Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Effective: August 2011

1.00 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines and standards for Periodic Evaluation, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) of probationary and tenured faculty consistent with the California Faculty Association/California State University (CFA/CSU) Collective Bargaining Agreement. This policy is intended to reflect the University's commitment to the principles, goals, and ideals described in the California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Vision Statement. If anything in this policy is in conflict with the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, the terms of the bargaining agreement and not the provisions of this policy shall take precedence.

The Vision of CSUMB is that of a model, pluralistic, academic community where all learn from and teach one another in an atmosphere of mutual respect and pursuit of excellence. The identity of CSUMB is framed by a substantive commitment to a multilingual, multicultural, intellectual community. That community is distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions, both public and private, and by cooperative agreements that enable students, faculty and staff to cross institutional boundaries for innovative outcomes-based instruction, broadly defined scholarly and creative activity, and coordinated community service. Faculty are expected to excel both in their respective fields and through their contributions to CSUMB and the community.

The decisions to retain, grant tenure to, or promote a faculty member are among the most vital that take place in a university. One key measure of the excellence of a university is the quality of its faculty and their scholarly achievements. With respect for vigor, flexibility, and breadth it is expected that faculty members shall exhibit highly varied profiles of achievement. Judgments about quality and significance of achievement within each scholarly area will vary with disciplines, and with department and college goals.

The policy for the review and evaluation of faculty is designed to equitably document and assess the performance of individual faculty members, rewarding both excellence and diversity in contributions made to department and University goals. In the development of this policy, CSUMB recognizes the uniqueness of individual faculty members, the departments of which they are a part, and their specific fields of knowledge.

For the purposes of this document, "department" refers to an academic unit in which faculty participate as their main assignment. In most cases, "department" refers to a degree-granting academic unit, but in certain cases a more flexible definition is necessary. The list of academic units is maintained by Academic Personnel.
2.00 Areas of Scholarship and Scholarly Work

This document strives to both expand and deepen the definition of scholarship to encompass all outstanding faculty work that furthers the educational goals of students, faculty, academic units, the University as a whole, and the community. This more inclusive definition allows for a greater recognition of diverse faculty activities. Faculty have a responsibility to their students, their disciplines, the community, and the University to strive for outstanding intellectual, ethical, aesthetic, and creative achievement. Such achievement in the four scholarship areas of Teaching and Learning; Discovery, Creation and Integration; Professional Application; and University Service, is an indispensable qualification for retention, tenure, and promotion. While the categorical division of faculty roles into four scholarship areas serves to clarify a complex evaluation process, it is important to remember that these divisions function primarily as tools for the assessment of faculty work. Although these areas are categorized below, it is critical to underscore that sharp distinctions between these categories do not exist and that scholarly activities should emphasize collaborative and integrative relationships. It should also be emphasized that no faculty member shall be expected to commit an equal amount of time, make an equal contribution, or achieve equally in the four categories of scholarly work described hereafter.

2.10 Teaching and Learning

Contributions to Teaching and Learning involve facilitating student learning, critical thinking and inquiry, as well as transmitting, integrating, interpreting, and extending knowledge. In addition, teaching should reveal and develop diverse perspectives, help to facilitate creativity and life-long learning, and work to integrate various principles central to the Vision of CSUMB. Activities to consider in the evaluation of Teaching and Learning may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix A, section A.2. The faculty member’s contributions to Teaching and Learning shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (Appendix A, section A.3).

2.20 Discovery, Creation and Integration

This scholarly activity constitutes academic work that confronts the unknown, seeks new understandings, and/or offers a new perspective on knowledge, through both individual and collaborative work both within and across disciplines. Activities to consider in the evaluation of Discovery, Creation and Integration may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix B, section B.2. The faculty member’s contributions to Discovery, Creation and Integration shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (Appendix B, section B.3).

2.30 Professional Application

Faculty engaged in Professional Application use their academic training and experience to serve the profession and the public and to contribute to the CSUMB Vision. The diversity of external needs, as well as faculty training and experience, leads to many different forms of Professional Application, however, Professional Application activities share all of the following distinguishing characteristics:

a. They contribute to the public welfare or the common good;
b. They call upon a faculty member's academic and/or professional expertise;
c. They directly address or respond to real-world needs; and
d. They support the CSUMB Vision.

Activities to consider in the evaluation of Professional Application may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix C, section C.2. The faculty member’s contributions to Professional Application shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (Appendix C, section C.3).

2.40 University Service

University Service includes service to California State University, CSUMB, the college, and department. Faculty engaged in University Service contribute to the shared governance system and institutional development through a variety of activities including service on committees, task forces, policy advisory bodies, and the development and management of academic programs. Activities to consider in the evaluation of University Service may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix D, section D.2. The faculty member's contributions to University Service shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (Appendix D, section D.3).

3.00 Evaluation and Review Cycles for Probationary Faculty

3.10 Types of Evaluations

a. Periodic Evaluation. In an academic year or work year in which a probationary faculty member is not scheduled for Retention, Tenure or Promotion Review, the faculty member shall receive a Periodic Evaluation, as described in section 8.00.

b. Retention Review. Probationary faculty are normally appointed for a two-year term and receive a Full Retention Review prior to the renewal and extension of their probationary appointment, in accordance with section 9.10.

c. Tenure Review. As described in section 9.20, a Full Tenure Review is conducted to determine whether a probationary faculty member's work has satisfied University standards of quality and significance in the four areas of scholarship to merit the right to continuous employment at the campus.

d. Promotion Review. Probationary or tenured faculty being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a Full Promotion Review in accordance with sections 9.30 and 9.40.

3.20 Review Cycles

The normal schedule for Retention and Tenure Reviews of probationary faculty is as follows:
Normal Cycle

Year 1 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 2 - Full Retention Review in the Fall Semester
Year 3 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 4 - Full Retention Review in the Spring Semester
Year 5 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 6 - Tenure Review in the Spring Semester

1 Year Credit

Probationary faculty granted one year of credit towards tenure at the time of initial appointment, as stated in the official appointment letter, enter the "normal" review cycle at Year 2 with a Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester, followed by a Full Retention Review in the Fall Semester of Year 3. S/he would enter the normal Retention Review cycle at Year 4. The schedule for Retention and Tenure Reviews in this scenario is as follows:

Year 1 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 2 - Full Retention Review in the Fall Semester
Year 3 - Full Retention Review in the Spring Semester
Year 4 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 5 - Tenure Review in the Spring Semester

2 Years Credit

Probationary faculty granted two years of credit towards tenure at the time of initial appointment, as stated in the official appointment letter, enter the "normal" retention review cycle at Year 3. The schedule for Retention and Tenure Reviews in this scenario is as follows:

Year 1 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 2 - Full Retention Review in the Spring Semester
Year 3 - Periodic Evaluation in the Spring Semester
Year 4 - Tenure Review in the Spring Semester

The normal retention and tenure cycle also can be changed in the following ways:

a. Probationary faculty may be scheduled for a Full Retention Review instead of a Periodic Evaluation in Year 3 or in Year 5 if the decision requiring a Full Retention Review is noted in the President's retention letter the preceding year.

b. Probationary faculty may be non-retained (terminated) in Year 2 as a result of the Full Retention Review during Fall Semester of Year 2, effective at the end of the Academic Year.

c. Probationary faculty may be granted a terminal year as a result of a Full Retention Review during Years 3, 4 or 5, or Tenure Review in Year 6. Terminal
year means that the faculty member is eligible to work another full Academic Year following the non-retention decision before termination.

d. Probationary faculty may request consideration for early tenure or early promotion pursuant to the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement and section 9.20 of this policy. Early tenure and early promotion are not the norm and are considered only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. The length and breadth of the faculty member's record shall be sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contributions will continue.

e. A faculty unit employee's probationary period may be extended by the President when taking a leave of absence. See CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, Articles 13.7 and 13.8.

