CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
SCHOOL OF NURSING
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
SCHOOL OF NURSING
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

School of Nursing(In Italics)

The School of Nursing and its faculty, as members of the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore, the *School of Nursing* promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to CHHS,the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the *school* establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for

RTP Policy, or th

further the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of both the university and the college. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The standards and criteria adopted at the academic-unit level shall not be lower than standards specified in this document.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

(University) Faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally

behavioral terms, the learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education.

(2)

units with relevant expertise who are approved by the academic unit RTP Committee. *(Nursing) Candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must submit at least two but not more than four peer evaluations conducted within the three years prior to the review, by different tenured colleagues at or above* *Peer evaluations must be based on personal observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. To standardize the type of information contained in the peer evaluation, the form in Appendix A must be used by the tenured peer*

effectiveness.

2.1.1b(College) Candidates for reappointment must provide evidence of either continued improvement in teaching or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must provide evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.1.1c Thoughtful and deliberate actions that produce continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness are expected of all CHHS faculty. This pattern of change should be described in the candidate's narrative and documented by

pedagogical coaching and/or other activities which contribute to the development of improved teaching effectiveness.

(4) Development of new curriculum, instructional programs or materials, including electronic or multimedia instructional software or new advising materials or programs.

2.1.1d All faculty members are expected to be actively involved in instructionally-related activities outside the classroom in such areas as academic advising, field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, thesis or project supervision*(Nursing) (as chairperson or committee member), and student recruitment and/or retention efforts.*

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

(University) Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

(University) In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by academic unit and college RTP policy documents, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

(College) Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with the requirements of the RTP Policy of their academic unit.

2.1.3.a In developing their RTP policies, academic units are encouraged to require:

(1) candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor to submit student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since their initial appointment; and

(2) candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor to submit student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since their last promotion review.

2.1.3.b(Nursing) The School of Nursing requires candidates to submit student evaluations for every course in which the university administered SPOT evaluations were given:

Initial appointment
Last review for a mini- evaluation
Review for retention (3rd year)
Review for tenure
Last review for promotion

2.1.3.c(College) Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.

2.1.3.d While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the academic units and/or the college for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative, overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages. Academic units within the college shall articulate this criterion.*(Nursing) Generally, teaching evaluations should be no lower than one standard deviation below the school mean on all evaluation indicators. However, an occasional course might be evaluated below this threshold. The candidate should provide a context or explanation for course evaluations below this threshold. explainable reasons.*

(1). (College) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for reappointment must evidence either continued improvement in teaching *(Nursing) in response to feedback from peers and students* (College) or a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

(2) (College) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.

(3) Student evaluations submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must evidence that the candidate has reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.

2.1.3.e

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.

(1.) (Nursing) Nursing is an applied discipline in a rapidly changing health care environment. This necessitates the nurse educator to maintain clinical currency. Enrollment in certificate programs, continuing education workshops, updates in clinical practice, or advanced academic courses that are clinically focused are examples of on-going professional development that can be described in terms of teaching effectiveness.

(2).(Nursing) Teaching effectiveness can also be evaluated written comments. The university standard evaluation form provides an anonymous opportunity for students to write comments on the back. Candidates are not required to submit the written comments from the students in their evaluated courses. However, if candidates chose to submit the comments, all of the comments from the evaluated course must be submitted.

(3)(Department) Unsolicited student feedback may be included as supplemental attachments and further evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

(University) Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies.

(College) Examples of RSCA may include, but are not limited to: books, journal articles that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly book chapters that are reviewed by professional peers, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, artistic exhibits or performances, and awarded grants or contracts, as required by their individual academic units.

(Nursing) Nursing is a profession that has many specialties/ subspecialties and RSCA encompasses a variety of different approaches. These varied specialties use a diverse array of methodologies that are all equally valued. The RSCA activities must be relevant

knowledge have the potential for improving the quality of life.

(Nursing) RSCA represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and fessions to create their own visions of the future. For these reasons, the faculty in the School of Nursing are expected to be engaged in an ongoing program of RSCA which demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application and/or pedagogy of the profession. RSCA that impact the discipline include the development of the following:

- *Theory*
- *Empirical data*
- *New discoveries*
- *Expanding existing knowledge*
- *Developing new insights or methods of integrating what is currently known*
- *Methodological innovation*
- *Clinical innovation*
- *Creative clinical strategies and modalities*

(Nursing) Across successive publications and creative works, distinct and progressive contributions are valued (as opposed to multiple dissemination of similar work).

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines

(College) Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Consistent with University expectations of all faculty members, RTP candidates within the CHHS must demonstrate achievements in the area of research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in this Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in the RTP policies of their respective academic unit(s). When developing such policies, academic units shall

reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by the candidate.

2.2.2.c (College) Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends). However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to any rank.

2.2.2.d (College) Candidates

progression of that agenda as evidenced by publications in suitable, scholarly venues (as described in Dissemination, 2.2.3 below).

3.(Nursing) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained pattern of achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly record.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA

(College) Consistent with university expectations of all faculty members, candidates for

(1) During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members are not required to participate in college and university service; however, they are expected to perform quality service at the academic unit level.

(2)(Nursing) Examples of Quality service to the School of Nursing include, but are not limited to:

(a). Membership/ participation in standing and ad hoc committees, as assigned

(b).Participation in authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the School of Nursing

(c).Participation in professional development opportunities sponsored by the School of Nursing

(d).Participation in student activities such as thesis, directed project, comprehensive examination, student organizations, and/or honor societies

(e).Student advisement

During the first three years, probationary faculty are not expected to assume committee leadership roles and should do so only if their research, scholarly and creative activities and instructional effectiveness have reached the levels required for reappointment.

