

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

Department of Physical Therapy

College of Health and Human Services

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY

9/9/2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Guiding Principles	page 2
1.1	Mission and Vision	page 2
1.2	Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion.....	page 3
1.3	Governing Documents	page 4
1.4	Obligations	page 4
1.5	Standards	page 4
1.6	Profiles of Academic Ranks.....	page 6
1.7	Narrative.....	page 7
2.0	RTP Areas of Evaluation	page 7
2.1	Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities.....	page 7
2.2	Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA).....	page 12
2.3	Service.....	page 21
2.4	Evaluation of Service.....	page 25
3.0	Responsibilities in the RTP Process	page 25
3.1	Candidate.....	page 26
3.2	Department Unit RTP Policy.....	page 26
3.3	Department Unit RTP Committee.....	page 26
3.4	Department Chair/Director.....	page 20
4.0		

Preamble

clinical doctorate physical therapists who are highly-valued professionals who practice autonomously in a highly diverse community. Graduates will provide care based on scientific evidence and will assume social responsibility, providing pro bono programs to their communities.

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

1.2.1 A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is essential to accomplishing the mission and vision of the university, the CHHS, and the Department of Physical Therapy. Faculty members integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the Department of Physical Therapy, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession.

1.2.2 Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement.

1.2.3 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three

and independent research projects;

- E. through the ongoing process of socializing students into a culture of intellectual discovery and professional communication via both group and one-on-one interactions in classes, at conferences, in co-curricular activities, the Physical Therapy Association.. etc.), and through advising/mentoring; and
- F. through assigning meaningful work in the discipline, and by interacting with students both in and out of class in a manner that fosters the development of broadly-applicable intellectual habits necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship.

1.5.5 Meaningful, Collegial Service

Faculty members are expected to serve the Department of Physical Therapy, the CHHS, the University, the community, and the profession as a meaningfully contributing citizen.

- A. CSULB depends on faculty contributions to ensure that it achieves its educational mission through effective and efficient operations. The university's commitment to participatory governance and the needs of academic programs and units necessitate a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all faculty members in the Department of Physical Therapy are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in professional organizations.
- B. Faculty service contributions are expected to increase concomitantly with the institution's commitment to the individual. This means that faculty members are expected to accept more significant service responsibilities over time during the probationary period, and then even more at each higher rank.

1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks

The Department of Physical Therapy is comprised of a community of teacher-scholars and learners who are dedicated to free inquiry and open exchange. In accordance with the CSULB Mission, the Department's faculty is dedicated “to providing physical theraphe Ó (

candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements. As explained in sections 3.1 of this policy (which mirrors the language used in the RTP Policy of the CHHS), the narrative should range from between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As Section 2.0 the university and CHHS RTP policies both make clear, *academic units are responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of the university, the college, and the particular academic unit.* The subsections of Section 2.0 in this Policy were crafted in fulfillment of that obligation. Accordingly, the provisions in Section 2.0 and its subsections articulate the standards for faculty accomplishments and the criteria for evaluation of those accomplishments in three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) collegial service and engagement.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities

While all of expectations set forth above in Sections 1.5.0 through 1.5.5 are highly valued, Physical Therapy faculty members are expected, above all, to serve the missions of the department, college, and university through high-quality teaching that successfully integrates both discipline-specific and broad learning goals and objectives. The goal of higher education is to help develop educated, ethical, and productive citizens, as well as capable Physical Therapy professionals in a variety of disciplines and fields. In a rapidly changing world, a university education must provide students with more than the knowledge needed for success in a specific profession. It also must provide them with skills and attitudes that facilitate adaptation and constructive response to societal needs and changes. Accordingly, faculty at all ranks should aspire to be teachers of the first order.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student differences.