A calendar showing the exact dates for the process shall be prepared annually by Academic Personnel and posted on the Academic Personnel website.

4.00 Working Personnel Action Files (WPAF)

The WPAF is the file reviewed by faculty committees and academic administrators during the RTP process. Recommendations shall be based upon review of accomplishments in the four areas of scholarship that are described and documented in the faculty member's WPAF. The WPAF shall include all required documents, all information specifically provided by the faculty member being evaluated, and information provided by other faculty members, students, and academic administrators. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. WPAF materials are deemed incorporated by reference into the Personnel Action File (PAF), but need not be physically placed in the file.

4.10 Contents of the WPAF

The WPAF is defined as that file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. The file shall include:

a. A scholarly portfolio of materials submitted by the candidate (section 4.22);

b. Materials submitted by other persons prior to the submission deadline (section 4.30);

c. Written evaluations and recommendations from subsequent levels of review;

d. Any rebuttal statements submitted by the faculty member. Rebuttals may not contain attachments. Rebuttals from individuals other than the candidate (such as faculty or staff members, students, peer review committee members, chairs, the community, etc.) are not allowed, therefore, responses from such individuals will not be added to the WPAF nor considered by reviewing bodies;
e. Amendments made by reviewers following meeting with or rebuttal by candidate; and

f. All student evaluations for a period of up to six years prior to date of current review. These are kept in a separate file or online and are considered part of the WPAF. The candidate may also include materials such as peer reviews of teaching, peer summaries of student evaluations of teaching, or instructor self-evaluations.

4.20 Portfolios of Scholarly Achievements

Portfolios make up the candidate-developed portion of the WPAF. Portfolios may be submitted in hard copy or on CD, DVD, or other portable media. Faculty members scheduled for Periodic Evaluation shall prepare Abbreviated Portfolios (section 4.2.1), whereas faculty who are subject to Full RTP Review shall prepare complete Scholarly Portfolios (section 4.2.2) that describe and document their accomplishments in each of the four scholarship areas. Documentation and evidence provided to support scholarly achievements must be specific and verifiable. For example, if a manuscript has been accepted for publication and is “in press,” a copy of the acceptance letter may be included. Verification of evidence in portfolios by RTP reviewers may occur at any level of the review process. RTP reviewers shall submit any such request for verification of evidence through Academic Personnel. If RTP reviewers find a discrepancy in the Portfolio, this will be documented in the recommendation.

4.2.1 Abbreviated Portfolios for Periodic Evaluation

Probationary faculty not scheduled for Retention, Tenure, or Promotion Review shall prepare an Abbreviated Portfolio and submit it to Academic Personnel by the closing date specified on the calendar distributed annually by Academic Personnel. The Abbreviated Portfolio shall contain:

a. Appointment letter;

b. Curriculum Vitae listing achievements and contributions relevant to the review without including supporting documentation;

c. Faculty Development Plan (section 5.10);

d. Annual Faculty Workload Plan for the past year (section 5.20);

e. Self-appraisal that synthesizes achievements and contributions in each scholarship area, and that summarizes progress in any areas identified from previous recommendations as needing improvement;

f. Copies of letters and recommendations from the most recent Full Retention or Promotion Review, when applicable; and

g. All student evaluations for a period of up to six years prior to the date of current review. These are kept in a separate file or online and are considered part of the WPAF. The candidate may also include materials such as peer reviews of
teaching, peer summaries of student evaluations of teaching, or instructor self-evaluations.

The WPAF for a Periodic Evaluation may also include a letter of evaluation from the Chair, pursuant to section 8.00.

4.2.2 Scholarly Portfolios for Retention, Tenure, or Promotion Reviews
Each candidate shall develop a Scholarly Portfolio that highlights a sampling of the candidate's scholarly work, with narrative sections that provide context and continuity for the selected materials. The Scholarly Portfolio shall include:

a. An index of portfolio sections and ALL supporting documentation in each section;

b. Prefatory materials, including:
   
   • Appointment letter;
   • Curriculum Vitae;
   • Faculty Development Plans relevant to the period under consideration, signed by candidate, Chair and Dean (section 5.10);
   • Annual Workload Plans for the period under consideration, signed by candidate, Chair and Dean (section 5.20);
   • Copies of syllabi from all classes taught since last Full Review;
   • Copies of evaluations and recommendations from the most recent Periodic Evaluation and Full Review, when applicable.

c. An integrative narrative; and

d. Portfolio sections that describe and document achievements in each of the four scholarship areas. Documentation shall be limited to the period under review, which includes the years since the candidate was hired in a tenure-track or tenured position at CSUMB. Probationary faculty granted credit towards tenure at the time of initial appointment, as stated in the official appointment letter, may provide documentation of accomplishments from previous years to demonstrate a sustained record of achievement.

Candidates may wish to consult Appendices A, B, C and D before preparing their portfolios. In addition, prior to their first review, candidates shall attend a training session, offered annually, on how to document their scholarship and how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of scholarship being presented. Candidates are also required to attend a training session prior to review if there have been substantial changes to RTP policies and procedures.

4.2.3 Index and Prefatory Materials
The first section of the Scholarly Portfolio shall include an index of ALL materials in the portfolio, followed by prefatory materials that provide context for subsequent descriptions and documentation of scholarly achievements.
4.2.4 Integrative Narrative
The Scholarly Portfolio shall include a three to five page Integrative Narrative that synthesizes and interconnects the candidate's achievements in the four areas of scholarship. The Integrative Narrative unites all sections of the portfolio and ties achievements to the CSUMB Vision Statement. The narrative shall emphasize collaborative and integrative activities. It shall also provide an opportunity to reflect on professional growth and/or areas needing improvement.

4.2.5 Portfolio Sections and Reflective Summary Statements
The Scholarly Portfolio shall include four portfolio sections describing and documenting activities in each of the four areas of scholarship. Each section shall be prefaced by a Table of Contents of the evidence contained therein. At the beginning of each section, candidates shall include a one to three page reflective summary statement relating the described achievements to the documentation in that section, along with a description of how scholarly work will be further developed. Summary statements may complement or provide a level of detail to further support, but not substitute for, the Integrative Narrative.

Evidence shall consist of representative samples of the candidate's best work, not an exhaustive compilation of materials. Evidence shall be sufficient to make it possible to apply the performance standards as outlined in the Appendices. Documentation and evidence provided to support scholarly achievements must be specific, unambiguous and verifiable. Documentation within each of the portfolio sections shall focus on the quality and significance of the scholarly activity using an appropriate combination of narrative and illustrative materials. It shall focus on documenting the scholarly activities and contributions of the individual faculty member rather than documenting the results of a project or a program. Similarly, in documenting collaborative scholarly work, faculty shall focus on their personal role and contributions to the collaborative process and outcomes. Candidates are encouraged to highlight scholarly activities which are integrative and collaborative and which serve department goals and the CSUMB Vision Statement.

4.30 Addition of Other Materials to the WPAF

The WPAF shall be considered 'open' for insertion of relevant materials from the first day of fall semester until the submission date specified in the calendar prepared annually by Academic Personnel. Insertion of material after this submission date shall be limited to items that became accessible after this date. Materials submitted after the WPAF closes are not automatically included in the WPAF. With the exception of recommendations from subsequent levels of RTP review and the candidate's response or rebuttal statements, insertion of materials after the submission date requires prior approval of both the candidate and the University RTP Committee.

While the WPAF is considered open, faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President may contribute information relevant to the evaluation or review of a faculty member. Information submitted by the faculty unit employee and by academic administrators may include statements and opinions about the qualifications and work of the employee provided by other persons identified by name. Inclusion of materials relevant to evaluation or review does not require approval of the candidate. RTP candidates shall not solicit written letters of support from students. All materials added to the WPAF shall be signed, with the exception of formal student evaluations of teaching.
Academic Personnel shall provide faculty members with a copy of all materials submitted to the WPAF. The faculty member may submit a response or a rebuttal statement by the date the WPAF is considered closed, or ten (10) days after the date the material is submitted, whichever is later.

