

**Findings from the First Round of RTP C&S Review 2014-2018 and Issues to  
Discuss and Address in the next Round Review  
2018-05-14**

## Executive Summary

In 2014 in accordance with Appendix J, the Committee on Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Criteria and Standards was tasked by the University Senate with reviewing departmental RTP standards. The Committee's role is to provide guidance for departments in clarifying their RTP standards for RTP candidates, for personnel committees, and for administrators. Another goal is to identify areas in which departments' proposed RTP standards fall outside the range of university-wide criteria and standards.

The RTP C&S Committee has been meeting to review Department RTP Standards for five years. We have nearly completed one full cycle of review. Toward the end of our review, we have made cross department comparisons of RTP standards and compiled what we have learned in the process. We present our findings here. There are three categories of recommendations for the next round of review:

1. **Outliers in Currently Approved Department RTP Standards Recommended for Revision:**
  - Standards that do not have separate standards for promotion to associate and professor
  - Standards that lack quantitative standards
  - Standards that are unnecessarily complicated (e.g. point counting systems)
  - Standards that allow promotion with tenure without a peer reviewed publication, or discipline appropriate dissemination, or completing an equivalent creative achievement in the arts.
  
2. **Recommendations for Approaches to Evaluations that have proven to be Successful across Departments**
  - **Recommendations for Evaluating Teaching:**  
Many departments rely entirely on Appendix J, which gives limited guidance. We recommend that departments define essential and desired activities and develop guidelines as to what constitutes evidence of excellence in teaching using these activities.
  - **Recommendations for Evaluating Scholarship:**  
We recommend two of the current approaches departments are using.

- Recommendations for Evaluating Service:  
We recommend two of the current approaches departments are using.
3. Issues to be addressed and resolved, with recommendations made to departments before the next round of review
- Essential Functions for Faculty: We recommend that the Faculty Affairs Committee put forth a resolution to change Appendix J to include a standard (brief) description of collateral duties faculty are to perform as part of their job that are not to be counted separately as service
  - Scenarios for Early Tenure and Counting Service Credit Years: We recommend that the Faculty Affairs Committee put forth a resolution to change Appendix J to clearly address the issue of early tenure and promotion.
  - Student Evaluations are a key component of assessing teaching: We recommend encouraging faculty to set aside time for in-class evaluations

#### 4. Conclusions and Next Steps

We believe that the next round of review for departmental RTP criteria and standards will proceed more effectively, if the RTP C&S Committee recommendations are implemented. We presented our recommendations to the University Faculty Personnel Committee in April 2018 and plan to present them to Faculty Affairs in August, 2018. We propose to disseminate this report widely by meeting with department chairs, IUPC's and college personnel committees in Fall 2018 before the next review cycle begins in Spring 2019.

## **Introduction**

In 2014 in accordance with Appendix J, the Committee on Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Criteria and Standards was tasked by the University Senate with reviewing departmental RTP standards. The Committee's role is to provide guidance for departments in clarifying their RTP standards for RTP candidates, for personnel committees, and for administrators. Another goal is to identify areas in which departments' proposed RTP standards fall outside the range of university-wide criteria and standards.

The RTP C&S Committee has been meeting to review Department RTP Standards for five years<sup>1</sup>. We have nearly completed one full cycle of review. Toward the end of our review, we have made cross department comparisons of RTP standards and compiled what we have learned in the process. We present our findings here. There are three categories of recommendations for the next round of review.

### **1. Outliers in the Currently Approved Department Standards that should be revised**

Some department standards fall outside the range of university-wide criteria and standards and should be revised in the next cycle.

#### **1.1 Some departments do not have separate standards for promotion to Associate and Professor.**

Recommendation: Revise these in next round.

#### **1.2 Some Departments lack quantitative standards**

Recommendation: Revise these in next round.

