

1                   **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH**  
2                   **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**  
3                   **COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**  
4                   **DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION**  
5                   **EFFECTIVE FALL 2010**  
6

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

15  
16 **1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES**  
17

18                   **1.1 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)**  
19

20                   **1.1.1** The University RTP Policy provides the basic framework for all RTP  
21 procedures and decisions on this campus. The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy  
22 provides additional specificity for the evaluation of faculty members in the  
23 college.  
24

25                   **1.1.2** All departments in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) are required to have  
26 an RTP Policy. Department RTP standards shall not be lower than college-level  
27 standards. Departments may adopt the college policy as their own. In all cases,  
28 basic principles of shared governance must be followed in the creation, adoption,  
29 and emendation of such policies.  
30

31                   **1.1.3** Candidates, evaluators, and mentors need to consult university, college, and  
32 department policies.  
33

34                   **1.1.4** The purpose of the RTP process is to evaluate candidates on completed  
35 work for specified periods of review.  
36

37                   **1.1.5** Academic honesty is one of the core values that drive the RTP process. As  
38 such, all statements made by candidates and all materials put forth for  
39 consideration in RTP matters must abide by the highest standards of academic  
40 honesty and integrity. Members of the faculty found to have altered or  
41 misrepresented their academic records shall be found in violation of this basic  
42 principle. Such issues shall be referred to Academic Affairs.  
43

44                   **1.1.6** Candidates are expected to present their files in a clear and coherent manner  
45 organized according to the policy requirements and instructions.  
46

47 **1.1.7** Candidates' narratives shall clearly contextualize work accomplished as  
48 detailed on the Professional Data Sheet.

49  
50 **1.1.8** The CLA RTP policy requires mentoring of candidates and candidates'  
51 participation in the mentoring process. While mentoring provides ongoing  
52 evaluative feedback for candidates, the RTP process constitutes the formal  
53 mechanism for evaluation of probationary and tenured faculty.

54  
55 **1.1.9** Evaluations and recommendations of candidates must be made based on  
56 criteria and procedures delineated in university, college, or department RTP  
57 policies. No evaluation shall include or be based on unprofessional sources such  
58 as hearsay in any form, including unofficial sources (e.g., Facebook,  
59 RateMyProfessors.com, Pick-a-Professor.com), petitions and anonymous letters.

60  
61 **1.1.10** As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), letters and other  
62 materials obtained during open period are to be considered as part of the  
63 evaluation of a candidate.

64  
65 **1.1.11** Concision and accuracy guide the RTP process at all levels. The CLA RTP  
66 Policy requires a streamlined approach to candidates' files. Forms shall be fillable  
67 to ensure compliance with word limits.

68  
69 **1.1.12** Faculty engage in multi-faceted activities that encompass one or more  
70 areas of evaluation. Multi-faceted activities may be broken into components and  
71 discussed where appropriate. Components discussed or listed under one area of  
72 evaluation cannot be duplicated under another area of evaluation.

## 73 74 **1.2 File Requirements**

75  
76 **1.2.1** All candidates shall provide the following in RTP files:

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

79 1. Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities:

80 a. By semester, list formal academic advising  
81 activities and associated duties.

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

86 c. By semester, include other instructional activities  
87 outside of the classroom. Such activities include,  
88 but are not limited to: (1) supervision of student  
89 independent research projects; (2) supervision of  
90 student research assistants; (3) chairing or serving  
91 on student thesis, project, and/or exam committees;  
92 and (4) supervision of student teachers.