4.40 External Letters of Evaluation

In most scholarship areas, CSUMB colleagues are well qualified to provide the requisite objective review. In other instances, particularly in the areas of Professional Application and Discovery, Creation, and Integration, colleagues or community partners outside the University may be needed to provide additional expertise not available within the CSUMB community. A request for external review may be initiated at any level of the review by any party to the RTP review process in order to solicit external evaluators to provide local, regional, national, and/or international perspectives on a candidate’s achievements and activities. Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitate an outside reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the Dean or appropriate administrator, as President’s designee, with concurrence of the faculty member. In such cases, the candidate may be asked to submit the names of potential external evaluators. The Chair is responsible for soliciting letters of evaluation in a timely manner. An external evaluator shall be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of a candidate’s achievements only in those scholarship areas where the evaluator has first-hand knowledge of the candidate’s scholarly work or contributions. External evaluators shall not be asked to conduct evaluations of the candidate’s Scholarly Portfolio based on RTP criteria.

4.50 Disposition of WPAF at End of Review or Evaluation Cycle

At the end of each review or evaluation cycle, Academic Personnel shall permanently place copies of the following materials from the WPAF into the candidate's official Personnel Action File (PAF):

a. Index of the Scholarly Portfolio contents;

b. Integrative Narrative;

c. Faculty Development Plan and Annual Faculty Workload Plans;

d. Evaluation and recommendations from each level of review, and any responses submitted by the faculty member.

Academic Personnel will notify the faculty member to pick up his/her Scholarly Portfolio at the end of the review or evaluation cycle.

5.00 Faculty Development and Annual Faculty Workload Plans

To ensure that the diverse needs of CSUMB students, faculty, and other constituents are well served by the allocation of faculty time, Faculty Development Plans and Annual Faculty Workload Plans for each faculty member shall be developed. Each Dean or other appropriate academic administrator shall ensure that the development of Annual Faculty Workload Plans is conducted in a consistent and timely manner. Faculty Development Plans and Annual Faculty Workload Plans
must be signed by the Dean, Chair and candidate. The distribution of faculty time between different scholarship areas may vary considerably between faculty members who are at different stages in their professional careers and between faculty with different interests, abilities and experiences.

5.10 Faculty Development Plan

Each tenure-track faculty member shall develop, in consultation with the Chair, a three to five year Faculty Development Plan that describes a program of professional development in the four areas of scholarship: Teaching and Learning; Discovery, Creation and Integration; Professional Application; and University Service. The plan shall be flexible and open to change as needed, reflect the strengths of the individual faculty and her/his professional development needs, and be aligned with University, college and department missions. Faculty are encouraged to discuss prior RTP recommendations or evaluations with the Chair to identify strengths that should be recognized and areas that may benefit from mentoring and professional development. The approved Faculty Development Plan forms the basis for the development of the Annual Faculty Workload Plan, and constitutes a commitment by the department or college to provide necessary support for faculty development.

5.20 Annual Faculty Workload Plan

Once the Faculty Development Plan has been completed, each faculty member shall meet with the Chair to design an Annual Faculty Workload Plan covering individual workload responsibilities for the upcoming year. Each Annual Faculty Workload Plan shall include an individualized goal statement outlining professional goals and priorities for the upcoming academic year and shall specify in detail the allocation of individual faculty workload among the four areas of scholarship. Annual Faculty Workload Plans shall be consistent with the individual’s Faculty Development Plan.

Since the proportionate distribution of workload across scholarship areas may vary widely among individual faculty members, each faculty member shall include copies of the Annual Faculty Workload Plans in her/his Scholarly Portfolio or Abbreviated Portfolio (section 4.20).

6.00 Roles and Responsibilities of RTP Reviewers

The integrity of the RTP process and the quality of the University depend upon the commitment of reviewers to evaluate each candidate’s WPAF carefully and objectively using this policy and appendices.

All levels of review shall adhere strictly to all deadlines specified in the calendar distributed annually by Academic Personnel.

6.10 Mandatory Training of All Reviewers

All RTP reviewers, both faculty and administrators, shall attend a training session prior to the first time they serve on an RTP Committee or if five years or more have passed since the last time they attended training. All RTP reviewers must attend a training session if there have been changes in policy since their last training. The purpose of the training is to ensure uniform, fair application of the RTP policy across campus with emphasis on how candidates document their scholarship, and
how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of scholarship being presented. The training shall be conducted each fall and will be coordinated by Academic Personnel in conjunction with representatives from the Faculty Affairs Committee.

6.20 Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty RTP Committees and Administrative Reviewers

Faculty RTP Committees and academic administrators evaluate each candidate's WPAF and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and promotion, with four levels of review prior to the President's decision:

- Department RTP Committee
- Dean or appropriate academic administrator
- University RTP Committee
- Provost
- President

Only the President or her/his designee may disseminate information to the campus about RTP decisions.

Members of Department and University RTP Committees shall review each candidate's WPAF before meeting in person to deliberate and make recommendations. Any level of review may also request to review the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF) to assist them in their review of the candidate. All deliberations regarding retention, tenure, and promotion shall be kept confidential. The formal recommendations of RTP Committees shall be determined by majority vote.

The result of each level of RTP review shall be a written recommendation that summarizes strengths and areas needing development, gives ratings of scholarly activity in each scholarship area (section 9.00 and Appendices A through D), and makes a formal recommendation regarding retention, tenure, or promotion. In the case of tenure and promotion, one document may be prepared but the ratings and recommendations are separate. All review recommendations shall be added to the WPAF and forwarded to the next level of review, with a copy of the recommendation to the candidate. Committee recommendations may include dissenting recommendations, or a minority report may also be prepared and included with the majority recommendation. Committees are encouraged to discuss differences of opinion and reach consensus whenever possible.

In accordance with section 9.00, performance ratings of Outstanding, Commendable, Adequate, or Less than Adequate shall be specified for each scholarship area. Only a single rating may be used for a given scholarship area. All recommendations shall be signed by the reviewers.

6.30 Role of Department Chairs in Reviews

The responsibilities of Chairs in the RTP review process are as follows:

a. Facilitate/organize elections for the Department RTP Committee.

b. Initiate requests for external letters of evaluation, when appropriate (section 4.40)
c. The Chair may submit a letter to the candidate’s WPAF (prior to the date the WPAF closes) commenting on contributions the candidate has made to the department and her/his strengths and weaknesses in each scholarship area.

7.00 Election and Composition of Faculty RTP Committees

All Department and University RTP Committees shall be composed of tenured faculty members. All eligible faculty shall be considered for election and must serve, if elected, with the following exceptions:

a. A faculty member who is on an approved leave of absence.

b. A faculty member with health problems that have been documented by evidence from a physician.

c. A faculty member who is elected to the University RTP Committee may not serve on Department RTP Committees.

d. A faculty member who is serving on two or more Department RTP Committees in a given year may choose to exempt him/herself from serving on additional RTP Committees for that year.

e. A faculty member who has served two consecutive years on the University RTP Committee may choose to exempt him/herself from the University RTP Committee. The faculty member must notify Academic Personnel before the election is scheduled to be exempted from the election. If a faculty member does not notify Academic Personnel in advance of the election, the faculty member shall serve for the academic year, if elected.

f. Tenured faculty in a Department that has two or fewer eligible faculty for the Department RTP Committee may choose to exempt themselves from the University RTP Committee. Faculty must notify Academic Personnel before the election is scheduled to be exempted from the election. If a faculty member does not notify Academic Personnel in advance of the election, the faculty member shall serve for the academic year, if elected.

g. Tenured faculty or who have applied for a sabbatical are exempt from the University RTP Committee for that year.

h. Any faculty with less than one year as a tenured faculty member at CSUMB may not serve on the University RTP Committee.