2.3.1.b(College) For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members are required to make quality service contributions to their academic unit and to the college. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have made quality service contributions to the community and/or to the profession.

(Nursing) Quality contributions to the School of Nursing (in addition to those indicated above) include leadership positions on standing and/or ad hoc committees as assigned and voluntary membership on various working groups and task forces.

(3). Direct delivery of health care to individuals, families, and/or the community

(4). Participation in health fairs, health clinics, health promotion events, school health events, community health events, disaster preparedness simulations, immunization clinics

(5). Authoring short health articles for newsletters, newspapers, brochures, handouts, fact sheets, and electronic information sources

2.3.1.e (College) Service to the profession may include leadership positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected professional offices. Academic units must make clear the types of professional service that are appropriate to their discipline, as well as the criteria for the evaluation of quality professional service.

(Nursing) Examples of quality service to the profession include, but are not limited to:

(1). Membership /participation in professional health or nursing organizations

(2). Leadership roles in professional health or nursing organizations (chairperson, officer, coordinator, organizer, panel or roundtable leader, moderator, workshop chair, group leader)

(3). Committee appointments and participation in professional health or nursing organizations

(4). Serving on governing boards appropriate to the discipline

(5). Participation in the authorship of professional

position statements, standards and protocols

(6). Instructional/advisory services to the profession

(7). Participation in academic or nursing practice related consultancies or advisory groups

(8). Authoring recurrent features, sections, departments or columns (such as clinical pearls, editorials, viewpoints, note

(b) Within each academic unit, all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability

(a) The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.

(b) Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic unit. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations.

3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.

(b) After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic C q0.00000

3.3.6 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy Statement 94-11.

3.4 Chair or Director of the Academic Unit

The chair or director of the academic unit (hereinafter referred to as “the chair”) is responsible for communicating the academic unit, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with academic unit expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college and/or academic unit mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

3.4.1 Meeting with Committee

The chair shall meet with the academic unit RTP committee prior to the beginning of the academic unit evaluation process to review the academic unit, college, and university processes and procedures.

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by Director or Chair

Directors or chairs of academic units may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the director or chair is elected to the RTP committee of their academic unit. However, in promotion considerations, a director or chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a director or chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4.3 Candidate’s Rights

At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the candidate’s file and also be sent to all previous levels of review. This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.

3.5 College RTP Policy

This document serves as the official college RTP policy. It shall be interpreted to ensure consistency of standards across the college to the

maximum extent possible in light of the breadth of disciplinary diversity and expertise within the CHHS.

3.5.2 Review of RTP Policy (Optional) 10 pt 449.650 0 k 0.137 w 8 M 3 i 0 J 0 j [] 0 d 1 Tr 0.126 612.792 m 612.792 0 l S

3.5.1 Ratification

The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary college faculty members with the CHHS, and to approval by the Dean and the Provost.

3.5.2 Review for Currency

The college RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenured and probationary faculty of the college.

college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).

3.6.5 Chair
A chair shall be elected from among the members of the college RTP committee.

3.6.6 Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files

(a) The college RTP committee shall evaluate all candidates' files in accordance with standards established in the RTP policies of the

3.7.1 General Responsibilities

The Dean mentors the chairs and directors of academic units regarding their roles in the RTP process; encourages academic units to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance; provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee; and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with the policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university. The Dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

3.7.2 Responsibilities with Regard to RTP Recommendations

The Dean shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations and recommendations from academic units and the college RTP committee, and provide a written, independent recommendation to the Provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier in Sections 2.1 to 2.3.3.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and academic units' RTP committees.

The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9 President

The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the Provost.

4. 0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members undergo performance review and evaluation. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years.

The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in all three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service.

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty

The candidate must have completed at least one periodic evaluation and must demonstrate that he or she is making significant progress toward tenure. Based upon criteria established by the academic unit and the college, a candidate for reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective teaching that is responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse students and to the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in his or her program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily at the academic unit level and consistent with academic unit and college service expectations.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

The awarding of tenure represents the university's long

on external evaluation.

Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide

8.2.1 Voting on Amendments

Voting on amendments shall be by secret ballot prior to the close of the preceding academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CSU/CFA Bargaining Agreement.

8.2.2 Majority Needed to Adopt

To become effective, all proposed a G[To)-2(b)-5(e)-3(c)10(o)-340 78 beco 5(e)-3(ch0 0261

Mini review of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the School of Nursing, the School Chair, and the College Dean. The University approved form for evaluation must be used. The candidate will be evaluated in the following areas of activity.

(1) instruction and instructionally-related activities;
(2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and
(3) department, college, university, community, and professional service.

Candidates for mini-review are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini review or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).

To assist the School of Nursing RTP Committee in conducting a mini review of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit:

1. An updated, current Professional Data Sheet (PDS);

2. A narrative that reflects and explains the candidate's accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation since the last review.

   The content of the narrative should express the candidate's philosophy of pedagogy and student learning, as well as examples of how the candidate incorporates these tenets into his/her teaching and course design. The narrative must also contain a discussion of the planned program of scholarly research as well as current progress in achieving the goals set forth in the plan. It is important that specific goals and plans - both current and future - be clearly articulated and documented in order to validate the progression from intent to production of tangible outcomes. 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, the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period should be explained.

2. Student Evaluations

   a) Probationary Faculty Prior to Initial Reappoin

b)Probationary Faculty Following Initial Reappointment - Following reappointment, copies of student evaluations for all courses in which the university administered SPOT evaluations were given

Table 2: Summary of Grade Distributions

Date	Course Number	A (n)	B (n)	C (n)	D (n)	F (n)	W (n)	CR (n)