---

<sup>1</sup> Current members: Yvonne Everett and Clair Knox, Co-Chairs, Lisa Bond-Maupin, Jennifer Eichstedt, Benjamin Marschke, Manohar Singh, Steve Smith, Robert Zoellner. Past members: Kenneth Ayoob, Richard Boone, Mark Hemphill-Haley, Nicole Jean-Hill, Chris Hopper, John Lee, Kris Patzloff, Sondra Schwetman, Noah Zerbe. Ex-officio: Colleen Mullery

**1.3 Some Standards are unnecessarily complicated** (for example complex point based counting systems)

Recommendation: Revise these in next round.

**1.4 It should not be possible to be promoted with tenure without publishing in a peer-reviewed format, or discipline appropriate dissemination, or completing an equivalent creative achievement in the arts.** It is important that departments review their RTP standards for clear minimum expectations: What is the minimum required to achieve tenure, and is this what the department intends?

Recommendation: Revise these in next round.

## **2. Recommendations for Approaches to Evaluations that have proven to be Successful across Departments**

Departments have chosen to use several approaches to evaluating teaching, scholarship and service in the RTP process. We have compared these approaches across all university departments and recommend models that are widely used across colleges and transparent for candidates and all levels of subsequent review.

### **2.1 Recommendations for Evaluating Teaching**

Currently 11 departments rely entirely or predominantly on Appendix J.

Of those who have written guidelines with regard to teaching, these typically include at least some of the following elements:

- A minimum average score on anonymous student evaluations. Any average scores below this minimum must be addressed in the PDS: an explanation and/or plan for improvement is expected. Minimum expected mean scores fall in the range 3.5 to 4.0;
- Specification of engagement in activities supportive of teaching such as faculty development related to teaching (eight departments have a similar template in this regard);
- A list of specific teaching related activities regarded as essential to the discipline or unique to the department, such as instructing/mentoring students with regard to scholarship activities, involving students in research projects, laboratory work, service learning, participation in performances, etc.;
- A list of “essential activities,” all of which must be accomplished; and a list of measures of “excellence,” some of which must be accomplished;
- A distinction between evidence of teaching excellence appropriate for promotion to Associate with tenure vs. promotion to “full” Professor, such as leadership activities, including mentoring of other faculty, assessment, pedagogical innovations, curricular changes, team-teaching, etc.

#### **Recommendations:**

Departments develop guidelines with regard to what constitutes evidence of excellent teaching. In these guidelines departments should:

1. Stipulate that collegial letters will document multiple observations over time and address the use of specific teaching strategies. Departments should decide (in consultation with the respective dean) how many letters are sufficient and what to do if there is an

insufficient number of letters (for whatever reason). Letters should speak to any criteria listed in the department's teaching standards that may be available to the observer.

2. Describe appropriate pedagogies that support multimethod instruction appropriate to the discipline. Departments should specify how faculty should engage with these pedagogies (similar to what is being done in assessing scholarship):
  - Examples include: providing constructive feedback in studio, lab or practicum settings; designing and implementing collaborative applied projects; providing informative, current direct instruction; leading inquiry activities; and/or facilitating open-ended critical discussion.
3. Create a list of appropriate activities that support university-wide goals for increasing inclusivity and infusing an equity framework in teaching.
  - Examples include: crafting curricula that integrate the voices and analyses of diverse groups of people in substantive ways; and/or using discussion practices that draw on multiple traditions of sharing information and learning.
4. Require that the PDS expand upon and explain efforts to improve teaching effectiveness, as documented in the WPAF.
5. Address the role of, expectations for, and assessment of student advising and mentoring.
6. Distinguish between specific teaching activities and appropriate supportive activities so that these may be addressed distinctly in the WPAF. Candidates should indicate in the PDS how supporting activities were useful and have influenced their teaching or other work with students.
  - Examples include: Participation in professional development activities and/or use of resources on or off campus; development of teaching materials; development and/or revising of curriculum outcomes and assessment methodologies; indicators of availability to students for advising; and/or ancillary instruction or other support.
7. Distinguish between evidence of teaching excellence appropriate for tenure and promotion to associate vs. promotion to "full" Professor. Expectations for promotion to "full" Professor should include maintaining and/or improving teaching evaluations over time as well as a list of possible additional items.
  - Examples include: Teaching a variety of courses relevant to the discipline, program and area of the candidate's expertise – expanding their repertoire; mentoring other faculty; developing, having approved and implementing new courses, pedagogies, curriculum or programs of study; presenting in on-campus professional development meetings; sharing resources, strategies and/or materials with fellow faculty; and/or receiving a teaching award.