To he

supporting materials, include, but are not limited to:

- A. *Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey to students—in measurable, behavioral terms—expected student learning outcomes.*
- B. *Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements (including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices, standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for which a course may be meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school, or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic responsibilities and/or individual personal growth).* For more information on syllabi, see Section 2.1.5 in this Policy and CSULB Policy # 04-05 and/or its successor policies.
- C. Careful preparation and clear organization of lessons and pedagogical materials that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.
- D. Thoughtful, deliberate effort to produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness is expected of all candidates, including but not limited to:
 - 1) Regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation on course development; or
 - 2) A sustained record of involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty Center for Faculty Development; or
 - 3) A sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or professional organizations; or
 - 4) A sustained record of giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

- A. Required Documentation – In order to allow for complete consideration of student evaluations, candidates for review at all levels, including mini-review, retention, tenure, or promotion must submit Summaries of Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT). All candidates, regardless of rank, must submit the evaluation summary sheets for all the courses in which university administered SPOT evaluations were given.
Submission of student qualitative comments is optional but if submitted, all forms from all students and all classes must be included.

- C. Caveat on the Use of Student Ratings – *Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. For this reason, candidates must present other information, such as their syllabi, grade distributions, and peer evaluations of instruction. These additional materials serve to help the Department RTP Committee contextualize student ratings.*

2.1.4 Peer-Evaluations of Teaching

- A. the measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major;
 - B. clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
 - C. instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and
 - D. readings and assignments that are up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and enhance student learning.
- The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes

- a) Publication of scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals is required of all candidates at all levels of review. Specific publication requirements are set forth below in subsections C(2), D(1), and D(2).
- (1) *Research involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as policy analysis or legal analysis) that rely on or are derived from data that were obtained by means of observation or experiment.*
- (2) Under appropriate circumstances, such as publication of articles or original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully advance the discipline of physical therapy may also constitute “research,” depending on the candidate’s area of expertise. Under no circumstances, however, shall this provision be interpreted as allowing literature reviews, book reviews, scholarly article reviews, or encyclopedia entries to satisfy the departmental requirement for “scholarly research.”
- b) All RTP candidates are expected to present their research at relevant academic conferences (see subsection 2.2.2 D(6), below).
Conference

scholarly article in a refereed venue or an equivalent RSCA accomplishment. Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.

- d) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals.

shall constitute a significantly criterion that is given extremely positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.

- a) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the entirety of the probationary period, merely applying for sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather should be encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills. However, applying for sponsored research opportunities does not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
- b) During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related scholarly activities, allowances should be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly journal articles. Such allowances must recognize that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming and, therefore, publication of the results of such research may be delayed until after an extensive data-collection and analysis process.

D. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of Specific Forms of RSCA

The following tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality can be used to guide choices of scholarship dissemination outlets. The most important of these criteria are contained in subsections (1) and (2), as such publications are a requirement for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as stated above in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a) and C(2); all other forms for RSCA listed below strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).

- 1) Authorship – Sole-authored and first-authored work is evaluated most positively. For multiple-authored works, the amount or nature of author contributions should be specified.
- 2) Refereed Journal Articles –

and/or health sciences disciplines are all valued as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The degree of value, however, depends on the quality of the journal, the quality of the research published, the degree of the candidate's contribution to the publication, and the impact of the publication on the discipline must always be taken into account when assessing the significance of any publication.

b) Exceptional Scholarship

- (1) Top-Tier Journals – Publishing exceptionally high-quality scholarship in top-tier journals constitutes the strongest evidence of scholarly achievement that contributes to the meaningful advancement of the discipline. RTP Committee members, therefore, usually give significant, positive weight to such publications in their evaluation of a candidate's RSCA contributions for reappointment, tenure, and promotions decision purposes.
 - (2) High-Quality Journals –The fields of Physical Therapy recognize a number of journals for their generally consistent, high quality contributions to our interdisciplinary knowledge base even though they are not generally recognized as “top tier” journals. Although RTP Committee members must still evaluate the quality of any publication, an article published in one of these high-quality journals usually constitutes evidence of scholarly achievement.
- 3) Books – The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.
- (a) Both scholarly books and textbooks are valued for RTP purposes.
 - (b) Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.
- 4) Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.
- 5) Invited Publications and/or Presentations – The stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional,

or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.