If a committee member has personal interests that are incompatible with his/her professional duties or believes he/she cannot provide an unbiased recommendation regarding a candidate, he/she shall contact Academic Personnel with a request to be recused from committee deliberations. If recusal is approved, the remaining committee members shall deliberate and make the recommendation. The committee member who was recused from deliberations shall not sign the recommendation, but may participate in other reviews.
7.10 University RTP Committee

The University RTP Committee shall consist of five eligible tenured faculty at the rank of Full Professor or equivalent who shall be elected annually for a one-year term. The nomination and election process for the University RTP Committee shall be facilitated by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, after Academic Personnel has provided a list of eligible faculty. During the first month of each academic year, all tenured and probationary faculty shall be given five rank-order votes to distribute among all eligible tenured Full Professors, ranking their candidates from 5 (highest ranking) to 1 (lowest ranking). The five candidates with the highest numerical rankings shall serve on the University RTP Committee, except that no more than one faculty member from any department shall serve on the University RTP Committee. A tie for the fifth position shall be broken by lot.

If a faculty member is ineligible to serve on the University RTP Committee for one of the reasons listed in section 7.00, or due to resignation from the University, the vacancy shall be filled by the next candidate in rank order.

7.20 Department RTP Committees

The listing of “equivalent units” considered to be “departments” for RTP purposes shall be maintained in Academic Personnel, as well as a listing of appropriate administrators designated to participate in the RTP review process.

After the University RTP Committee has been elected, tenured and probationary faculty of each department shall elect a Department RTP Committee that shall consist of three tenured faculty who shall serve for a one-year term. Faculty with joint appointments in more than one department shall vote only in the department where they perform the highest proportion of their duties. The election process is decided by the Chair (or head of unit) and probationary and tenured faculty of the department. Each probationary and tenured faculty member of the department shall vote with equal weight. All eligible department tenured faculty names shall appear on the Department RTP Committee ballot. Immediately following election, the membership of the Department RTP Committee shall be forwarded to the Dean and Academic Personnel.

Tenured faculty members being considered for promotion shall be ineligible for service on Department RTP Committees. They are, however, eligible for serving on Retention and Periodic Evaluation Committees. In this case there may be two Department RTP Committees. All other tenured faculty in the department shall be eligible for election to the Department RTP Committee with the exceptions noted in section 7.00.

In years that candidates from the department are applying for promotion to Full Professor or are being reviewed for tenure at the rank of Full Professor, the department shall elect a separate Full Professor Tenure/Promotion Review Committee consisting of three tenured faculty at the rank of Full Professor for the purpose of reviewing only those candidates.

A department with four or more eligible tenured faculty shall elect a Department RTP Committee consisting entirely of faculty from the department. If there are three or fewer eligible tenured faculty in the department, then they ALL shall serve on the Department RTP Committee. If there are
fewer than three eligible tenured faculty in a department, then the tenured and probationary faculty in the department shall nominate a sufficient number of tenured faculty from related academic disciplines to elect the remaining members of the committee.

If a faculty member is ineligible to serve on the Department RTP Committee for one of the reasons listed in section 7.00, the vacancy shall be filled by a subsequent election. The vacancy shall be filled by eligible faculty tenured in the department, if any are available. If no eligible tenured faculty within the department are available to serve, eligible faculty from outside the department shall be elected.

8.00 Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

As noted in section 3.20, the normal six-year review schedule for probationary faculty includes Periodic Evaluation in years when there is no Full RTP Review. Periodic Evaluation is designed to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year's Full RTP Review. It does not involve any retention, tenure, or promotion decisions and, therefore, no performance ratings shall be assigned.

The Periodic Evaluation process shall consist of two levels of evaluation: the Department RTP Committee and the Dean or appropriate academic administrator. The Department RTP Committee shall review the candidate's Abbreviated Portfolio for Periodic Evaluation (section 4.21), may meet with the candidate, and shall provide written feedback with suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year's Full RTP Review. A signed copy of the feedback letter shall be forwarded to Academic Personnel by the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar.

The Dean or appropriate academic administrator shall review the candidate's Abbreviated Portfolio as well as the feedback provided by the Department RTP Committee, may meet with the candidate, and shall provide written feedback with suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year's Full RTP Review. A signed copy of the feedback letter shall be forwarded to Academic Personnel by the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar.

The written feedback letters from both levels of review shall become part of the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF). If the Chair is not on the Department RTP Committee, the Chair may submit a letter to the candidate's WPAF commenting on contributions the candidate has made to the department, and providing feedback and suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year's Full RTP Review.

9.00 Conditions for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

The overarching characteristics of faculty performance ratings are:

**Outstanding:** The candidate demonstrates leadership, influences the practices of others, and has a continuous record of significant participation and achievement in the scholarly area and rank being evaluated.

**Commendable:** The candidate demonstrates an increasing record of significant participation and achievement in the scholarly area and rank being evaluated.
**Adequate:** The candidate demonstrates satisfactory participation and achievement in the scholarly area and rank being evaluated.

**Less than Adequate:** The candidate needs improvement to attain an "Adequate" performance rating.

The ratings of **Commendable** and **Outstanding** require an increasing record of participation, achievement and leadership in each scholarship area. Because a primary goal of the University is to achieve excellence in undergraduate, graduate and professional education, all faculty are expected to demonstrate and maintain ongoing teaching effectiveness; and the performance and ratings standards for Teaching and Learning apply equally to all ranks. There is an expectation that scholarship activities in areas of Discovery, Creation and Integration; Professional Application; and University Service shall increase in scope or depth and in significance and leadership with increasing rank. More rigorous performance and ratings standards shall reflect these increased expectations (see examples in Appendices, sections B.3, C.3, and D.3).

All tenure-track faculty shall be required to fulfill the following conditions for retention, tenure and promotion:

**9.10 Retention**

The purpose of the probationary period is to allow time for the candidate to develop his/her scholarship and to demonstrate that his/her scholarship is consistent with department goals and the University mission. Probationary faculty are initially appointed for a two-year term. The initial retention review occurs during the Fall semester of the second probationary year (section 3.20). In the case of a faculty member granted two years service credit, initial retention review will occur in the Spring semester of the 2nd probationary year. To be recommended for retention, candidates shall receive performance ratings of **Adequate** or better in all four scholarship areas (section 2.00 and Appendices) and shall show evidence of making progress towards a higher performance rating. It is essential that reappointment decisions are made with due recognition that they lead toward a tenure decision. Accordingly, retention reviews shall look at progress towards tenure; a recommendation for reappointment shall be made only when the candidate has responded appropriately to previous retention reviews and is clearly on track towards tenure.

**9.20 Tenure**

Tenure is granted to probationary faculty whose work has satisfied University and department standards of quality and significance in the four areas of scholarly work. Tenure represents the University’s long-term commitment to a faculty member, and is only granted when there is evidence that the individual will continue to make increasingly distinguished contributions to the University and its instructional program, his/her discipline, and the community.