- 93 2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA):  
94 1. For all RSCA that does not appear under Works in  
95 Progress, candidate must:  
96 a. Label according to CLA definitions for  
97 publication status and peer-review.  
98 b. List RSCA-related external grants;  
99 c. Briefly annotate each peer-reviewed publication  
100 listed with the following:  
101 i. Description of publication venue (e.g.,  
102 journal, media, or volume) vis-à-vis the  
103 discipline and/or subfield;  
104 ii. Rationale for publication venue choice;  
105 iii. Explanation of candidate's contribution  
106 to co- and multi-authored RSCA.  
107 3. Service activities, including dates of service, offices held,  
108 degree of participation, and responsibilities.  
109 b. Narrative addressing the three areas of evaluation (instruction and  
110 instructionally-related activities; RSCA; and service). This three-part  
111 narrative shall be submitted via the Candidate Statement Form\*, which  
112 allows up to 3,000 words.  
113 c. Workload Assignment Form.\*  
114 d. Academic Advisor Report† (as appropriate).  
115 e. All peer-reviewed publications for the period of review, including (for  
116 each):  
117 1. Proof of peer-review for peer-reviewed publications;  
118 2. Proof of publication status for all in press, forthcoming, and  
119 accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.  
120 f. Student course evaluation summaries for each course taught for which  
121 formal student course evaluations were required during the period of  
122 review.  
123 g. For each course taught during the period of review:  
124 1. One (1) representative syllabus;  
125 2. One (1) sample learning assessment tool;  
126 3. One (1) sample of representative course materials not to exceed  
127 four (4) pages.  
128 h. All prior RTP reviews, periodic evaluations, and evidence of  
129 mentoring (i.e., mini-review evaluations or other) over the full review  
130 period, including the candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.  
131 i. Index of all materials prepared by the candidate except the index of  
132 open period materials, which shall be prepared by department RTP  
133 committee chair or designee.  
134

135 **1.2.2** With the exception of optional written student evaluations as per 2.1.7.3,

---

\* 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.

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

137

## 138 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

139 The following categories of evaluation are required by the University RTP policy. The College  
140 of Liberal Arts requires compliance with the presentation of documentation as per the guidelines  
141 for each area of evaluation below.

142

### 143 **2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities**

144 Effective instruction and instructionally-related activities within the College of Liberal Arts  
145 encompass a wide range of tasks and responsibilities. This section specifies criteria for the  
146 evaluation of a faculty member's instruction and instructionally-related activities. Further, this  
147 section delineates the type and amount of documentation regarding a candidate's instructional  
148 effectiveness.

149

#### 150 **2.1.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities File**

151 Candidates **must** submit:

152

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

163

#### 164 **2.1.2 Narrative of Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

165 The candidate's narrative of instructional philosophy and practice provides the context  
166 necessary for understanding and interpreting the candidate's instructional goals,  
167 materials, and accomplishments.

168

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

170

- 171 a. The over-arching goals of the candidate's instructional practices.
- 172 b. Relationship between RSCA and/or service activities to instruction.
- 173 c. Teaching methodologies and their links to student assessment and learning  
174 outcomes.
- 175 d. Student course evaluations relative to level.
- 176 e. Grade distributions relative to level.
- 177 f. Reflection on course evolution in response to feedback, professional  
178 development activities, and/or experimentation with instructional  
methodologies or assessments.

179

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

179 g. Student course evaluations that are below department and/or college norms,  
180 relative to level.

181 h. Grade distributions that differ from department norms, relative to level.

182 **2.1.3 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Materials**

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

186

187 **2.1.3.1 Syllabi**

188 A representative syllabus for each course instructed during the period of review  
189 must be submitted. Candidates may include an additional syllabus for no more  
190 than two selected courses to demonstrate course revisions and/or experimentation.  
191 Evaluation will consider syllabi content relative to course level and catalog  
192 description. Syllabi must reflect currency in the discipline and be consistent with  
193 current Academic Senate syllabus policies.

194

195 **2.1.3.2 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

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

201

202 **2.1.3.3 Instructional Materials**

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

209

210 **2.1.4 Peer Observation of Instruction**

211 As part of the department RTP evaluation, the department committee may choose  
212 to perform a classroom observation or a candidate may choose to request such an  
213 observation. If performed, the evaluation must adhere to the CBA and comply  
214 with a consistent departmental rubric or procedure, including compliance with the  
215 requirement that notice be given at least five (5) days before a classroom visit.  
216 The subsequent evaluation may be incorporated into the department RTP  
217 evaluation and/or submitted as a separate document during the open period.