- 6) Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – A peer review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local). Presentations at the conferences of the American Physical Therapy Association and similar nationally-recognized organizations are paramount. Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to

- 1) Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary journals. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar work).
- 2) Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students via improvement in instruction or improvement in evidence for practice. The Department of Physical Therapy evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in graduate research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the research process and research findings in courses).
- 3) Community Impact

A. Service within the University

- 1) *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in university or college service; however, they are expected to perform quality service within the Department of Physical Therapy as demonstrated by:*
 - (a) advising students, student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;
 - (b) participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees;
 - (c) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the department;
 - (d) attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty meetings;
 - (e) attending and meaningfully participating in professional development opportunities sponsored by the department, the college, the university, and professional organizations; and
 - (f) actively participating in student programs (e.g., commencement, research day presentations).

- 2) *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to both the Department of Physical Therapy (as discussed above) and to service contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, such as:*
 - (a) serving on college-wide committees
 - (b) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the college.

University-level service is desirable, but not required.

- 3) *For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership at the department, college, and university levels. In doing so, they must contribute significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution, including, but not limited to:*
 - (a) Serving as the Department Chair, Graduate Advisor, or Director of Clinical Education;

- (b) chairing major departmental committees;
- (c) holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;

- (3) consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations;
- (4) serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or
- (5) engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to physical therapy; serving as a media consultant (by giving interviews or otherwise) for physical therapy related topics; assisting civic or non-profit organizations with health-related missions; writing physical therapy-relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.

F. the

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP shall make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the Department Chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of his or her accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all information and supporting materials specified in all applicable RTP policies. The candidate must clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. The narrative should range from between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch

- 1) *The Committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be*

3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.6 Review by Department Chair

The chair or director of the academic unit, if eligible and if not an elected member of the academic unit RTP committee, may review the candidate's materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.7 Review College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.8 Review by Dean

The Dean reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.

6.9 Review by Provost

The Provost reviews the candidate's materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 Withdrawal

Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

7.2 Missing Documentation

If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.

7.3 Rebuttal

At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate's rebuttal/responses shall be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as to any previous review levels.

7.4 External Review

The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation,

APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MINI-EVALUATIONS

Mini-Evaluations of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the Department of Physical Therapy RTP Committee, the Department Chair (optional), and the College Dean. The standard form for evaluation must be used. Pursuant to that form, a candidate's activities are to be evaluated under the categories of: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. The dossier, however, for a mini-evaluation is not a full RTP evaluation file. Accordingly, candidates for mini-reviews are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini-evaluation or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).¹

To assist the Department RTP Committee in conducting a mini-evaluation of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit an updated PDS which addresses: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. These updates are to be supported with the following documentation:

1. Narrative – The narrative for a mini-review should be in the form of a short letter (*two to three pages*) that reflects on a candidate's accomplishments in all three areas either since initial appointment (for new probation faculty), since the last mini-review (for candidates in their second or fifth years), or since formal reappointment (for candidates in their fourth year).

In terms of the content of the narrative, two or three paragraphs should be devoted to reflection on one's teaching. Two or three paragraphs should discuss the candidate's scholarly activities; in these paragraphs, in accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy (and its subsections), candidates must identify their program of scholarly research. It is important that specific goals and plans – both current and future – be clearly articulated and documented because mere claims of intent are insufficient. This should include not only a written plan of research activity, but also some indication of how data for empirically-based research may be derived or obtained. Finally, a paragraph or two should explain the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period.

2. Student Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.3(A)(1) of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review are strongly encouraged to submit all student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, from all sections of all courses they have taught; however, candidates for mini-review are only required to submit all quantitative and qualitative copies of student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses taught each semester. In addition, candidates must submit a summary table of their student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses that are subsequently evaluated by students. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 1: Summary of Quantitative Anonymous Feedback on Teaching

Academic semester	Course no.	No. students enrolled	No. students respond	Candidate mean	Candidate SD	Dept mean	Dept SD	School mean	School SD

