over time

2.1.7.2 Course Evaluation Summaries

Course evaluation summaries that are consistent with department and college means provide one measure of effective instruction. Course evaluation summaries must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations are required during the period of review.

2.1.7.3 Written Remarks on Student Course Evaluations

The inclusion of written remarks from student course evaluations is optional. Candidates may include written remarks for a course if such remarks help clarify or explain an ambiguity on the course evaluation summaries. In such cases, all original student evaluations for the selected course, including those evaluations without student comments, must be included.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

The Department of Economics requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) of all faculty members. This section outlines the criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

2.2.1 RSCA File

2.2.1.1 Required Materials

Candidate’s files **must** include:

- 269 a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.
270 b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative
271 activities for the review period only. RSCA claimed in prior
272 actions cannot be included. Published peer-reviewed research is
273 defined under 2.2.3.1. Such materials shall be placed in the binder
274 or, in the case of books and other materials that do not fit in the
275 binder, shall be submitted with the file. Furthermore, candidates
276 have the option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming
277 RSCA as per the following guidelines:
278 1. Candidates may include accepted, in press, or forthcoming
279 RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it
280 beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such
281 materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates
282 decide to withhold these materials, such items must be
283 listed under Works in Progress on the PDS.
284 2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only
285 include publications and all in press, forthcoming, or
286 accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a
287 prior successful action.
288 c. For candidates who author externally-funded RSCA grants and
289 choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, file
290 must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2)
291 length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award;
292 (5) brief description of candidate's role in authorship and
293 implementation.
294 d. Proof of publication status as per policy (below) for all in press,
295 forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.
296 e. Proof of peer review as per 2.2.3.
297

2.2.1.2 Optional Materials

298 The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews) is
299 optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as
300 negative for any candidate.
301
302

2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials

303 Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g.,
304 works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures). Listing
305 such items on the PDS is sufficient.
306
307

2.2.2 RSCA Narrative

308 The RSCA narrative for the period of review must address:

- 309 a. Focus and sustained nature of the candidate's research,
310 scholarly, and creative activities.
311 b. Significance and impact of the candidate's RSCA.
312 c. Candidate's role in authorship for co- and multi-authored
313 RSCA.
314

- 315 d. Significance and impact of non peer-reviewed RSCA included
316 in the candidate's RTP file.

317
318 **2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition**

319 In the Department of Economics, the primary requirement for a candidate's
320 research, scholarly, and creative activities is peer review

321
322 **2.2.3.1 Definition**

323 Peer review is typically defined as a process by which qualified experts in
324 the discipline impartially evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of
325 research, scholarly, and creative activities. For the purposes of this policy,
326 the term peer review encompasses the terms 'juried' and 'refereed,' which
327 may be used for all RSCA impartially evaluated by qualified experts in
328 specific disciplines.

329
330 **2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement**

331 For each RSCA item on the Professional Data Sheet, candidates are
332 required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using
333 consistent labels of "Peer Reviewed," "Refereed," or "Juried" as
334 appropriate to the field.

335
336 **2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status**

337 RSCA not yet in print or otherwise in the public domain must be labeled on the
338 Professional Data Sheet according to the following definitions of publication
339 status:

- 340 a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable, except when a DOI
341 (digital object identifier) has been issued. Both refer to an accepted
342 work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-publication
343 state. A work is considered published after a DOI has been issued.
- 344 b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has
345 agreed to publish without major changes.
- 346 c. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed
347 and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity,
348 indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be
349 published.
- 350 d. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and
351 has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating
352 that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.
- 353 e. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.
- 354 f. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for
355 which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.
- 356 g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for
357 which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.

358
359 **2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status**

360 For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file,

361 candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the
362 publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation
363 (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.
364

365 **2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

366 **2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

367 Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such
368 proof must be provided in English.
369

370 Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:

- 371 a. A printout of the venue's editorial policy.
- 372 b. Copies of reader reports.
- 373 c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.
374

375 **2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns**

376 Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.
377

378 Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest;
379 monetary payment to secure publication; and duplicate publication:
380

- 381 a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include, but are not
382 limited to serving contemporaneously on the editorial, advisory, or
383 executive board of the press or journal with which one has
384 published.
385
- 386 b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author
387 is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure
388 publication (e.g., for-profit presses and vanity presses) shall be
389 considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection
390 process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to
391 offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for
392 publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images).
393
- 394 c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in
395 their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same
396 article published in different venues or in different languages.
397 Reprints must be labeled as such.

398 **2.3 Service**

399 High-quality, sustained service contributions to the University as well as to the profession
400 and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts.
401 Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty member.
402

403 In keeping with the self-governance tenets that inform our campus, service contributions
404 must be performed at the department, college, and/or university levels. This section
405 delineates service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.
406

407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451

2.3.1 Service File

Candidates **must** submit:

- a. Narrative written on the fillable form. The narrative shall address significance and impact of service identified on the PDS.
- b. Professional Data Sheet. As per university guidelines, the PDS must address dates of service, offices held, degree of participation, and responsibilities.

2.3.2 Service Expectations

All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues. Candidates should discuss service opportunities with their mentors. At all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates serve.

Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to: faculty governance activities and committees; program development; sponsorship of student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and projects; authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or department policies and procedures; mentoring of students; service or leadership activities for university committees, professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations; peer review for scholarly journals; organization of conferences; and consulting in federal, state and local government, and community organizations.

2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank

- a. Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment typically are expected to focus service activities at the department level.
- b. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-quality service contributions to their department, and to either the college or the university.
- c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates are expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (1) service at department, college, and university levels; (2) a record of leadership at the University; and (3) a record of service in the community and/or the profession. University leadership may be demonstrated by a record of holding formal offices (e.g., committee chair) and/or of active engagement in faculty governance (e.g., active participation in accreditation or policy-writing processes).

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service activities relative to department, college, and university RTP policies as well as

452 the CBA. Candidates must describe the nature of the service activities in their
453 narrative, providing the basic parameters for peer evaluation.
454

455 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

456 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process, and
457 emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.
458

459 **3.1 Candidate**

460 Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that
461 complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking
462 guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and
463 procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.
464

465 **3.1.1** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually
466 accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Academic Affairs.
467

468 **3.1.2** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required material is
469 included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.
470

471 **3.1.3** As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become
472 accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of material after the date of file
473 completion must have the approval of the college RTP committee, which is the
474 peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.
475

476 **3.2 Joint Appointments**

477 The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with
478 a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates
479 that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the
480 formation of an evaluation committee. This committee shall consist of members selected
481 from among the peer review committees of the departments within which the candidate
482 holds a joint appointment. For more details on joint appointments, see the university
483 policy.
484

485 **3.3 Department RTP Committee**

486 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities for department RTP
487 committees and stipulates that no one individual may participate in the evaluation of any
488 single candidate in more than one level of review.

489 3.3.1 The Department RTP Committee Chair is responsible for protecting the
490 confidentiality of RTP documents.

491 3.3.2 The Department RTP Committee Chair must inform all other committee
492 members on the decisions of the Department Chair, CLA committee, Dean and
493 Provost.
494

495 **3.4 Department Chair Evaluations**

496 In the Department of Economics the Chair will provide an independent evaluation of
497 RTP candidates. That document usually will not exceed 500 words.

498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543

3.7 College and University Review

The college RTP committee reviews materials submitted by candidates, departmental committees, and department chairs. Evaluation by the college committee must take into account the RTP policy of the candidate’s department as well as the university and college RTP policies. The committee renders its own evaluation, which it forwards to the dean.

The Dean is charged with mentoring department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process. The dean also communicates standards and expectations and ensures the integrity of the RTP process across the college. The Dean writes an independent evaluation and recommendation for each candidate and forwards that evaluation to the Provost.

The Provost reviews the candidate’s file and all prior evaluations and makes a final recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.

5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any action.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the college and the candidate’s department, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

At minimum, this evidence must include demonstration of: (1) effective teaching; (2) research, scholarship, and/or creative activities that include initial publications or similar evidence of RSCA appropriate to rank, experience, and discipline; and (3) engagement in service at the department level.

The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The University RTP Policy delineates the meaning of tenure and the criteria for the awarding of tenure.

544 **5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor**

545 The University RTP Policy states the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to
546 Associate Professor, including the expectation that a candidate shall have a record of
547 high-quality peer-reviewed work that has contributed to the advancement, application, or
548 pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. In addition to the
549 minimum standard stated in that policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the candidate
550 to make high-quality service contributions to the department and to either the college or
551 the university.

552
553 **5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor**

554 The University RTP Policy states that standards for promotion to full professor shall be
555 higher than standards for promotion to associate professor.

556
557 In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor
558 must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The
559 successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include high-quality contributions to
560 the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary
561 fields of study. The candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed
562 work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to
563 Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities. The
564 candidate also is expected to have a substantive service record that includes: (a) service at
565 department, college, and university levels; (b) a record of leadership at the University;
566 and (c) a record of service in the community or the profession.

567
568 **5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

569 As outlined by the University RTP Policy, early tenure and/or early promotion are
570 awarded in rare circumstances in which a candidate demonstrates a superior record of
571 accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation. That policy states that candidates for
572 early tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation
573 process according to the university policy on external evaluation.

574
575 **5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts**

576 In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a
577 potential candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources
578 and mentors, including the department chair and dean.

579
580 **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

581 The university-mandated timeline and steps in the RTP process are outlined in the
582 University RTP Policy.

583
584 In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall
585 prepare the index of open period materials.

586
587 **7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

588

589 7.1 The University RTP Policy specifies that, prior to the final decision, candidates for
590 promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review
591 (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.
592

593 7.2 The University RTP Policy and the CBA specify that if, at any time during the review
594 process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package
595 shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been
596 provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner. In the College of Liberal
597 Arts, a timely manner is defined as no more than five business days.
598

599 7.3 In the College of Liberal Arts, committees, chairs, and deans cannot request
600 additional material that is not specified by the college or department RTP policies unless
601 such material is required to verify otherwise unsupported claims made in the file.
602

603 7.4 The University RTP Policy specifies that, at each level of review, the candidate shall
604 be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the
605 recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The
606 candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten
607 (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the
608 candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any
609 previous review levels.
610

611 7.5 External evaluations of candidates are governed by the university policy on external
612 evaluation and the CBA.
613

614 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

615
616 8.1 Amendments may be proposed by the Department RTP Committee or by a petition
617 signed by 20 percent of the tenured and probationary faculty of the Department.

618 8.2 The Chairperson shall call a meeting of the Faculty to discuss proposed amendments.

619 8.3 Voting shall be consistent with the By-Laws of the Department of Economics.

620 8.4 Amendments are ratified by a majority of the ballots cast by the tenured and
621 probationary faculty and approvals required by the CLA Faculty Council, the CLA
622 Dean, and the Provost.

623 8.5 If any provision of this Document is in conflict with either (a) RTP provisions in the
624 Collective Bargaining Agreement or (b) the University Policy on RTP, the Faculty
625 shall approve changes to bring the provision into conformity, thereby amending this
626 Document.