



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
DOMINGUEZ HILLS

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

Office of Faculty Affairs and Development
AY 2023-2024

Meet the Staff of Faculty Affairs and Development

- Staff

- Dr. Cheryl Koos, Associate Vice President
- 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

- Contact

Welch Hall B-368

(310) 243-3766

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

Office of Faculty Affairs and Development

■ RTP 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 Definitions of 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: Evaluation of 1st Year Tenure-Track Faculty
(Abbreviated Review includes both no credit and credit towards tenure)
 - Cycle II: Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty in Second Full Year of Service
 - Cycle III: Reappointment or Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty in their 3rd, 4th or 5th Year (Full RTP or Abbreviated Review)
 - Cycle III-6th Year (Tenure & Promotion)
 - Cycle IV: Promotion to Full Professor

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** rather than a full RTP performance 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

Sequence of RTP Review for Abbreviated Periodic Review

- The following individuals and committees will participate in the RTP review during the AY 2023-2024 (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 Second Year and Beyond Full Performance Reviews

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

Evaluation Procedures Cycle II, III and IV

- The following individuals and committees participate in full performance RTP 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

Full Performance Review

Working Personnel Action Files (WPAF)

- Tenure-Track Faculty participating in a full RTP review submit an electronic WPAF via Interfolio along 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: 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 SIF and WPAF with 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 .
- 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/csu-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/csu-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!