Tenure is normally considered during the sixth year of a probationary appointment. Up to two years of credit towards tenure may be granted at time of appointment; any such credits would reduce the length of the probationary period. Early tenure is considered only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Early tenure shall not normally be considered until the candidate has completed at least one Full Retention Review in accordance with section 3.20, after which he/she
may request consideration for early tenure. The length of the candidate’s record shall be sufficient (at CSUMB and at other accredited institutions of higher learning) to provide confidence that the pattern of achievements shall continue. To receive a favorable recommendation for early tenure, a candidate shall have achieved, before the normal probationary period, a record of accomplishment that meets the standards and level of performance for tenure indicated in this policy. The length and breadth of the faculty member’s record shall be sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue. Prior to the final decision, candidates for early tenure may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review. To be recommended for tenure, candidates shall receive performance ratings (Appendices A - E) that, at a minimum, match one of the scenarios in Table 1:

Table 1. Minimum Performance Ratings for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and Granting of Tenure with Rank of Associate Professor (or equivalent rank for Librarians and Counselors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching &amp; Learning</th>
<th>Discovery, Creation &amp; Integration</th>
<th>Professional Application</th>
<th>University Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commandable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probationary faculty in the rank of Assistant Professor (or equivalent rank for Librarians and Counselors) shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time as they are considered for tenure. Early tenure and early promotion are considered only in exceptional circumstances and for
compelling reasons. Probationary faculty members shall not normally be promoted during probation. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion. Faculty may request consideration for promotion to Associate Professor before the time for normal consideration, but in those instances the faculty member shall demonstrate that he/she has achieved, in a shorter period of time, a record of accomplishments which meets the standards and level of performance that would be expected during the normal six years in rank as an Assistant Professor. The length and breadth of the faculty member’s record shall be sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue.

To qualify for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member shall demonstrate that he/she is an effective teacher who contributes to the instructional mission of the University and shall receive performance ratings that, at a minimum, match one of the scenarios in Table 1.

Candidates who declare their preliminary intent to be considered for promotion but fail to submit a WPAF by the deadline established for submission of such materials shall be considered as having withdrawn voluntarily from promotion consideration.

At any time prior to the final decision of the President, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration.

9.40 Promotion to Full Professor

Tenured faculty in the rank of Associate Professor shall normally be considered for promotion during their fifth year in rank. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion. In order to be considered for promotion to Full Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement. Probationary Associate Professors shall not be promoted to Full Professor unless they are selected for the simultaneous award of tenure. Early tenure and early promotion are considered only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Faculty may request consideration for promotion to Full Professor before the time for normal consideration, but in those instances the faculty member shall demonstrate that he/she has achieved, in a shorter period of time, a record of accomplishments which meets the standards and level of performance that would be expected during the normal five year period of time in rank as an Associate Professor. The length and breadth of the faculty member’s record shall be sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue.

To be recommended for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, candidates shall receive performance ratings that, at a minimum, match one of the scenarios in Table 2:

Table 2. Minimum Performance Ratings for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor; Minimum Performance Ratings for Granting Tenure with Rank of Full Professor (or equivalent ranks for Librarians and Counselors).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10.00 Department Examples of Activities and Performance Standards**

With the exception of Librarian and Counselor faculty, who have an approved set of Department RTP Standards consistent with University RTP criteria and standards, personnel decisions shall be controlled by the standards and criteria outlined in this policy.

Each department shall have the option of developing specific examples of activities and performance standards to supplement the examples in the RTP Policy Appendices. Examples of specific activities and performance standards expected for retention, tenure, and promotion that fall under the categories of Teaching and Learning; Discovery, Creation and Integration; Professional Application; and University Service should be as thorough as possible but not described as exclusive. Examples of activities must be approved (with signatures) in this order: probationary and tenured faculty of the department, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, Dean, and Provost. Academic Personnel will retain the official approved documents and provide them to candidates and reviewers.
11.00 Continuous Renewal

This policy shall be reviewed six years from its effective date to determine its effectiveness and appropriateness. This policy may be reviewed before that time as necessary.

s/ President Dianne F. Harrison

Effective Date: August 12, 2011

Reviewed by: Faculty Affairs Committee, Policy Facilitation Team, Deans & Provost, Academic Senate, Academic Personnel, Academic Senate Executive Committee, ESALT, CSU Legal, Provost
APPENDIX A - TEACHING AND LEARNING

A.1 Definition

Contributions to Teaching and Learning involve facilitating student learning, critical thinking, and inquiry, as well as transmitting, integrating, interpreting, and extending knowledge. In addition, teaching should reveal and develop diverse perspectives, help to facilitate creativity and life-long learning, and work to integrate various principles central to the Vision of CSUMB. The faculty member’s contributions to Teaching and Learning shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (section A.3 below).

A.2 Examples of Activities in Teaching and Learning

Activities to consider in the evaluation of Teaching and Learning may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Instructing

- Instructing students in courses, laboratories, field instruction, clinics, studio classes;
- Instructing participants in workshops, retreats, seminars;
- Providing one on one instruction;
- Managing a course (student assessment, maintaining student records, planning learning experiences).

Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring Students

- Advising and mentoring students (career, academics);
- Advising and mentoring capstone, service learning, and independent study students;
- Advising and mentoring graduate students;
- Performing independent student assessment;
- Supervising teaching assistants and student assistants.

Developing Learning Experiences and Resources

- Developing and revising outcomes-based curriculum and assessment;
- Developing teaching materials, manuals, software;
- Applying Discovery, Creation and Integration to Teaching and Learning;
- Contributing to the achievement of department curriculum goals;
- Developing resources and curriculum in support of distributed education and independent learning;
- Selecting, organizing, and providing access to information resources in support of curricular goals;
- Ensuring that instructional materials meet accessibility standards.

Professional Development of Teaching

- Evaluating teaching of colleagues;
- Reviewing current literature and research in teaching subject areas;
- Attending, contributing to and planning professional development activities;
- Developing and improving teaching and assessment methods;
- Conducting instructional and classroom research.
### A.3 Examples of Performance Standards and Ratings for Teaching and Learning

Departments are expected to establish clear expectations for activities and achievements that meet tenure and promotion standards for Teaching and Learning, and for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements. The following are examples, not an exhaustive list, of achievements that could provide evidence of performance at the different rating levels:

Table 1. Examples of Teaching and Learning Performance Standards and Ratings for Tenure or Promotion to Associate or Full Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Performance</th>
<th>Commendable Performance</th>
<th>Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates competent teaching practice by:</td>
<td>Contributes significantly to Teaching and Learning by:</td>
<td>Provides leadership and influences the Teaching and Learning practices of others by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing appropriate outcomes-based course syllabi; incorporating the CSUMB Vision into Teaching and Learning;</td>
<td>- Demonstrating excellence in facilitating student learning;</td>
<td>- Demonstrating excellence in facilitating student learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Showing improvement in response to student and peer evaluations;</td>
<td>- Successfully adapting new or innovative teaching practices while developing or revising outcomes-based courses;</td>
<td>- Developing innovative ways of teaching subject matter to a variety of student populations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in Teaching and Learning professional development workshops;</td>
<td>- Refining and improving teaching practices based on self-reflection and assessment;</td>
<td>- Mentoring other faculty in Teaching and Learning activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serving as an effective academic advisor to students.</td>
<td>- Making substantial contributions to Teaching and Learning development workshops;</td>
<td>- Planning, organizing, and leading Teaching and Learning or curriculum development workshops;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective mentoring and guiding of diverse students toward curricular goals;</td>
<td>- Effective and compassionate mentoring of diverse students toward academic, professional, and personal goals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mentoring students in internship, or professional development, or research activities that enhance student learning;</td>
<td>- Developing exemplary internship or professional development programs that are emulated by others;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing peer review of teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities;</td>
<td>- Establishing frameworks for peer and student review of teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collaborating with faculty from other disciplines on Teaching and Learning activities.</td>
<td>- Collaborating with faculty from other disciplines and institutions on the development of Teaching and Learning materials and activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Presenting at national Teaching and Learning conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B - DISCOVERY, CREATION AND INTEGRATION

B.1 Definition

This scholarly activity constitutes academic work that confronts the unknown, seeks new understandings, and/or offers a new perspective on knowledge, through both individual and collaborative work. The faculty member’s contributions to Discovery, Creation and Integration shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (section B.3 below).