218

219 **2.1.5 Grade Distributions**

220 Differentiation among levels of student learning is an important responsibility of  
221 any teacher. Grade distributions provide a measure of grade leniency and severity.  
222 Further, they provide a useful measure for contextualizing assessment of student  
223 learning and student course evaluations. Therefore department chairs or designees  
224 are expected to make grade distributions available to all faculty members annually

225 so that faculty can reflect, as appropriate, on these numbers. As grades in a class  
226 necessarily differ from one group of students to another, evaluation will consider  
227 the overall trend in grade distributions.  
228

### 2.1.6 Academic Advisor Report

229 Candidates who have received assigned time to provide formal student academic  
230 advising shall report on their activities per a consistent procedure approved by the  
231 Dean or designee. For RTP purposes, the report serves to document  
232 instructionally-related activities for which assigned time is granted.  
233  
234

### 2.1.7 Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

235 Student course evaluations complement the information obtained in the criteria stated  
236 above.  
237  
238

#### 2.1.7.1. Evaluation Relative to Context

239 Committees, chairs, and the dean shall evaluate student response to instruction  
240 relative to context, including:  
241

- 242 a. Class characteristics
    - 243 1. Course level
    - 244 2. Number of enrolled students
    - 245 3. Whether this was a new course preparation
  - 246 b. Candidate's teaching assignment
    - 247 1. Number of new course preparations during the semester of  
248 evaluation
    - 249 2. Total number of different course preparations
  - 250 c. Candidate's experimentation with methodologies in attempting to  
251 improve teaching effectiveness
  - 252 d. Trends over time
- 253

#### 2.1.7.2 Course Evaluation Summaries

254 Course evaluation summaries that are consistent with department and college  
255 means provide one measure of effective instruction. Course evaluation summaries  
256 must be included for each section of a course for which student course evaluations  
257 are required during the period of review.  
258  
259

#### 2.1.7.3 Written Remarks on Student Course Evaluations

260 The inclusion of written remarks from student course evaluations is optional.  
261 Candidates may include written remarks for a course if such remarks help clarify  
262 or explain an ambiguity on the course evaluation summaries. In such cases, all  
263 original student evaluations for the selected course, including those evaluations  
264 without student comments, must be included.  
265  
266  
267

## 2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

268 The College of Liberal Arts requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)  
269 of all faculty members. CLA recognizes the diversity of fields represented within the  
270

271 college. Traditional scholarship and emerging scholarly fields, such as the scholarship of  
272 engagement and multi-media RSCA, fall under this rubric. This section outlines the  
273 criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities  
274 regarding RTP files and materials.  
275

## 276 **2.2.1 RSCA File**

### 277 **2.2.1.1 Required Materials**

278 Candidate's files **must** include:

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

### 308 **2.2.1.2 Optional Materials**

309 The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews,  
310 conference proceedings or materials not subjected to professional editing)  
311 is optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as  
312 negative for any candidate.  
313

### 314 **2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials**

315 Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g.,  
316 works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures). Listing

317 such items on the PDS is sufficient.

318  
319 **2.2.2 RSCA Narrative**

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

- 321 a. Focus and sustained nature of the candidate's research,  
322 scholarly, and creative activities.
- 323 b. Significance and impact of the candidate's RSCA.
- 324 c. Candidate's role in authorship for co- and multi-authored  
325 RSCA.
- 326 d. Significance and impact of non peer-reviewed RSCA included  
327 in the candidate's RTP file.

328  
329 **2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition**

330 In the College of Liberal Arts, peer review is the primary requirement for the  
331 majority of a candidate's research, scholarly, and creative activities.

332  
333 **2.2.3.1 Definition**

334 Peer review is typically defined as a process by which experts in the  
335 discipline evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research,  
336 scholarly, and creative activities. For the purposes of this policy, the term  
337 peer review encompasses the terms 'juried,' 'edited' and 'refereed,' which  
338 may be used for all RSCA evaluated by experts in specific disciplines.  
339 'Edited' means that the materials have been subjected to a review and  
340 approved for publication/dissemination by experts in the field, such as, but  
341 not limited to, editor(s) in a newspaper, producer(s) at a television station,  
342 or campaign manager(s).

343  
344 Peer review is also defined as:

- 345 a. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the  
346 publishing venues of non-academic sectors such as but not limited  
347 to news stories in edited media, columns, features, multimedia  
348 presentations, documentaries, political and public relations  
349 campaigns and related materials.
- 350 b. The process of evaluation of extramural RSCA grant proposals  
351 by granting agencies or organizations.
- 352 c. A process leading to performances or exhibits.

353  
354 **2.2.3.2. Balance of academic and non-academic publications**

355 Candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion in the Department of  
356 Journalism and Mass Communication are strongly encouraged to  
357 contribute peer-reviewed work to non-academic sectors in addition to  
358 pursuing academic publishing. Non-academic peer-reviewed publishing is  
359 considered essential to staying current in the field and practicing many of  
360 the same skills that we teach to students. Non-academic publishing by  
361 candidates is not, however, a substitute for developing a sustained research  
362 agenda and pursuing scholarly publications in the field of journalism and



363 mass communication.

364

365 **2.2.3.3. Evaluating contributions to the field and the context of**  
366 **publications**

367 The Department of Journalism and Mass Communication recognizes the  
368 value and relevance of interdisciplinary and international research and  
369 publications by its faculty. The RTP committee will use resources and  
370 guidelines provided by the top organizations in the field of journalism,  
371 mass communication and related disciplines to evaluate the merit and  
372 contribution of the candidates' peer-reviewed publications. Faculty should  
373 provide all relevant materials that will help the RTP committee understand  
374 the context and importance of their contribution to the field.

375

376 **2.2.3.4. Online vs. traditional outlets**

377 The departmental RTP committee should weigh the relative merit of peer-  
378 reviewed academic and non-academic publications based on their  
379 contribution to the field with the understanding that online-only outlets  
380 have become a viable segment of contemporary academic publishing and  
381 media. By no means should the format of the publication (e.g., online) be  
382 used as a sole criterion in the evaluation of a candidate's contribution.

383

384 **2.2.3.5 Labeling Requirement**

385 For each RSCA item on the Professional Data Sheet, candidates are  
386 required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using  
387 consistent labels of "Peer Reviewed," "Refereed," or "Juried/Edited" as  
388 appropriate to the field.

389

390 **2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status**

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

394

- 395 a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable. Both refer to an  
396 accepted work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-  
397 publication state.
- 398 b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has  
399 agreed to publish without major changes.
- 400 c. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed  
401 and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity,  
402 indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be  
403 published.
- 404 d. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and  
405 has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating  
406 that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.
- 407 e. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.
- 408 f. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for  
which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.

- 409 g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for  
410 which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.  
411

### 412 **2.2.5 Proof of Publication Status**

413 For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file,  
414 candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the  
415 publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation  
416 (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.  
417

### 418 **2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

#### 419 **2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

420 Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such  
421 proof must be provided in English, or in the original language with an  
422 accompanying English translation.  
423

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

- 425 a. A printout of the venue's editorial policy.  
426 b. Copies of reader reports.  
427 c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.  
428  
429

#### 430 **2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns**

431 Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.  
432

433 Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest;  
434 monetary payment to secure publication; and duplicate publication:  
435

- 436 a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include, but are not  
437 limited to serving contemporaneously on the editorial, advisory, or  
438 executive board of the press or journal with which one has  
439 published.  
440 b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author  
441 is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure  
442 publication (e.g., for-profit presses and vanity presses) shall be  
443 considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection  
444 process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to  
445 offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for  
446 publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images).  
447 c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in  
448 their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same  
449 article published in different venues or in different languages.  
450 Reprints must be labeled as such.  
451

### 452 **2.3 Service**

453 High-quality, sustained service contributions to the University as well as to the profession  
454 and/or the community are required of all faculty in the College of Liberal Arts.

455 Expectations for degree and quality of service vary by rank of the faculty member.

456  
457 In keeping with the self-governance tenets that inform our campus, service contributions  
458 must be performed at the department, college, and/or university levels. It is understood  
459 that all faculty members are expected to provide sustained and high quality service to the  
460 Department of Journalism and Mass Communication throughout their CSULB careers.  
461 Candidates are also expected to engage in service at college and university levels  
462 appropriate to their rank and experience. Contribution to all levels of service will be used  
463 to evaluate candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion. This section delineates  
464 service expectations and criteria for evaluation of quality service.

### 465 466 **2.3.1 Service File**

467 Candidates **must** submit:

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

### 473 474 **2.3.2 Service Expectations**

475 All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the processes of  
476 faculty governance by working collaboratively and productively with colleagues.

477  
478 At all levels, quality and degree of participation of service activities shall be  
479 weighted more heavily than the sheer number of committees on which candidates  
480 serve.

481  
482 Examples of service contributions may include, but are not limited to: faculty  
483 governance activities and committees; program development; sponsorship of  
484 student organizations; direction of non-instructional activities and projects;  
485 authorship of reports and other materials pertinent to university, college, or  
486 department policies and procedures; mentoring of students outside of regular  
487 academic advising; service or leadership activities for university committees,  
488 professional organizations or boards; conducting external evaluations;  
489 participating in the peer-review process for academic publications and  
490 conferences; and consulting in public schools, local government, and community  
491 organizations.

#### 492 493 **2.3.2.1 Minimum Service Expectations by Rank**

- 494 a. Probationary faculty members in the first three years of appointment  
495 typically are expected to focus service activities at the department  
496 level.
- 497 b. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor,  
498 probationary faculty members typically are required to make high-  
499 quality service contributions to their department, and to either the  
500 college or the university.

- 501 c. For promotion to the rank of Professor, successful candidates must  
502 have a record of substantive service to the University, including  
503 service at department, college, and university levels. Moreover, the  
504 candidate must have a record of service to the profession and/or the  
505 community. Candidates are required to have a record of leadership at  
506 the University. Leadership may be demonstrated by a record of  
507 holding formal offices (e.g., chair) and/or of active engagement in  
508 faculty governance (e.g., committee chair, active participation in  
509 accreditation or policy-writing processes).  
510

### 511 **2.3.3 Evaluation of Service**

512 RTP committees must evaluate the nature and quality of the candidate's service  
513 activities relative to department, college, and university RTP policies as well as  
514 the CBA.  
515

## 516 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

517 The University RTP Policy delineates the responsibilities of all parties in the RTP process, and  
518 emphasizes the confidentiality of all RTP deliberations.  
519

### 520 **3.1 Candidate**

521 Candidates have the primary responsibility for presenting a coherent RTP file that  
522 complies with all specifications herein. Similarly, candidates are charged with seeking  
523 guidance from the department chair or designated mentor regarding the RTP process and  
524 procedures. Clarity, disclosure, and organization are the hallmarks of a sound RTP file.  
525

526 **3.1.1** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the narrative is factually  
527 accurate. Misrepresentations shall be referred to Academic Affairs.  
528

529 **3.1.2** It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that all required material is  
530 included in the RTP file before submission to the department RTP committee.  
531

532 **3.1.3** As per the CBA, late materials shall be limited to those items that become  
533 accessible after the file completion date. Insertion of material after the date of file  
534 completion must have the approval of the college RTP committee, which is the  
535 peer review committee designated by the campus for this decision.  
536

### 537 **3.2 Joint Appointments**

538 The university policy on joint appointments for faculty stipulates that all individuals with  
539 a joint appointment have one administratively responsible department. It also stipulates  
540 that for RTP purposes the administratively responsible department shall initiate the  
541 formation of an evaluation committee. This committee shall consist of members selected  
542 from among the peer review committees of the departments within which the candidate  
543 holds a joint appointment. For more details on joint appointments, see the university  
544 policy.  
545

### 546 **3.3 Department RTP Policy**

547 The University RTP Policy dictates that all departments shall have RTP policies. The  
548 document also delineates ratification procedures and review requirements. All department  
549 policies must then be ratified by the Faculty Council in a majority vote and must be  
550 approved by the dean and the Provost.

551  
552 In the College of Liberal Arts, departments may adopt the college policy as their own.  
553 All department RTP policies must be reviewed, at minimum, every five years by  
554 probationary and tenured departmental faculty. If changes are made, the department  
555 policy must then be ratified and approved as outlined above.

556  
557 **3.4 Department RTP Committee**

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

561  
562 **3.4.1** In the College of Liberal Arts, departments must elect no fewer than three  
563 (3) tenured, full-time faculty members to department RTP committees. As per the  
564 CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may  
565 serve on RTP committees if elected by majority vote and approved by the  
566 President, yet no RTP committee may comprise solely faculty participating in the  
567 FERP. All elections must be done by secret ballot.

568  
569 **3.4.2** Department constitutions or RTP policies may stipulate that larger  
570 committees or separate committees may be elected for different actions (i.e.,  
571 reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Professor). In all cases, at least three (3)  
572 members of the department RTP committee must evaluate each candidate.

573  
574 **3.4.3** As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a  
575 higher rank than the candidate.

576  
577 **3.4.4** Department RTP committees are encouraged to provide concise evaluative  
578 commentary of candidates' files.

579  
580 **3.4.5** As per the academic honesty clause of the College RTP policy,  
581 misrepresentations, if detected, must be noted in the evaluation.

