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1.000 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines and standards for the 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 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 CSU Monterey Bay 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 CSU Monterey Bay is framed by 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 CSU Monterey Bay 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 and procedures for the review and evaluation of faculty are 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 these policies and procedures, the university recognizes the uniqueness of individual faculty members, the departments of which they are a part, and their specific fields of knowledge. To help insure the flexibility needed to reflect this diversity, the main responsibility for developing criteria and standards for retention, tenure, and promotion resides in the departments. Thus, it is the responsibility of departments to establish clearly
the expectations for promotion and tenure consistent with the university criteria and standards as outlined in section 10.000. The departments are also responsible for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements. In the event that there are no existing department RTP criteria and standards, the University RTP criteria and standards will be applied.

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.

2.000 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.

2.100 Teaching and Learning

Contributions to Teaching and Learning involve facilitating student learning, critical thought, 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 CSU Monterey Bay. 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). 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.

2.200 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. 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).
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.

2.300 Professional Application

Faculty engaged in Professional Application use their academic training and experience to serve the public and contribute to the CSU Monterey Bay 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 CSU Monterey Bay vision.

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

2.400 University Service

University Service includes service to the discipline, department, college, and university. 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 (Appendix D, section D.3). Activities to consider in the evaluation of University Service may include, but are not limited to, those listed in Appendix D, section D.2.

3.000 Evaluation and Review Cycles for Probationary Faculty

3.100 Types of Evaluation

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 8.000. Periodic evaluation of temporary and tenured faculty shall be governed by separate policy.

b. Retention Review. Probationary faculty are normally initially 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 9.100.

c. Tenure Review. As described in section 9.200, a full Tenure Review is conducted to determine whether a probationary faculty member's work has satisfied university and
department 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 9.300 and 9.400.

3.200 Review Cycles

The normal schedule for retention and tenure reviews of probationary faculty is as follows:

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

A calendar showing the exact dates for the process shall be prepared annually by Academic
Personnel with the approval of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

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

a. Probationary faculty may be scheduled for a Full Retention review in
Year 3 or in Year 5 if the decision regarding such a review is noted in
the President's retention letter the preceding year.

b. Probationary faculty may be terminated at the end of Year 2 as a result
of the Full Retention review during Fall Semester of Year 2.

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.

d. Probationary faculty granted one year of credit towards tenure at the
time of initial appointment would enter the 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.

e. Probationary faculty granted two years of credit towards tenure at the
time of initial appointment would enter the normal retention review
cycle at Year 3.

f. Probationary faculty may request consideration for early tenure pursuant
to the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement and section 9.200 of
this policy.

g. A faculty unit employee's probationary period may be extended by the
President for an additional year when such faculty unit employee is on
Workers' Compensation, Industrial Disability Leave, Nonindustrial
Disability Leave, leave without pay, or paid sick leave for more than
one (1) semester or two (2) consecutive terms. Faculty taking a one-year leave of absence for pregnancy/birth or adoption shall be allowed to "stop the tenure clock" for a period of one year. (See CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 13.)

4.000 Working Personnel Action Files

The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is the file reviewed by faculty RTP committees and academic administrators during the retention, tenure, and promotion process. Retention, tenure, and promotion recommendations shall be based upon review of only those accomplishments in the four areas of scholarship that are described and documented in the faculty member’s WPAF. WPAF materials are deemed incorporated by reference into the Personnel Action File.

4.100 Contents of the Working Personnel Action File

The Working Personnel Action File (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 4.220);

b. Materials submitted by other persons prior to the submission deadline (section 4.300);

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

d. Any rebuttal statements or other responses submitted by the faculty member. Responses/rebuttals may not contain attachments. Responses/rebuttals from individuals other than the candidate (such as faculty or staff members, students, department peer review committee members, department chairs, the community, etc.) are not allowed. Therefore, responses from such individuals will not be added to the WPAF or considered by reviewing bodies;

e. Amendments made by reviewers following meetings with or rebuttal by candidates; and

f. All student evaluations for a period of up to six years prior to date of current review. The candidate may also include materials such as peer reviews of teaching, peer summaries of student evaluations of teaching, or instructor self-evaluations.

4.200 Portfolios of Scholarly Achievements

Portfolios make up the candidate-developed portion of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Faculty members scheduled for periodic evaluation shall prepare Abbreviated Portfolios, (section 4.210), whereas faculty who are subject to full retention, tenure, or promotion review shall prepare complete Scholarly Portfolios that describe and document
their accomplishments in each of the four scholarship areas (section 4.220). Verification of evidence in portfolios by RTP reviewers may occur at any level of the review process. If RTP reviewers find a discrepancy in the Portfolio, this will be documented in the recommendation. Portfolios may be submitted on CD, DVD or other portable media.

