

Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Policies and Procedures Workshop

Office of Faculty Affairs and Development
AY 2024-2025

Topics for Review

FAD Staff

RTP Guidelines and Standards

The RTP Cycles

Types of Reviews

Sequence and Procedures for Each RTP Cycle

Tenure and Promotion

Can I Negotiate a Salary?

Early Tenure and Promotion

Evaluation and Recommendations

Final Considerations

Policies and Contractual Obligations

Meet the Staff of Faculty Affairs and Development

- ❖ Dr. Corinne Martinez, Interim Associate Vice President
- ❖ Dr. Marisela R. Chávez, Director, Faculty Development Center
- ❖ Mrs. Cheryl A. Atienza, Confidential Personnel Analyst
- ❖ Mrs. Dianne D. Vogel, Academic Personnel Analyst
- ❖ Ms. Ruby Martinez, Academic Personnel Analyst
- ❖ Mrs. Claudia Currie, Administrative Support Coordinator

FAD

Office: Welch Hall B-368

Phone: (310) 243-3766

Email: facultyaffairs@csudh.edu

Web: <https://www.csudh.edu/faculty-affairs/>

FDC

Office: LIB 1940 (*first floor of South University Library*)

Phone: (310) 243-3148

Email: fdc@csudh.edu

Web: <https://www.csudh.edu/fdc/>

Office of Faculty Affairs and Development

- Support and Services
 - Professional Development and Support for Faculty
 - Overall Management of the RTP Process
 - Design and Manage the RTP Schedule
 - Custodian of all RTP and Tenure-Track Faculty Personnel Files
 - Notifications to RTP Reviewers
 - Notifications to Candidates

RTP Guidelines and Standards

CSUDH's Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policies delineate the professional standards probationary and tenured faculty are expected to achieve and the evaluation processes that the University follows.

<https://www.csudh.edu/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp/rtp-guidelines-and-policies/>

- AA 2021-10 Policy for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures
- AAPS011.001 WPAF Guidelines
- AAPS012.002 Cycle I and VI Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) or Professional Plan
- AAPS025.001 Department Definitions of Scholarship
- AAPS030.001 Evaluation of Assigned Time
- PM 1978-11, 1978-12 Eligibility for Early Tenure/ Eligibility for Early Promotion
- PM 84-02 Language for RTP Evaluation

RTP Standards for Scholarship and Creative Activity

- Each Department and equivalent unit has adopted and implemented standards for scholarship and creative activity
 - Electronic copies are posted on the Faculty Affairs and Development Website <https://www.csudh.edu/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp/rtp/>
- RTP reviewers must apply definitions in effect when the candidate was hired; candidate may agree in writing to be reviewed with updated standards.

The RTP Cycles

The RTP process consists of the following four cycles:

Cycle I	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evaluation of 1st Year Tenure-Track Faculty• Abbreviated Review includes both no credit and credit towards tenure
Cycle II	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty in second full Year of Service
Cycle III	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reappointment or Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty in their 3rd, 4th or 5th Year (Full RTP or Abbreviated Review) OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6th Year (Tenure & Promotion)
Cycle IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promotion to Full Professor



Types of Reviews

Tenure-track faculty who are not undergoing a Full Review for Reappointment, Tenure, and/or Promotion must undergo an Abbreviated Review.

ALL reviews are submitted via Interfolio – secure online system used for faculty reviews for reappointments, tenure and promotion

Abbreviated Review

- An Abbreviated Review includes a Professional Development plan and shall be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee, the Department Chair (if applicable), and the Dean for strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's plan, focusing on teaching, scholarship, and service, with specific recommendations.

Full Review

- Each tenure-track or tenured faculty member who undergoes evaluation for Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion (RTP) must submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The Supplementary Information Form (SIF), together with supporting documents, will be the core of the WPAF.

Evaluation Procedures for First Probationary Appointment

- Tenure-track faculty in their first year of appointment (Cycle I) and faculty in year one of a two-year appointment (Cycle III) undergo an **Abbreviated Review**.

- First Year Faculty submit a Professional Plan:
 - The Professional Plan is an initial outline and discussion of projected teaching, research, scholarship, or creative activities, and service goals toward tenure.
 - The Professional Plan should align with department/unit RTP criteria and should outline the faculty member's projected path to tenure.
 - The Professional Plan is developmental and should be revised in subsequent abbreviated and full reviews.
 - Professional Plans do not require supporting materials, i.e. PTE's, publications, syllabi, etc.
 - Not to exceed 5 pages.