## **2.2 Recommendations for Evaluating Scholarship**

A comparison of department RTP expectations for scholarship reveals that departments apply several approaches to evaluate scholarship. We have grouped these approaches as follows into approaches we recommend and those we do not recommend.

**2.2.1 Contributions categorized into two groups, Category I (A) and Category II (B), and a certain number of contributions from each category is expected for each level of**

**assessment:** Category I typically focuses on peer reviewed publications or discipline appropriate dissemination and extramural funding, and Category II includes other scholarly activities less likely to be peer reviewed, such as technical reports and conference presentations. This is the most common approach to evaluating scholarship. Many departments use this approach. (See Figure 1 appended).

Departments using this Category I&II classification are fairly consistent in their groupings and assessment of the amount of work required. There is a greater similarity within colleges (they have reviewed and incorporated each other's approaches) than between colleges. Departments using this approach agree on peer reviewed publications and funded extramural grants as Category I. For Category II non-peer reviewed activities, where dissemination is part of the design, curriculum development counts (Boyers model is more frequently referred to in AHSS than in the other colleges). Departments tend to agree on the amount of work required with some exceptions (e.g. funded vs. unfunded extramural grants). CNRS programs with graduate students count chairing graduate theses as scholarship while AHSS and CPS programs count them as service.

Recommended: This two category approach is a transparent method that seems to apply well across disciplines.

**2.2.2 Mixed Quantitative and Qualitative Breadth:** Some departments evaluated scholarship through escalating or additive quantitative expectations for discipline appropriate dissemination and increasing expectations for the quality of scholarship from minimum essential to excellent. These departments often reference all or parts of the Boyers dimensions of scholarship. For example, "*the candidate must meet all 6 criteria for "minimum essential". For "good" the candidate must meet minimum essential and meet an additional four from among seven criteria*" (Forestry and Wildland Sciences); or "*giving presentations at state, national and*

*international venues is good; giving invited presentations and keynote addresses is excellent”*  
(Child Development).

Recommended: This approach is a reasonably transparent method that seems to apply well across disciplines. By adding a breadth requirement, it ensures that faculty are engaging in a range of activities.

**2.2.3 Departments with Scholarship and Creative Activities** A number of departments value both peer reviewed publications and peer reviewed creative activities. They quantify the number of contributions in categories reflecting peer reviewed publications and professional activities similar to Category I & II and value increasing levels of recognition from local, to regional, national and international audiences. Creative Activities are assessed based on levels of peer review; the competitiveness of exhibitions or performances and the like.

Recommended: Departments using this approach have argued convincingly that this approach works well for them. They have worked to make the process transparent for reviewers outside their departments.

**2.2.4 Departments using purely qualitative measures of evaluation and lacking quantitative distinctions**

Not Recommended

**2.2.5 Point Systems** Several departments have developed point systems as a basis for evaluating scholarship. Points may be earned in a range of categories and caps on the number of points that may count from a given category are used to ensure breadth of activities. For example, a maximum of one point may count for acquiring funding from internal, campus based sources, while extramural funding may earn up to four points. These approaches are not always internally consistent and logical, they are also idiosyncratic, requiring higher level review committees to learn a new metric for each case.

Not Recommended

**2.2.6 Differentiated lists** One department generated a ranked list of acceptable scholarship activities. They then used the number of activities from the list (including emphasis placed on the top activities on the list e.g. peer reviewed publications) to differentiate between minimum essential, good and excellent scholarship. The system may work for this department but is narrow in its range of definitions of scholarship and is an outlier. It could easily be adapted to the two category system that most departments use.

Not Recommended

### **2.3 Recommendations for Assessing Service based on a Typology of Departmental RTP Standard Assessment of Service**

Departments are using each other's guidelines as models, so that there are certain "flavors" or "types" of RTP standards emerging. One way of categorizing these is:

**2.3.1 Service assessed in terms of number of activities from categories of essential, breadth/quality and/or leadership** with increasing numbers of activities and demonstration of leadership required for promotion from Associate to "full" Professor. 14 Departments are currently using this approach.

Recommended: This approach addresses both the quality and the amount of service performed.

**2.3.2 Combination of categories defined in terms of quantity, quality and breadth assessed in hours.**

Recommended: This approach addresses both the quality or impact of the service and the amount of service performed.

**2.3.2 Service assessed in categories (light duty vs. sustained duties / leadership) measured in service hours** with some variation in the number of hours required to meet minimum essential, good or excellent. Hours expected generally increase from promotion to Associate to promotion to "full" Professor.

Consider Revising: Departments might consider that measuring service in terms of hours alone may not address the quality of the service effort.

**2.3.4 Point counting systems with some activities worth more points than others** (e.g. light duty vs. sustained duties vs. leadership) and a set number of points required for minimum essential, good and excellent for each level of rank. These are unnecessarily complex. They require the higher level reviewing bodies to apply a different metric for each department. In some cases departments themselves don't use the system they have set up.

Not Recommended

**2.3.5 Categories of service and activities but no clear way to quantify activities, instead use of vague terms like “effectively”, “actively” participate in a given activity.** This approach is the most similar to past approaches and would likely not be approved in the next cycle.

Not Recommended

Factors that make the comparison more complex include the variation in how departments define assumed duties of the job; e.g. participating in faculty meetings which is often counted as “minimum essential” service. (See Recommendation 3.1 Essential Functions for Faculty)

### **3. Issues to be addressed and resolved, with recommendations made to departments before the next round of review**

There are a number of issues that remain unresolved that should be clarified before the next round of review. Having a clear set of recommendations will make it easier for departments to update their RTP Standards in ways that make them clearer for candidates and all subsequent levels of review.

#### **3.1. Essential Functions for Faculty**

Recommendation: We recommend that the Faculty Affairs Committee put forth a resolution to change Appendix J to include a standard (brief) description of collateral duties faculty are to perform as part of their job that are not to be counted separately as service. The following language is typical of what some departments are using:

Tenure track faculty are expected to carry out normal professional duties, such as regularly attending convocation, commencement, and department meetings, majors meetings, writing peer evaluations for colleagues and letters of reference for students, and working collaboratively with colleagues. These activities are not classified as “service activities” but as part of faculty’s collateral responsibilities. Candidates who consistently fail to carry out these duties shall not receive a positive recommendation for tenure/promotion.

#### **3.2 Scenarios for Early Tenure and Counting Service Credit Years**

Recommendation: We recommend that the Faculty Affairs Committee put forth a resolution to change Appendix J to clearly address the issue of early tenure and promotion. HSU, along with CSU San Diego and San Marcos, are the only CSUs that do not address the expectations around early tenure except to indicate that candidates must meet the regular requirements for tenure. Other CSUs indicate that early tenure is exceptional and reserved for truly outstanding records of accomplishment.<sup>2</sup>

Possible language for inclusion in Appendix J: “The normal period of review for tenure and promotion is six years (including service credit). Any deviation from this standard is

---

<sup>2</sup>A summary of examples from other CSUs is available from Jennifer Eichstedt.

unusual and shall require such an exceptionally strong profile of performance in all aspects of tenure criteria or other factors as to make the case unambiguously compelling. To be successful a candidate's dossier must contain evidence of extraordinary achievement or recognition beyond the normal expectations for tenure. The earlier a candidate applies, the harder it may be to meet this standard.” (CSU East Bay - please see Table 1)

3.2.1 Faculty should not rest on activities completed during service credit years. Appendix J emphasizes the importance of RTP candidates demonstrating sustained effort over the course of the review period and into the future.

3.2.2 With regard to assessing teaching for someone with service credit who may come up for tenure after a short time, Appendix J IV.F.5 currently says:

The President may award tenure to a faculty unit employee before the normal (6) year probationary period (13.3, 13.19) if the following criteria are met:

- a) Such consideration is initiated by the faculty unit employee's department or equivalent unit or by the faculty member with the knowledge of his/her department or unit.
- b) The faculty unit employee demonstrates clear evidence that s/he has achieved, before the normal probationary period, a record of accomplishment that meets the standards and level of performance for tenure indicated in this appendix.
- c) **The length and breadth of the faculty unit employee's service are sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue.**

We propose the following approach to "Length and Breadth." As illustrated by the accompanying chart (Figure 3), to satisfy the "length and breadth" of service for early tenure requires the demonstration of excellence in teaching for at least three academic years (six academic semesters). Thus, an application for early tenure and promotion cannot be made prior to the beginning of the fourth year in residence at HSU.

**3.3 Student evaluations** are a key component of assessing teaching. Moving to online evaluations has reduced the participation in evaluations. There seems to be an increase in students' use of harassing language toward faculty in evaluations

Recommendation: Encourage faculty to set aside time for in-class evaluations. Students can complete them on their phones or laptops. (Laptops can also be checked out from the library).

**3.4 Some CNRS departments include chairing Master's theses as Category I scholarship** while AHSS and CPS count this as service.

Recommendation: Discuss

**3.5 Quantifying contributions clearly:** Number of items per year (n or n-1) vs. number of items for the overall period.

Recommendation: "Per year" is difficult for new faculty to meet. Suggest "average n per years in residence"

## **4. Conclusions and Next Steps**

We believe that the next round of review for departmental RTP criteria and standards will proceed more effectively, if the RTP C&S Committee recommendations are implemented. We presented our recommendations to the University Faculty Personnel Committee in April 2018 and plan to present them to Faculty Affairs in August, 2018. We propose to disseminate this report widely by meeting with department chairs, IUPC's and college personnel committees in Fall 2018 before the next review cycle begins in Spring 2019.

**Figure 1: Spreadsheet Comparison of Scholarship Categories I and II** (print separately in landscape view).

Figure 1 Categories of Contributions in Research and Scholarly Activities Listed by Departments

CATEGORIES OF CONTRIBUTIONS IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES LISTED BY DEPARTMENTS (BY SIMILARITY)														
Department:	viron. Sci. & Maloiogical Scis	heries Bio/ldlife Man	lathematio	olitic	ommunicatio	nglish	1 Studie	at. Amer. Studi	usines	onomic	Psychology	Philosophy	World Lang. & Cuk.	(relative merit)
<b>CATEGORY ONE CONTRIBUTIONS</b>														
Peer-reviewed publications	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	G/EX
Funded extramural research grants	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Unfunded extramural research grants		X	X	X										
Completed graduate theses	X	X	X	X	X									
Extramural meeting presentations						X	X	X	X	X		X		
Shaping core curriculum/designing new courses						X	X	X	X					G/EX
Curating/organizing a national/international conference						X	X	X	X					EX
Curating/organizing a local/regional conference						X				X				
Presentation/performance of original creative work								X						G/EX
Applied research as ongoing activities	X													
<b>CATEGORY TWO CONTRIBUTIONS</b>														
Other non-peer-reviewed publications	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	ME
Funded intramural grants	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	G
Extramural meeting presentations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	ME/G
Unfunded extramural research grants	X				X	X			X	X	X			G/EX
Software and instructional materials	X	X	X	X	X			X	X					G/EX
Technical reports	X	X	X	X	X						X			G/EX
Publishing a non-scholarly publication						X	X	X		X				G
Academic seminars	X	X	X	X	X									
Unfunded intramural grants submitted		X			X									
Other unpublished materials	X	X	X	X	X					X				
Scholarly resource to non-academic organization						X	X	X	X	X		X		G/EX
Presentation/performance of original creative work							X	X						
Extramural meeting proceedings				X						X				
Curating/organizing a local/regional conference							X	X	X					G
Funded extramural research grants											X		X	
Active involvement of students in scholarship											X			
Curating/organizing a national/international conference								X						
External grant submission														ME

Comparisons Between Departments RTP Standards for Scholarship

- Departments that use Category I and Category II
  - o Overall consistent
  - o Greater similarity within colleges (they copied from one another)
  - o Everyone agrees on peer reviewed publications and funded extramural grants as Category I; For Category II non-peer reviewed publications;
  - o If dissemination is part of the design – curriculum development counts (Boyers model stronger in AHSS than in the other colleges).
  - o Departments tend to agree on the amount of work required with some exceptions (e.g. funded vs. unfunded extramural grants,
  - o CNRS programs with graduate students count chairing graduate theses as scholarship; AHSS programs count them as service

This approach is a transparent method that seems to apply well across disciplines

**Table 1: CSU CAMPUSES AND EARLY TENURE LANGUAGE**

School	Specifies time period	Special language	Language
<b>SCHOOLS THAT HAVE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE</b>			
<b><u>BAKERSFIELD</u></b>	Normal 6 years	YES	record of <b>exceptional performance</b> in teaching (for counselors, exceptional performance in counseling) and scholarly/creative activities and of acceptable performance in professionally related service
<b><u>CHICO</u></b>	Normal 6 years	YES	consideration of early tenure is <b>not the normal pattern</b> , a <i>recommendation</i> for early tenure <b>must be accompanied by its justification as a special case</b>
<b><u>CHANNEL ISLANDS</u></b>	Normal 6 years	YES	Early tenure and promotion should be considered only <b>in the case of an exceptionally strong record</b> . (ELABORATES IN LANGUAGE)
<b><u>DOMINGUEZ HILLS</u></b>	Normal 6 years	YES	...early promotion and/or tenure are awarded <b>only in unusually meritorious cases...</b> There is no disadvantage to requesting evaluation for early promotion and/or tenure, <b>other than that more stringent criteria must be met for a positive award decision</b> (see criteria listed below).
<b><u>EAST BAY</u></b>	Normal 6 years	YES	<b>Any deviation from this standard is unusual and shall require such an unusually strong profile of</b>

			<b>performance</b> in all aspects of tenure criteria or other factors as to make the case unambiguously compelling. .... a candidate's dossier <b>must contain evidence of extraordinary achievement or recognition beyond the normal expectations for tenure.</b> The earlier a candidate applies, the harder it may be to meet this standard.
<b><u>FRESNO</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	Faculty members seeking early tenure must provide <b>evidence of sustained excellent performance in all three areas:</b> Scholarship of Teaching; The Scholarship of Application, Integration, and Discovery; and university and community service
<b><u>FULLERTON</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	“Early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that <b>performance in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceed the expectations for tenure</b> stated in the approved Department Personnel Standards...
<b><u>LONG BEACH</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	Standards for early tenure and/or promotion <b>are significantly higher</b> than those standards applied in a normal timeline
<b><u>LOS ANGELES</u></b>		YES	faculty member applying for <i>early</i> tenure or <i>early</i> promotion to associate professor may be recommended for that

			action only if found to have a <b>record of sustained outstanding performance</b> in categories A and B, "educational performance" and "professional achievement," and at least satisfactory performance in category C, "contributions to the University."
<b>MONTEREY BAY</b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	<b>Early tenure and early promotion are not the norm and are considered only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons.</b>
<b>NORTHRIDGE</b>	DEPT LEVEL – MOST SAY 6 YEARS	YES	Most say that normal period of review is 6 years and that early tenure and promotion is reserved for those candidates whose achievements in teaching, research and service are <b>exceptional.</b>
<b><u>CAL POLY POMONA</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	must provide <b>evidence of outstanding performance</b> in each of the following areas: Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Professional growth and achievement</li> <li>● Service to the University and community</li> <li>● Results of the student evaluation program</li> <li>● Specific criteria outlined in the Campus Administrative Policy and in college or department personnel policies.</li> </ul>

<b><u>SACRAMENTO</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	Early tenure is granted for attaining a professional standard that includes activities which bring <b>widespread recognition to the individual and the university from the academic community</b> and/or the general public. <b>Early tenure is not a right.</b>
<b><u>SAN BERNADINO</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES  Say have to meet all requirements as for normal tenure, and then outstanding and sustained record	Faculty members who request early tenure shall be considered to be at the end of the normal probationary period and be evaluated the same as any faculty requesting tenure or promotion. In addition, faculty members requesting early tenure shall have <b>demonstrated an outstanding and sustained record of involvement and achievement</b> , on this campus (see extended notes)
<b><u>SAN FRANCISCO</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEAR	YES  Will be evaluated according to all the criteria for tenure and then notes "special circumstances.."	The President <b>in special circumstances</b> may award tenure earlier than the normal six-year probationary period. ...  <b>Departments</b> should include, in their departmental RTP criteria, clear guidelines as to <b>what might constitute the special circumstances</b> for a candidate to be

			recommended for early tenure.
<b><u>SAN JOSE</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	Favorable early decisions <b>require a significantly higher level of achievement</b> than a favorable decision after the normal period of review
<b><u>SAN LUIS OBISPO</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES	In addition to meeting department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure, an applicant for early tenure <b>must provide evidence of outstanding performance</b> in each of the following performance areas: teaching or library effectiveness, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University and community.
<b><u>SONOMA</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	YES, NOT DETAILED	<b>In the case of an outstanding candidate, a deviation from the normal six-year probationary period shall be the decision of the President .....</b>  a faculty member with <b>an exceptional record</b> , with a positive recommendation from the department RTP committee, may be considered for promotion earlier than normal.
<b>MIXED INFORMATION</b>			
<b><u>MARITIME</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	MIXED	May request early consideration based on their belief that have

			achieved the levels of excellence required for the award of tenure.... <b>Under extraordinary circumstances a candidate may apply for early promotion</b> to the next higher rank.
<b><u>NO STATED DIFFERENCE FOR EARLY TENURE</u></b>			
<b><u>SAN MARCOS</u></b>	6 YEARS, AND THEN SPECIFIES NORMAL YEAR FOR "EARLY TENURE" (SEE NOTES)	<b>NOT DIFFERENT</b>	requires clear evidence that the Candidate has a record of achievement at CSUSM combined with a record of achievement for which service credit was awarded that fulfills all criteria for promotion or tenure as specified in University, College/Library/School, and Department standards
<b><u>SAN DIEGO</u></b>	NORMAL 6 YEARS	<b>NOT DIFFERENT</b>	may request consideration for tenure earlier than the sixth year if the faculty employee believes he or she has satisfied the criteria for tenure.
<b><u>UNABLE TO LOCATE INFORMATION</u></b>			
<b><u>STANISLAUS</u></b>	CAN'T FIND INFO		CAN'T FIND INFO

1. Out of 22 other campuses, can't find information for 1 campus – Stanislaus
2. Of the 21 campuses that have information, besides Humboldt, only **TWO don't specify additional criteria** for early tenure besides meeting regular criteria for tenure/promotion (San Marcos and San Diego).
3. **1 other school**, have somewhat ambiguous language (Maritime)
4. **18 campuses have clear language indicating that there needs to an exceptional record, or something similar.**

**Figure 2: Scenarios for Promotion**

Scenarios for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure without and with Service Credit Years						
Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five	Year Six	Year Seven
<b>Assistant Professors (or Associate Professors without tenure) with no Service Credit Years --- The Normal Path</b>						
Begin the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Apply for P&T on schedule.	Begin appointment as Associate Professor w/tenure.
<b>Assistant Professors (or Associate Professors without tenure) with no Service Credit Years --- The Exceptional Path</b>						
Begin the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Exceptional: Apply for P&T 1 year early with 4 years teaching experience in residence	Begin appointment as Associate Professor w/tenure.	
<b>Assistant Professors (or Associate Professors without tenure) with ONE Service Credit Year --- The Normal "One Service Credit Year" Path</b>						
Service Credit Year	Begin the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Exceptional: Apply for P&T on schedule with 4 years teaching experience in residence	Begin appointment as Associate Professor w/tenure.
<b>Assistant Professors (or Associate Professors without tenure) with TWO Service Credit Years --- The Normal "Two Service Credit Years" Path</b>						
Service Credit Year	Service Credit Year	Begin the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Continue the establishment of teaching excellence.	Exceptional: Apply for P&T on schedule with 3 years teaching experience in residence	Begin appointment as Associate Professor w/tenure.
<p>Note: All of the above scenarios assume that, in addition to establishing teaching excellence, the faculty members also satisfy the requirements for Scholarship &amp; Creative Activities and for Service that are necessary for promotion and tenure.</p>						

Figure 2: Scenarios for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure without and with Service Credit Years

**RTP C&S COMMITTEE PROGRESS 5-14-2018**

<b>RTP Standards Complete</b>		<b>Approved</b>	<b>5 yr Review</b>	
Art	CAHSS	4/1/15	Spring 2020	Approved
Biological Sciences	CNRS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Business	CPS	9/1/15	Fall 2020	Approved
Chemistry	CNRS	5/1/14	Spring 2019	Approved
Child Development	CPS	11/1/14	Fall 2019	Approved
Communication	CAHSS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Computer Science	CNRS	4/10/18	Spring 2023	Approved
CRGS	CAHSS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Economics	CPS	3/3/17	Spring 2022	Approved
English	CAHSS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Environmental Resources Engineering	CNRS	2/12/18	Spring 2023	Approved
Environmental Science & Mgt	CNRS	2/1/14	Spring 2019	Approved
Environmental Studies	CAHSS	4/7/17	Spring 2022	Approved
Fisheries Biology	CNRS	4/1/15	Spring 2020	Approved
Forestry & Wildland Resources	CNRS	11/1/15	Fall 2020	Approved
Geography	AHSS	4/7/17	Spring 2022	Approved
Geology	CNRS	4/22/16	Spring 2021	Approved
History	CAHSS	4/1/15	Spring 2020	Approved
International Studies	CAHSS	5/1/15	Spring 2020	Approved
Kinesiology & Recreation Admin.	CPS	10/1/14	Spring 2019	Approved
Mathematics	CNRS	5/1/14	Spring 2019	Approved
Music	CAHSS	11/1/14	Fall 2019	Approved
Native American Studies	CAHSS	4/7/17	Spring 2022	Approved
Oceanography	CNRS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Philosophy	AHSS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Physics & Astronomy	CNRS	5/1/15	Spring 2020	Approved
Politics	CAHSS	2/16/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Psychology	CPS	5/11/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Social Work	CPS	9/1/15	Fall 2020	Approved
Sociology	AHSS	4/22/16	Spring 2021	Approved
Theater Film & Dance	AHSS	4/7/17	Spring 2022	Approved
Wildlife Management	CNRS	2/10/17	Spring 2022	Approved
<b>RTP Standards in Progress</b>				
Anthropology	AHSS			expected Fall 2018
Education	CPS	11/5/09	Fall 2014	expected Fall 2018
Journalism & Mass Communication	CAHSS	9/16/09	Fall 2014	expected Fall 2018
Library	CPS	5/1/09	Spring 2014	expected Fall 2018
Religious Studies	CAHSS			expected Fall 2018
World Languages & Cultures	CAHSS			expected Fall 2018
Counseling	CAPS	5/1/09	Spring 2014	HOLD OFF