4.210 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 5.200);

d. Annual Faculty Workload Agreement for the past year (section 5.300);

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; and

f. Copies of letters and recommendations from the most recent full retention, tenure, or promotion review, when applicable.

The WPAF for a Periodic Evaluation may also include a letter of evaluation from the Department Chair, pursuant to section 8.000.

Academic Personnel shall place in the WPAF all student evaluations for a period of up six years prior to current review. The candidate may also include materials such as peer reviews of teaching, peer summaries of student evaluations of teaching, or instructor self-evaluations.

4.220 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;
- Annual Department Workload Plan (section 5.100)
- Faculty Development Plans relevant to the period under consideration, signed by candidate, Department Chair and College Dean (section 5.200);
- Annual Workload Plans for the period under consideration, signed by candidate, Department Chair and College Dean (section 5.300);
- Copies of syllabi from all classes taught since last full review;
- Department RTP Standards that have been officially approved by University Standards Committee; and
- Copies of evaluations and recommendations from the most recent periodic evaluation and full retention, tenure, or promotion 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 tenure-track or tenure position at CSUMB. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, documentation should be included from those years as well.

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.

4.221 Index and Prefatory Materials

The first section of the Scholarly Portfolio shall include an index of ALL materials in the portfolio, followed by prefatory documents that provide context for subsequent descriptions and documentation of scholarly achievements.

4.222 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 CSU Monterey Bay 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.

4.223 Portfolio Sections

The Scholarly Portfolio shall include four portfolio sections, each describing and documenting activities in one 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**, but shall be sufficient to make it possible to apply the performance standards as outlined in the Appendices. 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 of the individual faculty rather than on 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 CSU Monterey Bay Vision Statement.

### 4.300 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, materials relevant to the evaluation or review of a faculty member may be contributed to the file by any person, including, but not limited to, faculty, staff, students, administrators, community members, external evaluators, and other colleagues. Inclusion of materials relevant to evaluation or review does not require approval of candidate. Academic Personnel shall issue a public notice that the WPAF files are open to such submission. 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 seven days after the date the material is submitted, whichever is later.

### 4.400 External Letters of Evaluation

**Letters of Evaluation Solicited by Department Chair:** Objective evaluation of the quality and significance of scholarly achievement in each scholarship area is the cornerstone of CSU Monterey Bay's RTP policy and process. In some scholarship areas, a candidate's CSU Monterey Bay 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 CSU Monterey Bay community. The Department Chair or Department RTP Committee may solicit additional external evaluators to provide local, regional, national, and/or international perspectives on a candidate's achievements and activities. In such cases, the candidate may be asked to submit the names of potential external evaluators to the Department Chair. In accordance with the RTP Procedures, the Department
Chair is responsible for soliciting letters of evaluation from appropriate colleagues or community partners 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 she/he has first-hand knowledge of the candidate's scholarly work. External evaluators shall not be asked to conduct evaluations of the Candidate’s full portfolio based on RTP criteria.

4.500 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. Copies of the approved Department RTP standards that have been signed and approved by the University Standards Committee; and
e. Evaluation and recommendations from each level of review, and any responses submitted by the faculty member.

The Scholarly Portfolio shall be returned to the faculty member.

5.000 Workload and Faculty Development Plans

To ensure that the diverse needs of CSU Monterey Bay students, faculty, and other constituents are well served by the allocation of faculty time, departments shall develop annual workload plans for the department reflecting both long- and short-term needs. Additionally, individual Faculty Development Plans and Annual Faculty Workload Plans for each faculty member shall be developed. Workload plans and Faculty Development Plans must be signed by the Department Chair and candidate. It is expected that department instructional needs and other university and department priorities shall be reflected in the allocation of workload. The distribution of faculty time between different scholarship areas may vary considerably between faculty who are at different stages in their professional careers and between faculty with different interests, abilities and experiences.

Each Dean or other appropriate academic administrator shall ensure that the development of Annual Department Workload Plans is conducted in a consistent and timely manner. Annual Department Workload Plans, Faculty Development Plans, and Annual Faculty Workload Plans shall require written approval of the candidate, Department Chair and the College Dean.

5.100 Annual Department Workload Plan

In collaboration with department faculty, each Department Chair may develop an Annual Department Workload Plan that reflects the long-term goals and directions of the Five-year Academic Plan. Consideration shall be given to the curricular, research, and other scholarly activities of the department, the funding it receives, and the services it offers within the context of the Five-year Academic Plan. To meet these diverse needs, it is expected that the responsibilities of individual faculty within departments shall vary considerably. Overall workload balance for the department shall be the responsibility of the Department Chair, subject to review and approval of the College Dean or other appropriate academic administrator.
The Annual Department Workload Plan shall include the following elements:

a. A list of department and university priorities and goals. While this list shall not serve to restrict faculty activities, it shall act as a general guide for the allocation of faculty time;

b. A statement of the number of credits and FTE to be delivered by the department as a whole and by the probationary and tenured faculty in the department;

c. A statement of department-wide apportionment of faculty time and effort among:
   - Direct instruction, advising, and other Teaching and Learning activities;
   - Discovery, Creation, and Integration;
   - Professional Application; and
   - University Service, including service to the department.

5.200 Faculty Development Plan

Each tenure-track faculty member shall develop, in consultation with the Department 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, it shall reflect the strengths of the individual faculty and her/his professional development needs, and it shall be aligned with department, college, and university missions. Faculty are encouraged to discuss prior RTP recommendation or periodic evaluation reports with the Department Chair to identify strengths that should be recognized and areas that may benefit from mentoring and professional development. The approved Faculty Development Plan and the Department Workload Plan form the basis for the development of the Annual Faculty Workload Plan, and constitute a commitment by the department or college to provide necessary support for faculty development. The Faculty Development Plan shall be signed by the candidate, Department Chair and College Dean.

5.300 Annual Faculty Workload Plan

Once Annual Department Workload Plans and Faculty Development Plans have been completed, each faculty member shall meet with the Department 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 Annual Department Workload Plan and the individual’s Faculty Development Plan. The Annual Faculty Workload Plan shall be signed by the candidate, Department Chair and College Dean.

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 4.200).
6.000 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 review each candidate's WPAF carefully and objectively in light of the Department RTP Standards (when available) and the University RTP Standards.

Because the review process must be completed prior to the deadline specified in the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, all levels of review shall adhere strictly to all deadlines specified in the calendar distributed annually by Academic Personnel.

6.100 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 and the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, in conjunction with representatives from the Faculty Affairs Committee and the California Faculty Association.

6.200 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
- College Dean or other appropriate academic administrator
- University RTP Committee
- Provost

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 to deliberate and make recommendations. Any level of review may also request to review the candidate’s Personnel Action File 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 9.000 and Appendices A through D), and makes a formal recommendation regarding retention, tenure, or promotion. 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.
In accordance with section 9.000, performance ratings of Outstanding, Commendable, Adequate, or Less than Adequate shall be specified for each scholarship area, and only a single rating may be used for a given scholarship area. However, a minority report with different ratings may be attached to the majority recommendation. All recommendations shall be signed by the reviewers.

6.300 Role of Department Chairs in Reviews

In accordance with RTP Procedures, the responsibilities of Department Chairs in the RTP review process are as follows:

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

b. Facilitate the external evaluation process.

c. If the Department Chair is not on the Department RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee, the Department Chair may submit a letter to the candidate’s WPAF commenting on contributions the candidate has made to the department and her/his strengths and weaknesses in each scholarship area.

d. If the Department Chair is not on the Department or University RTP Committee and is submitting a letter to the candidate’s WPAF, the Department Chair may review the Candidates RTP portfolio in preparation for writing the letter.

7.000 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 himself or 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 himself or herself from the Election and Composition of the University RTP Committee. The faculty member must notify Academic Personnel before the election is scheduled of the desire 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 Election and Composition of the University RTP Committee. Faculty must notify Academic
Personnel before the election is scheduled of the desire 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 who are under consideration for promotion, or who have applied for a sabbatical are exempt from the Election and Composition of the University RTP Committee for that year.

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

7.100 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 7.000, or due to resignation from the university, the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with RTP Procedures.

7.200 Department RTP Committees

After the University RTP Committee has been elected, the 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. 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 7.000. 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.

In the event that a faculty member regularly teaches at least one course per year in another department, that individual may request that a tenured faculty member from that department serve as a fourth member of her or his Department RTP Committee.

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 7.000, 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.

If a temporary vacancy arises because one committee member has a conflict of interest or believes she/he cannot provide an unbiased recommendation regarding the candidate and therefore cannot participate in deliberations regarding that candidate, the remaining two committee members shall deliberate and make the recommendation. The committee member who recused her/himself from the deliberations should not sign the recommendation, but may participate in other reviews.

8.000 Periodic Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

As noted in section 3.200, the normal six-year review schedule for probationary faculty includes periodic evaluation in years when there is no full retention, tenure, or promotion review. Periodic evaluation is designed to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year's full retention, tenure, or promotion review. It does not involve any retention, promotion, or tenure 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 College Dean or other appropriate academic administrator. The Department RTP Committee shall review the candidate's Abbreviated Portfolio, may meet with the candidate, and shall provide written feedback with suggestions for improvement in preparation for the next year's full review. A signed copy of the feedback letter shall be forwarded to Academic Personnel by date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar.

The College Dean or other 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 review. A signed copy of the feedback letter shall be forwarded to Academic Personnel by date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar.

The written feedback letters from both levels of review shall become part of the candidate's PAF. If the Department Chair is not on the Department RTP Committee, the Department 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 review.

9.000 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 A.3, B.3, C.3, and D.3).

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

9.100 Retention

The purpose of the probationary period is to allow time for the candidate to develop her/his scholarship and to demonstrate that her/his 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 3.200). 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 2.000 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 toward 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.

9.200 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, her/his 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 shall not normally be considered until the candidate has completed at least one full retention review in accordance with section 3.200, after which s/he may request consideration for early tenure. The length of the candidate's record shall be sufficient (at CSU Monterey
Bay 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. 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 (Appendix A, section A.3) 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>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.300 Promotion to Associate Professor

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. 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 s/he 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.
To qualify for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member shall demonstrate that s/he 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 Working Personnel Action File 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.

9.400 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. Probationary Associate Professors shall not be promoted to Full Professor unless they are selected for the simultaneous award of tenure. 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 s/he 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.

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>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>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10.000 Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion Standards

For the purposes of this document "department" refers to academic units in which faculty participate as their main assignment. In most cases, "department" shall refer to a degree-granting academic unit, but in certain cases a more flexible definition may be necessary.

Each department shall develop a written set of retention, tenure, and promotion standards of performance and evaluation criteria (Department RTP Standards) that shall be used to assess faculty activities that contribute to professional growth, department goals, and the university mission. Department Standards shall remain sufficiently flexible to allow for and recognize individual uniqueness and creativity in performance. Department RTP Standards shall not attempt to make all faculty members perform alike, though commensurate quality shall be expected for equivalent promotions and for tenure considerations. The review and recommendation of faculty performance shall take into account the proportionate distribution of individual annual workload allocation and the quality of performance. Tenure-track personnel decisions shall be controlled by the standards and criteria outlined in this university policy until departments have an approved set of Department RTP Standards, consistent with university-wide criteria and standards.

10.100 Department Standards Development Guidelines

Each department shall have the option to develop specific standards and criteria for the evaluation of its tenure-track faculty members which must be officially approved by the University Standards Committee according to the RTP Procedures. These Department RTP Standards shall be controlling documents in personnel decisions regarding retention, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track personnel. Department RTP Standards shall not conflict with university policy or the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, and may not require lower substantive levels of performance than those required by university policy. In the event that the department does not have approved Department RTP Standards, the University RTP Standards will be in effect. Department RTP Standards shall indicate all of the following:

a. Specific standards of performance and evaluation criteria that shall be used in making recommendations in the retention, tenure, and promotion process;
b. Examples of specific activities expected for retention, tenure, and promotion that fall under the categories of Teaching and Learning; Discovery, Creation and Integration; Professional Application; and University Service (although examples of activities should be as thorough as possible, they should not be described as exclusive);

c. Examples of achievement expected for retention, tenure, and promotion that fall under the categories of Teaching and Learning; Discovery, Creation and Integration; Professional Application; and University Service. Examples of achievement should be as thorough as possible, but should not be considered exclusive or exhaustive;

d. Requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements; and

e. The performance standards and evaluation criteria used to judge the level of performance necessary for early tenure and early promotion recommendations.

11.000 Continuous Renewal

This policy shall be assessed in four years from its effective date to determine its effectiveness and appropriateness. This policy may be assessed before that time to reflect substantive changes as a result of CSU Monterey Bay's personnel and infrastructure.

s/ Diane Cordero de Noriega  
Interim President or designee

Effective Date: June 12, 2006

Certification of Process

Reviewed by: Faculty Affairs Committee, RTP Policy Revision Group, Policy Facilitation Team, Academic Senate, Academic Personnel, Academic Senate Executive Committee, CSU Legal, Provost

Appendix A-E - Definitions, Examples of Activities, and Performance Standards and Ratings under each of the four Areas of Scholarship. Also contains a Glossary of terms.

Once effective (June 12, 2006), this policy supersedes the Retention Tenure and Promotion Policy dated July 1, 2002.