RTP Review for Abbreviated Periodic Review

- The following individuals and committees will participate in the RTP review during the AY 2024-2025 (Cycle I & Cycle III)
 - *Department RTP Committee*
 - *Department Chair (if applicable)*
 - *Dean*

Evaluation Procedures for First Probationary Appointment Abbreviated Review

- Department RTP Committee, Chair, and Dean review and evaluate the Professional Plan.
- Department RTP Committee will submit an evaluation form with feedback on the Plan; faculty member may submit a rebuttal.
- College Dean then will submit an evaluation form and assessment of the Professional Plan as to whether it indicates likelihood of appropriate advancement toward a positive tenure decision; faculty member may submit a rebuttal.

Evaluation Procedures

Full Performance Review

Working Personnel Action Files (WPAF)

- Tenure-track faculty participating in a full RTP review submit an electronic WPAF with the Supplementary Information Form (SIF), also known as “the narrative”; the SIF is normally limited to 10-15 pages, single spaced.

- Information contained in the SIF must be supported with evidence in the WPAF:
 - Evidence of Teaching Performance
 - Evidence of Scholarship or Creative Activity
 - Evidence of Effective Service Functioning in the Institution and in the Community

Evaluation Procedures Cycle II, III and IV

- The following individuals and committees participate in full performance reviews:
 - Department RTP Committee
 - Department Chair (if applicable)
 - College RTP Committee
 - College Dean
 - Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
 - University RTP Committee (if applicable)
 - President

Evaluation Procedures Second Year and Beyond Full Performance Reviews

- Three possible outcomes for full performance reviews:
 - Two- Year Reappointment
 - One- Year Reappointment
 - Terminal Year

Evaluation Procedures: Third-Year Review and Beyond

- Two Possible Review Tracks
 - *Professional Plan and Brief Written Report if granted a two-year reappointment (Review will end at the Dean Level)*
 - *Full RTP Review and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) if granted a one-year reappointment*

Sixth Year and Beyond

- *Sixth Year Review: Full RTP Review for Tenure and Promotion*
- *NOTE: If a faculty member was granted service credit for tenure at the time of hire, their tenure review will be in Year Four (2 Years Service Credit) or Year 5 (1 Year Service Credit),*

Tenure and Promotion

- For **probationary faculty**, the standard timeline for tenure and promotion is **six years**.
- If service credit was granted at hire, the timeline will be **four or five years**.
- The following guidelines govern standard reappointment:
 - Faculty members are evaluated during each of the pre-tenure years;
 - The accumulation of satisfactory evaluations, year-by-year is regarded as evidence of satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion;
 - Tenure-Track faculty are typically evaluated for promotion as well as tenure during the final year of their probationary period.

Tenure & Promotion

- The faculty member shall submit a WPAF with SIF and supporting evidence, an index, and updated CV for the sixth-year performance review for tenure and promotion.
- The WPAF shall provide supporting evidence of the member's activities *since the last full performance review*.
- The SIF shall address activities *since the beginning of the faculty member's probationary appointment* necessary to demonstrate completion of the Professional Plan and overall development of the faculty member .

NOTE:

- Previously submitted evidence, documented on the index, is not required.
- Faculty **may include** evidence covered in previous review **but are not required to**.

Promotion to Full Professor

- Eligibility for standard post-tenure promotion to full professor begins in the 5th year after receiving tenure/promotion to associate professor. Faculty must address all work done since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
- Promotions are effective at the beginning of the next academic year.
- Guidelines for **early promotion** (both tenured or probationary faculty) are the same as for early tenure.

Regarding Salary Negotiation in the Tenure and Promotion Process

- There is no salary negotiation involved in tenure or promotion.
- According to the 2022 Ratified Agreement Contract in Effect until June 30, 2024: The CFA and CSU agreed that effective the minimum increase on promotion pursuant to CBA Article 31.5 shall be 9%.
 - CFA <https://www.calfac.org/item/cfa-and-our-contract-weve-come-long-way>
 - CSU <https://www.calstate.edu/cs-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Pages/unit3-cfa.aspx>
- There is no policy or process to solicit a greater promotion salary increase. As per CBA Article 14.8 Promotion: The President shall make a final decision on promotion.
<https://www2.calstate.edu/cs-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Documents/unit3-cfa/article14.pdf>

Early Tenure and Promotion

- For **probationary faculty**, early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor are granted **rarely and only** for “unusually meritorious” performance (PM 1978-11)

- The following guidelines govern early tenure and early promotion
 - The demonstration of “unusually meritorious” performance requires substantial documentation

 - “**Outstanding**” Used only for evaluating applications for early tenure and/or early promotion. “Outstanding” cannot be used for evaluating within standard timelines for reappointment, tenure, or promotion

 - Evaluation is based primarily on evidence of demonstrated merit in performance at CSUDH

Early Tenure and/or Promotion (continued)

- The following guidelines govern “unusually meritorious” performance for probationary faculty:
 - Applicants must demonstrate “**outstanding**” performance in teaching and in one other area of evaluation, and “**satisfactory**” performance in the third area of evaluation.
 - “Outstanding” performance is above and beyond the “satisfactory” standard used for tenure and promotion.

- The following guidelines govern “unusually meritorious” performance for tenured faculty seeking early promotion to Full Professor (PM1978-12)
 - Applicants must demonstrate “**outstanding**” performance in teaching
 - Evaluation is based primarily on evidence of demonstrated merit in performance at CSUDH

Evaluation and Recommendation by Reviewers for Full RTP Review

- Guidelines recommend RTP evaluators use the following evaluative terms to summarize faculty performance in each category of review (teaching, scholarship and service)
 - **“Satisfactory”** indicates sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion within standard timelines.
 - **“Unsatisfactory”** indicates insufficient progress towards tenure and promotion
 - ***NOTE: “Outstanding”** Used only evaluating applications for early tenure and/or early promotion.

Evaluation and Recommendation by Reviewers (continued)

- PM 84-02 Language for RTP Evaluation
- Reviewers should use the following summary language in their final recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure or Promotion:
 - **“Highly Recommend”**
 - **“Recommend”**
 - **“Recommend with Reservations”**
 - **“Do not Recommend”**
 - **NOTE: We discourage the use of “recommend with reservations” with tenure and/or promotion recommendations.**

Recommendations and Evaluations by Reviewers

- RTP recommendations are those of the committee:
 - CBA 15.45: “Each peer review committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee.”
 - Minority reports nor dissenting decisions should not be submitted
- Split decisions may be indicated in the final recommendation or evaluation
 - For example “2-1” decisions of the committee may be indicated.

Final Considerations

- Process for submitting and distributing evaluations
 - Original signed evaluations will be uploaded to Interfolio by the committee chair. Copies of the evaluations will be sent to candidates electronically from the Office of Faculty Affairs and Development

- Rebuttal
 - Candidates under review have 10 calendar days to submit a written rebuttal and/or request a meeting to discuss a recommendation letter

- Late Submission of Materials
 - The URTP must approve the late submission;
 - Limited to material that became available after the deadline to submit;
 - Will be sent to the initial evaluation committee for review, evaluation, or comment before consideration at subsequent levels.

- Final Thoughts on the RTP Process
 - Evaluation of the Professional Plan is an “evaluation,” not a “recommendation”;
 - Full RTP Review is a recommendation for reappointment or tenure/promotion;
 - Be mindful of implicit bias in the review process ;
 - Be mindful of low PTE response rates in relation to department RTP standards;

Academic Affairs Policy References

- AA 2021-10 Policy for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures
- AAPS011.001 WPAF Guidelines
- AAPS012.002 Cycle I and VI Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) or Professional Plan
- AAPS025.001 Department Definitions of Scholarship
- AAPS030.001 Evaluation of Assigned Time
- PM 1978-11, 1978-12 Eligibility for Early Tenure/ Eligibility for Early Promotion
- PM 84-02 Language for RTP Evaluation

Some Key Contractual References: RTP Evaluation

- **Article 11**
 - Personnel Files

- **Article 14**
 - Promotion

- **Article 15**
 - 15.5 Candidates under review have 10 days to submit a written rebuttal and or request a meeting to discuss a recommendation letter

 - **15.10 RTP deliberations are confidential**

Some Key Contractual References: RTP Evaluation- Continued

- 15.43 for promotion consideration, reviewers must have a higher rank than those under review
- 15.45 Each RTP committee report shall be approved by a simple majority
- 15.12 (b) Late submissions approved by the campus peer review committee (URTP) shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee for review, evaluation or comment before consideration at subsequent levels

ALWAYS ASK!