B.2 Examples of Activities in Discovery, Creation and Integration

Activities to consider in the evaluation of Discovery, Creation and Integration (DCI) may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Conducting and Disseminating Research

- Conducting research and inquiry;
- Writing books, monographs, textbooks;
- Writing book chapters;
- Editing books;
- Writing papers in refereed journals and conference proceedings;
- Presenting papers at professional meetings;
- Writing translations, abstracts, and reviews;
- Writing and submitting grant proposals;
- Receiving internal or extramural funding for DCI;
- Successfully involving students in ongoing research.

Producing Creative Works

- Writing poems, plays, essays, musical scores;
- Producing radio and television productions, films, and videos;
- Engaging in competitions, commissions, exhibitions;
- Directing and choreographing creative works;
- Singing, dancing, acting;
- Designing, arranging creative works;
- Creating and preparing software and electronically published documents;
- Developing electronic and print information resources that support the curriculum.

Disseminating Curriculum and Pedagogical Innovations

- Disseminating creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including publication or presentation at professional meetings and the development of software and other technologies that advance student learning;
- Writing grant proposals and receiving grants for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques;
- Participating in the supervision of student research or independent study, capstone projects, and the mentoring of students that leads to the presentation of research and other creative works.
B.3 Examples of Performance Standards and Ratings for Discovery, Creation and Integration

Departments are expected to establish clear expectations for activities and achievements that meet tenure and promotion standards for Discovery, Creation and Integration, and for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements. It is expected that faculty activities and achievements will increase in scope, significance and leadership with increasing rank. Therefore, two sets of performance and rating standards were developed: one set that apply to candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and a second set that apply to candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor or for tenure as a Full Professor. In all instances, the quality of the work performed is more important than the quantity of work identified. The following are examples, not an exhaustive list, of achievements that could provide evidence of performance at the different rating levels:

Table 2. Examples of Discovery, Creation, and Integration Performance Standards and Ratings for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Performance</th>
<th>Commendable Performance</th>
<th>Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiates and participates in creative and scholarly work by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progressing towards completion of peer reviewed publications or presentation of original research or creative activity;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presenting at local or regional conferences;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submitting applications/proposals for externally or internally funded grants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows an increasing level of involvement and achievement in creative and scholarly work by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disseminating original research or creative activity by peer reviewed publication or performance;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presenting at regional or national conferences;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Receiving internal or extramural support for Discovery, Creation, and Integration;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a sustained record of significant creative and scholarly achievement by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disseminating significant original research or creative activity by peer-reviewed publications or performances;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Giving invited presentations at regional or national conferences;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Receiving significant extramural support for Discovery, Creation, and Integration;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completing a significant scholarly endeavor such as a book or work of art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Examples of Discovery, Creation, and Integration Performance Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor or for Tenure with Rank of Full Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Performance</th>
<th>Commendable Performance</th>
<th>Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a sustained record of creative and scholarly achievement by:</td>
<td>Demonstrates a sustained record of significant creative and scholarly achievement by:</td>
<td>Demonstrates a continuous record of recognized leadership and significant achievement in creative or scholarly work by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disseminating original research or creative activity by peer reviewed publication or performance;</td>
<td>- Disseminating original research or creative activity by peer reviewed publication or performance that results in regional or national recognition;</td>
<td>- Receiving national or international recognition for sustained creative activity or for original and sustained research published in major peer-reviewed journals or books by recognized publishers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Giving scholarly presentations at regional conferences;</td>
<td>- Giving scholarly presentations at national conferences;</td>
<td>- Giving invited presentations at national or international conferences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Receiving internal or extramural support for Discovery, Creation, and Integration.</td>
<td>- Receiving sustained awards of internal and external grants.</td>
<td>- Receiving awards of major grants and carrying out sustained grant activity;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C - PROFESSIONAL APPLICATION

C.1 Definition

Faculty engaged in Professional Application use their academic training and experience to serve the profession and the public and contribute to the CSUMB Vision. The diversity of external needs, as well as faculty training and experience, leads to many different forms of Professional Application; however, Professional Application activities share all of the following distinguishing characteristics:

a. They contribute to the public welfare or the common good;
b. They call upon faculty members’ academic and/or professional expertise;
c. They directly address or respond to real-world needs; and
d. They support the CSUMB Vision.

The faculty member’s contributions to Professional Application shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (section C.3 below).

C.2 Examples of Activities in Professional Application

Activities to consider in the evaluation of Professional Application may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Practical Applications

- Making research understandable and usable in specific professional and applied settings such as in technology transfer activities;
- Developing and offering training workshops and other forums for the dissemination of teaching techniques or demonstration of novel teaching methods;
- Giving presentations or performances for the public;
- Providing services directly to the community;
- Testifying before legislative or congressional committees;
- Writing for popular and non-academic publications, including newsletters and magazines directed to agencies, professionals, or other specialized audiences;
- Writing peer reviews for scholarly publications and funding organizations.

Participating in Partnerships with Other Organizations

- Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, or civic agencies;
- Consulting with town, city, or county governments; schools, libraries, museums parks and other public institutions; groups; or individuals.

Developing New Products, Practices, Procedures and Services

- Providing public policy analysis, program evaluation, technical briefings for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies;
- Testing concepts and processes in real-world applications;
- Contributing to University development through corporate grants, donations of equipment, and other entrepreneurial activities;
- Creating working relationships with business and other community partners for the purpose of generating revenue for the University;
- Participating in entrepreneurial activities;
• Assisting the University and its partners in identifying future business opportunities for the University;
• Evaluating programs, policies, or personnel for agencies.

Contributing to the Profession

• Fulfilling editorial assignments with scholarly and professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media;
• Participating in scholarly conferences as panel organizer and/or discussant;
• Organizing and directing scholarly conferences, symposia, etc.
• Providing service to professional organizations.

C.3 Examples of Performance Standards and Ratings for Professional Application

Departments are expected to establish clear expectations for activities and achievements that meet tenure and promotion standards for Professional Application, and for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements. It is expected that faculty activities and achievements will increase in scope, significance, and leadership with increasing rank. Therefore, two sets of performance and rating standards where developed: one set that apply to candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and a second set that apply to candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor or tenure as a Full Professor. In all instances, the quality of the work performed is more important than the quantity of work identified. The following are examples, not an exhaustive list, of achievements that could provide evidence of performance at the different rating levels:

Table 4. Examples of Professional Application Performance Standards and Ratings for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Performance</th>
<th>Commendable Performance</th>
<th>Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becomes active in community and professional service by:</td>
<td>Contributes to community and professional service by:</td>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in community and professional service by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing assistance to local or regional communities, agencies, or organizations;</td>
<td>- Participating in planning or development of community programs and services;</td>
<td>- Taking a leadership role in development of public services or policies based on the faculty member's expertise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in programs or activities that show promise of enriching the professional, artistic or cultural life of the community;</td>
<td>- Participating in programs or activities that enrich the professional, artistic or cultural life of the community;</td>
<td>- Developing and participating in programs or activities that substantially enrich the professional, artistic or cultural life of the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifying potential collaborative partnerships with schools, industry, or other community agencies;</td>
<td>- Initiating collaborative partnerships with schools, industry, or other community agencies;</td>
<td>- Establishing and maintaining successful collaborative partnerships with schools, industry, or other community agencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in entrepreneurial or applied research activities that show promise of benefiting the University</td>
<td>- Planning or developing entrepreneurial or applied research activities that show promise of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and community.</td>
<td>benefiting the University and community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing service to professional associations;</td>
<td>- Contributing as an officer or other additional role with professional associations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Serving as peer reviewer for journals, granting agencies, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Developing and conducting entrepreneurial or applied research activities that benefit the University and community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing leadership as an officer or other capacity with professional associations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fulfilling an editorial role with scholarly or professional publications;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Performance</td>
<td>Commendable Performance</td>
<td>Outstanding Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to community and professional service by:</td>
<td>Receives recognition for substantial contributions to community and professional service through:</td>
<td>Receives recognition for substantial and sustained leadership in community and professional service through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in planning or development of community programs and services;</td>
<td>- Planning and developing significant public services or policies based on the faculty member's expertise;</td>
<td>- Leading the development of significant public services or policies based on the faculty member's expertise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in programs or activities that enrich the professional, artistic or cultural life of the community;</td>
<td>- Planning, developing and participating in programs or activities that enrich the professional, artistic or cultural life of the community;</td>
<td>- Developing and leading programs or activities that substantially enrich the professional, artistic or cultural life of the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initiating collaborative partnerships with schools, industry, or other community agencies;</td>
<td>- Establishing and maintaining successful collaborative partnerships with schools, industry, or other community agencies;</td>
<td>- Creating and sustaining successful major collaborative partnerships with schools, industry, or other community agencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning or developing entrepreneurial or applied research activities that show promise of benefiting the University and community.</td>
<td>- Developing and conducting entrepreneurial or applied research activities that benefit the University and community.</td>
<td>- Developing and conducting major entrepreneurial or applied research activities that substantially benefit the University and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in professional associations at the national level;</td>
<td>- Serving as an officer of a regional professional association;</td>
<td>- Serving as an officer of a national professional association or as president/chairman of a regional association;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serving as peer reviewer for journals, granting agencies, performances, etc.;</td>
<td>- Fulfilling editorial assignments;</td>
<td>- Serving as editor or associate editor of a scholarly or professional journal;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing leadership and guidance to faculty colleagues in research and creative activity endeavors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D - UNIVERSITY SERVICE

D.1 Definition

University Service includes service to the California State University, CSUMB, college and department. Faculty engaged in University Service contribute to the shared governance system and institutional development through a variety of activities including service on committees, task forces, policy advisory bodies, and the development and management of academic programs. The faculty member’s contributions to University Service shall be evaluated using the Performance Evaluation Standards for scholarly achievement (section D.3 below).

D.2 Examples of Activities in University Service

Activities to consider in the evaluation of University Service may include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Governance**

- Fulfilling administrative responsibilities at the California State University, CSUMB, college, and/or department level;
- Contributing to California State University, CSUMB, college, and/or department policy development and governance.

**Academic and Faculty Development**

- Mentoring other faculty members;
- Participating in faculty search committees;
- Organizing, directing and/or implementing faculty development activities;
- Establishing and maintaining effective, collaborative working relationships with colleagues and other University personnel;
- Participating in academic program development.

**Student Support and Curriculum Development**

- Advising student organizations;
- Contributing individually and collaboratively to the development and improvement of the CSUMB outcomes-based academic program;
- Developing outreach activities and programs that enhance the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;
- Developing and maintaining services and programs that support the curriculum.

**University-wide Services**

- Facilitating presentations and/or performances that integrate residential living and learning on campus;
- Collaborating throughout the campus community on projects, workshops, presentations, and other campus activities.
D.3 Examples of Performance Standards and Ratings for University Service

Departments are expected to establish clear expectations for activities and achievements that meet tenure and promotion standards for University Service, and for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements. It is expected that faculty activities and achievements will increase in scope, significance and leadership with increasing rank. Therefore, two sets of performance and rating standards where developed: one set that applies to candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and a second set that applies to candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor or tenure as a Full Professor. In all instances, the quality of the work performed is more important than the quantity of work identified. The following are examples, not an exhaustive list, of achievements that could provide evidence of performance at the different rating levels:

Table 6. Examples of University Service Performance Standards and Ratings for Tenure or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Performance</th>
<th>Commendable Performance</th>
<th>Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becomes involved in University Service by:</td>
<td>Contributes actively to the University by:</td>
<td>Provides campus leadership by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in the University’s shared governance, including membership on University-wide committees, task forces or advisory bodies;</td>
<td>- Effectively participating in the University’s system of shared governance, including contributions to University-wide committees, task forces or advisory bodies;</td>
<td>- Taking a leadership role in the University’s system of shared governance, including University-wide committees, task forces or advisory bodies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in the University’s service of the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;</td>
<td>- Helping to advance the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;</td>
<td>- Advancing the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaborating with colleagues within the department and across campus;</td>
<td>- Successfully collaborating on at least one project with colleagues from other learning communities;</td>
<td>- Developing and sustaining effective collaborative projects with colleagues across campus;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performing expected duties at the department and college levels.</td>
<td>- Effectively carrying out faculty responsibilities at the department and/or college levels;</td>
<td>- Developing and implementing effective department and college programs and policies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supporting student organizations.</td>
<td>- Sponsoring successful student organizations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective mentoring of other faculty;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creating and managing successful campus programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Performance</td>
<td>Commendable Performance</td>
<td>Outstanding Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes actively to the University by:</td>
<td>Provides substantial, sustained contributions to the University by:</td>
<td>Provides sustained leadership and significant contributions to the University by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participating in the University’s system of shared governance through effective</td>
<td>- Participating actively and effectively in the University’s system of shared governance</td>
<td>- Taking a substantial leadership role in the University’s system of shared governance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service on University-wide committees, task forces or advisory bodies;</td>
<td>- through sustained, increasingly significant service on faculty committees and in other</td>
<td>by serving as an officer of the faculty senate, chair of a senate committee, or chair of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helping to advance the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse and</td>
<td>roles;</td>
<td>an important special committee;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-traditional student body;</td>
<td>- Advancing the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-</td>
<td>- Developing programs and outreach activities that significantly enhance the University’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Successfully collaborating on at least one project with colleagues from other</td>
<td>traditional student body;</td>
<td>ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning communities;</td>
<td>- Successfully collaborating on more than one project with colleagues from other</td>
<td>- Organizing and promoting collaborative efforts with colleagues across learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effectively carrying out faculty responsibilities at the department and/or college</td>
<td>learning communities;</td>
<td>communities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels.</td>
<td>- Effectively participating in planning and development of programs or services at the</td>
<td>- Developing and implementing effective programs or services at the department, college,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>department and/or college levels;</td>
<td>and/or University wide levels;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing sponsorship or support of student organizations.</td>
<td>- Serving effectively in a leadership role with student organizations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Serving as a role model for faculty and providing effective mentoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E – GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**Abbreviated Portfolio for Periodic Evaluation**
Developed and submitted by the candidate for Periodic Evaluations. Part of the WPAF. Includes current curriculum vitae, self-appraisal, and all formal course evaluations since hiring or the last Full Retention Review. See section 4.2.1.

**Annual Faculty Workload Plan**
Developed by each tenure-track faculty member in consultation with the Chair. Includes individual workload responsibilities for upcoming academic year. See section 5.20.

**California Faculty Association (CFA)**
Exclusive collective bargaining representative of CSU faculty, including tenured faculty, probationary faculty, lecturers, librarians, counselors, and coaches.

**CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement**
Document which sets forth the current terms and conditions of employment for the CSU faculty. Includes contractual definitions not found in this Glossary.

**Department**
Academic units in which faculty participate as their main assignment. In most cases, refers to a degree-granting academic unit, but in certain cases a more flexible definition may be necessary. See section 1.00.

**Department Level RTP Committee**
Committee of three tenured faculty elected annually by all probationary and tenured faculty in each department. Charge includes review of the WPAFs of all candidates in the department seeking periodic evaluation, retention, tenure or promotion. See sections 7.00 and 7.20.

**External Evaluation**
Optional review by local, regional, national or international colleagues of selected recent achievements of the candidate, especially in the areas of Professional Application and Discovery, Creation, and Integration. May be requested by the candidate. See section 4.40.