582  
583 **3.5 Mentoring**

584 The College of Liberal Arts recognizes the importance of mentoring in the success of  
585 RTP candidates and requires candidates to participate in ongoing mentoring activities,  
586 which aim to help candidates maintain a clear trajectory of their professional  
587 accomplishments and goals. The University RTP Policy identifies the department chair as  
588 having the responsibility for communicating the department, college, and university  
589 policies to candidates and for providing mentoring to candidates. In the College of  
590 Liberal Arts, mentoring can be performed by the chair or a mutually agreed-upon  
591 tenured, full-time faculty designee. Evidence of mentoring shall be included in the  
592 candidate's file and can include, but is not limited to, feedback provided on mini-review

593 evaluations.

594

595 **3.6 Department Chair Evaluations**

596 The University RTP Policy stipulates that a department chair may write independent  
597 evaluations of RTP candidates. In the College of Liberal Arts, the absence of such a letter  
598 shall not be construed as a negative judgment on the candidate. If the chair elects to write  
599 a separate evaluation, that document usually will not exceed 500 words.

600

601 **3.7 College RTP Policy**

602 The University RTP Policy specifies that the college RTP policy must be ratified by a  
603 majority of voting tenured and probationary faculty members and approved by the dean  
604 and the Provost.

605

606 The College of Liberal Arts RTP Policy is subject to review every five years and as  
607 needed. The Faculty Council shall be charged with facilitating those reviews. Any  
608 substantive change in the policy requires ratification as per the procedures outlined in this  
609 policy.

610

611 **3.8 College RTP Committee**

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

617

618 **3.8.1 Election of the Committee**

619 The college RTP committee shall have ten (10) full-time, tenured faculty  
620 members. The committee shall be constituted in the following way:

621

- 622 a. The committee must have seven (7) tenured, full-time faculty members  
623 at the rank of Professor and three (3) additional members at the rank of  
624 Associate Professor or Professor.
- 625 b. Additionally, one (1) alternate at the rank of Professor shall be elected  
626 for one year. If the alternate does not serve on the committee, this  
627 individual is eligible for election to the committee when the term ends.
- 628 c. Members shall be elected by secret ballot as per the election  
629 procedures delineated in the CLA Constitution.
- 630 d. As per the CBA, faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement  
631 Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if elected by majority  
632 vote and approved by the President, yet no RTP committee may be  
633 comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
- 634 e. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms and shall not be re-  
635 elected for more than two (2) consecutive terms.
- 636 f. There shall be no more than one faculty member from any one  
637 academic area.
- 638 g. Committee members may not serve on any other standing or ad hoc

RTP committee at the university.

### **3.8.2 Structure and Duties of the College RTP Committee**

**3.8.2.1** The RTP committee shall consist of two standing sub-committees:

- a. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of tenure and promotion. A minimum of five (5) committee members at the rank of Professor must serve on this committee.
- b. The Reappointment Sub-Committee shall consider all cases of reappointment. A minimum of three (3) committee members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must serve on this committee.

**3.8.2.2** At the first meeting of the CLA RTP Committee:

- a. The committee shall elect a chair who holds the rank of Professor. This chair also shall serve as chair of the Tenure and Promotion Sub-Committee.
- b. Once elected, the CLA RTP Committee chair, in consultation with the members of the committee, shall determine the size and membership of the two sub-committees based on the relative number of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion actions to be considered.
- c. The entire CLA RTP Committee then shall elect a chair of the Reappointment Sub-Committee. The sub-committee chair shall report to the CLA RTP Committee chair.

### **3.8.3 The sub-committees are bound to the following rules:**

- a. As per the CBA, committee members who evaluate a candidate must have a higher rank than the candidate.
- b. No RTP sub-committee may be comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
- c. For each action, a majority recommendation must be made by the members of the sub-committee. A minority report may be submitted.

### **3.8.4 Evaluation and Recommendations**

- a. The college RTP committee must make its own independent evaluation of each candidate.
- b. The college RTP recommendation usually shall not exceed 750 words.

### **3.9 Dean of the College**

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.

685 **3.10 University-Level Review**

686 The Provost reviews the candidate's file and all prior evaluations and makes a final  
687 recommendation regarding RTP. The President has the authority to make final decisions  
688 for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President  
689 may delegate this authority to the Provost.  
690

691 **4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

692 The University RTP Policy provides timelines for all RTP actions and for periodic review  
693 requirements for tenured and probationary faculty.  
694

695 **5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

696 Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: (1)  
697 instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) RSCA; and (3) service. Candidates shall  
698 demonstrate ongoing achievement in all three areas to receive a positive recommendation for any  
699 action.  
700

701 **5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

702 The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must  
703 demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based upon criteria established by the  
704 college and the candidate's department, a candidate for reappointment must show  
705 evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.  
706

707 At minimum, this evidence must include demonstration of: (1) effective teaching; (2)  
708 research, scholarship, and/or creative activities that include initial publications or similar  
709 evidence of RSCA appropriate to rank, experience, and discipline; and (3) engagement in  
710 service at the department level.  
711

712 The candidate must demonstrate efforts to improve performance if weaknesses in any  
713 area have been identified in any prior evaluations (e.g., mini-review).  
714

715 **5.2 Awarding of Tenure**

716 The University RTP Policy delineates the meaning of tenure and the criteria for the  
717 awarding of tenure.  
718

719 **5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor** The University RTP Policy states  
720 the minimum standard for appointment/promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to  
721 the minimum standard stated in that policy, the College of Liberal Arts requires the  
722 candidate to make high-quality service contributions to the department and to the college.  
723 University-level service is not required but can enhance a candidate's file.  
724

725 **5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor**

726 The University RTP Policy states that standards for promotion to full professor shall be  
727 higher than standards for promotion to associate professor.  
728

729 In the College of Liberal Arts, a candidate for appointment/advancement to Professor  
730 must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in all three areas of evaluation. The



731 successful candidate will demonstrate RSCA that include high-quality contributions to  
732 the advancement, application, or pedagogy of his or her discipline or interdisciplinary  
733 fields of study. The candidate is expected to have a substantial record of peer-reviewed  
734 work at the national and/or international levels. In addition, a candidate for promotion to  
735 Professor shall demonstrate high-quality instruction and instructional activities, as well as  
736 substantial service, including a record of leadership at the University as well as a record  
737 of service in the community or the profession.

738  
739 **5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

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

745  
746 **5.5.1 Additional Criterion in the College of Liberal Arts**

747 In the College of Liberal Arts, prior to applying for an early RTP action, a  
748 potential candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from all available resources  
749 and mentors, including the department chair, dean, and, if possible, department  
750 RTP committee members.

751  
752 **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

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

755  
756 In the College of Liberal Arts, the department RTP committee chair or designee shall  
757 prepare the index of open period materials.

758  
759 **7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

760  
761 **7.1** The University RTP Policy specifies that, prior to the final decision, candidates for  
762 promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review  
763 (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

764  
765 **7.2** The University RTP Policy and the CBA specify that if, at any time during the review  
766 process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package  
767 shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been  
768 provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner. In the College of Liberal  
769 Arts, a timely manner is defined as no more than five business days.

770  
771 **7.3** In the College of Liberal Arts, committees, chairs, and deans cannot request  
772 additional material that is not specified by the college or department RTP policies unless  
773 such material is required to verify otherwise unsupported claims made in the file.

774  
775 **7.4** The University RTP Policy specifies that, at each level of review, the candidate shall  
776 be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the

777 recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The  
778 candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten  
779 (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the  
780 candidate's rebuttal/responses shall accompany the RTP package and also be sent to any  
781 previous review levels.

782  
783 **7.5** The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external  
784 evaluation, consistent with the university policy on external evaluations.  
785

## 786 **8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

787 Changes to the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication RTP policy may occur as a  
788 result of changes to the CSU-CFA CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain  
789 procedural changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,  
790 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.  
791

792 The tenured and probationary faculty of the Department of Journalism and Mass  
793 Communication, voting by secret ballot, may amend the policy and evaluation criteria section of  
794 this document.  
795

796 Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:  
797

798 (1) A direct faculty action via petition from twenty percent (20%) of the tenured and  
799 probationary department faculty to the chair of the department.  
800

801 (2) By the department chair.  
802

803 Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called  
804 within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair  
805 of the department to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.  
806

807 Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a  
808 majority of the tenured and probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the  
809 department within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the  
810 concurrence of the CLA Faculty Council, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and the Provost.  
811

812 Approved: April 27, 2010

813 Effective: Fall 2010