

Guide to Preparing Department RTP Criteria

Approved by FSAC 11/18/2021

The Faculty Standards and Affair Committee of the Academic Senate provides the following information to guide departments in drafting and revising departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion criteria.

The University RTP policy recognizes the primacy of departments in determining the criteria for their tenure-track faculty, as appropriate to their discipline. As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty Association and the CSU, all criteria and procedures are to be made available for each cycle of RTP. Therefore, all department criteria are posted on the Faculty Affairs webpage.

FSAC understands the challenge departments face in providing a set of clear criteria for diverse faculty experiences and varied opinions in departments about expectation. The following information is to aid departments in drafting and/or revising criteria, and to explain the process of review and approval by FSAC.

1. Department criteria

- a. Department criteria can provide an opportunity for the department to describe its philosophy on how criteria are selected and valued, or how criteria fit within past practices of the department and/or dictates of the discipline. Department criteria should not reiterate information that is already in the University RTP policy.
- b. A clear set of minimum criteria for teaching/scholarship/service must be provided.
- c. Distinct criteria must be provided for tenure and promotion to Associate Profession and for promotion to Professor.
- d. Criteria must include expectations in the following areas (or equivalents, i.e., Library):
 - i. Teaching:
 - SETEs,
 - peer reviews, and
 - self-assessment.
 - ii. Research, scholarship, creative activities: Department expectations.
 - iii. Service to University, community, and public: Department expectations.
- e. Criteria may be quantitative, qualitative, or a combination. In explaining criteria, a list of acceptable types of activities/documents/performance may be appropriate (e.g.: including but not limited to...). However, it should be obvious how a candidate reaches a level of development that the department finds appropriate for a positive recommendation.
- f. If a department wishes to have additional information for candidates on exceptional performance that would be used for early tenure/promotion, these must be clearly separate from the minimum (required) criteria.

2. FSAC Review

The review of department RTP criteria will focus on the following:

- a. Consistency with CBA, especially Article 15 – Evaluation. FSAC may indicate departmental criteria are out of compliance and must be modified, or provide suggestions on revising criteria to better reflect the dictates in the CBA.
- b. Minimum criteria for tenure/promotion at Associate Professor and Professor levels are clearly indicated.
- c. Minimal ambiguity in the description of criteria or their application that may lead to confusion among candidates or higher levels of review.

3. Timelines and Procedures

New criteria or revisions must be received by FSAC at the end of the last week of March. This allows sufficient time for FSAC to review and make recommendations to departments, for departments to make changes to the document (if necessary), and final approval by FSAC for posting on the Faculty Affairs webpage. Approval will be an email from the chair of FSAC to the department chair and cc'd to Faculty Affairs. To facilitate implementation of the continuity clause in URTP policy (Section II.A.3), approved criteria must include on the first page "EFFECTIVE FALL 20XX", and departments are required to maintain copies of all previous criteria.