**Faculty Affairs Committee**
Standing committee of the Academic Senate. Charge includes defining, reviewing, and recommending policies and procedures regarding RTP, faculty workload, and faculty merit awards.

**Faculty Development Plan**
Developed by each tenure-track faculty member in consultation with the Chair. Describes a three to five year program of professional development in the four areas of scholarship. See section 5.10.

**Four Areas of Scholarship**
Teaching and Learning. Discovery, Creation and Integration. Professional Application. University Service. See sections 2.00, 2.10, 2.20, 2.30, 2.40 and Appendices A, B, C, and D.
Integrative Narrative
Developed and submitted by the candidate for Full RTP Reviews. Three to five page preface to the Scholarly Portfolio. Synthesizes and interconnects the candidate’s achievements in the four areas of scholarship. See section 4.2.4.

Periodic Evaluation
Provides feedback and suggestions for improvement before the next year’s Full RTP Review. Requires less documentation than a full review and does not involve any Retention, Tenure or Promotion decisions. Scheduled for the Spring Semester of the first, third, and fifth years of service. See section 8.00.

Personnel Action File (PAF)
The official personnel file containing information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty member. Housed in the office of Academic Personnel. See section 4.50.

Scholarly Portfolio for Retention, Tenure and Promotion
Developed and submitted by the candidate for Full RTP Reviews. Part of the WPAF. Includes integrative narrative and sections providing documentation of relevant achievements in the four areas of scholarship. See section 4.2.2 and Appendices A, B, C, and D.

University RTP Committee
Standing committee of the Academic Senate. Charge includes review of the WPAFs of all candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion. See sections 7.00 and 7.10.

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)
File specifically developed for use in a given Periodic Evaluation or RTP review cycle. Includes the faculty member’s Scholarly Portfolio or Abbreviated Portfolio plus all written evaluations and recommendations and rebuttals submitted by the faculty member. See section 4.00.
Retention, Tenure and Promotion Procedures

Effective: August 2011

A. Sequence of Events for Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

1. The candidate shall prepare an Abbreviated Portfolio for Periodic Evaluation and deliver it to Academic Personnel no later than the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar for inclusion in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).

2. If the Chair is not on the Department RTP Committee, the Chair may submit a letter to the candidate’s WPAF commenting on contributions the candidate has made to the Department and feedback and suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year’s Full Review. This letter must be received in Academic Personnel no later than the date the WPAF officially closes, as indicated in the Academic Personnel Calendar. Academic Personnel sends a copy to the candidate.

3. The Department RTP Committee shall review the candidate’s WPAF and provide written feedback with suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year’s Full Review. The written feedback is provided to the candidate in memo format. The memo shall be signed by all members of the committee. The signed memo shall be forwarded to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel adds the original memo to the WPAF and forwards a copy to the Dean and the candidate.

4. The Department RTP Committee may meet with the candidate in order to provide verbal feedback and suggestions for improvement in preparation for the Full RTP Review. A meeting with all committee members may be difficult to schedule, therefore, one or two members can represent the group for the purposes of this meeting. While it may be preferable for a meeting to take place prior to the deadline, due to scheduling conflicts, a meeting may take place after that date. The memo must be submitted to Academic Personnel by the deadline whether a meeting has occurred or not. The ten (10) day rebuttal period begins when the candidate receives a copy of the evaluation from Academic Personnel, not from the date of the meeting.

5. The Dean shall review the candidate’s WPAF as well as the memo provided by the Department RTP Committee, and provide written feedback with suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year’s full review. The written feedback is provided to the candidate in memo format. The memo shall be signed by the Dean. The memo shall be forwarded to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel adds the original memo to the WPAF and sends copies to the candidate and the Department RTP Committee.

6. The Dean may meet with the candidate to provide verbal feedback and suggestions for improvement in preparation for the full RTP review. While it may be preferable for a meeting to take place prior to the deadline, due to scheduling conflicts, a meeting may take place after that date. The evaluation must be submitted to Academic Personnel by the deadline whether a meeting with the Dean has occurred or not. The ten (10) day rebuttal period begins when the candidate receives a copy of the evaluation from Academic Personnel, not from the date of the meeting.

7. The outcomes and goals identified through the Periodic Evaluation process shall be reflected in the faculty member’s next Faculty Development Plan and Annual Faculty Workload Plan (sections 5.10 and 5.20 of the policy).
B. Sequence of Events for Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Reviews

1. The Academic Personnel Calendar specifying dates for each event in the RTP process is prepared annually by Academic Personnel. The calendar is posted on the Academic Personnel website prior to the beginning of the Academic Year. Training is offered each year for RTP candidates with the goal of helping them prepare their portfolios. Candidates are encouraged to select mentors or consult with the Director of Teaching, Learning and Assessment for advice on preparation of the portfolio.

2. Election of the University RTP Committee through an Academic Senate process occurs early in the academic year followed by election of the Department RTP Committees.

3. Academic Personnel provides advance notice via e-mail to each faculty member before any pending review.

4. If the Department Chair is not on the Department or University RTP Committee, he/she may write a letter (optional) commenting on contributions the candidate has made to the Department and the candidate’s strengths and areas for improvement in each scholarship area. The letter must be submitted prior to the date the WPAF officially closes, as published in the Academic Personnel Calendar. Academic Personnel inserts the letter into the WPAF and sends a copy to the candidate.

5. The RTP portfolio is submitted to Academic Personnel no later than the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar. If a candidate originally scheduled for a Periodic Evaluation is asked to submit a Retention Review, the dates for submission are the same as 4th year retention candidates.

6. No later than the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar, the Department RTP Committee forwards their written recommendation to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel adds the original recommendation to the WPAF and sends copies to the candidate and the Dean.

7. The candidate may submit a written rebuttal to Academic Personnel no later than ten (10) days after receiving the written recommendation from the Department RTP Committee.

8. No later than the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar, the Dean forwards his/her written recommendation to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel adds the original recommendation to the WPAF and sends copies to the candidate, Department RTP Committee, and University RTP Committee.

9. The candidate may submit a written rebuttal to Academic Personnel no later than ten (10) days after receiving the written recommendation from the Dean.

10. No later than the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar, the University RTP Committee forwards their written recommendation to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel adds the original recommendation to the WPAF and sends copies to the candidate, all earlier reviewers, and the Provost.

11. The candidate may submit a written rebuttal to Academic Personnel no later than ten (10) days after receiving the written recommendation from the University RTP Committee.

12. No later than the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar, the Provost forwards a written recommendation to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel adds the original recommendation to the WPAF and sends copies to the candidate, all earlier reviewers, and the President.

13. The candidate may submit a written rebuttal to Academic Personnel no later than ten (10) days after receiving the written recommendation from the Provost.

14. The President will forward his/her final written decision to Academic Personnel. Academic Personnel ensures that the candidate and earlier reviewers receive copies no later than June 1st.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 29, 2011

SUBJECT: August 2011 Implementation of Revised Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

TO: All Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty

FROM: Dr. Kathryn Cruz-Uribe, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

This memorandum is issued to provide guidelines for faculty and administrators to use in the review of faculty in retention, tenure and promotion decisions. A revised Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy was passed by the Academic Senate on April 11, 2011. Here are the guidelines for implementation:

- Faculty members will be asked to make a choice that will govern their review process through reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.
- Faculty members will make their choice when they submit their file for review.
- Faculty members hired prior to Fall 2011 will have the choice to be reviewed under either the old (2006) or the new (2011) set of RTP policies.
- Faculty members whose hire date is Fall 2011 or later, including those with service credit, will be governed by the new (2011) RTP policies.
- Academic Personnel will provide a “FACULTY RTP POLICY SELECTION FORM” to be completed and attached to the RTP file when it is submitted to Academic Personnel.

If you have any questions regarding these implementation procedures, please contact Academic Personnel.

Cc: President Harrison

Deans

Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness