

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT

PERSONNEL POLICIES & PROCEDURES

Introduction:

The Department of Recreation and Tourism Management (RTM) views the retention, tenure and promotion, process as formative in nature and actively involves each candidate throughout the review process. Although the candidate has the obligation to meet established criteria, faculty colleagues have the obligation to support, encourage, and advocate for the candidate's success. Throughout this document, the intent is to be compliant with Section 600 and Section 700 of the *California State University, Northridge (CSUN) Administrative Manual* for minimum standards.

I. Composition and Eligibility of Personnel Committee

When there is an insufficient number of RTM faculty (as described in Section 600) to constitute a personnel committee, the following procedure will be utilized to fill the minimum remaining seats on the committee.

1. Names of tenured campus colleagues of senior rank from other academically related departments will be submitted to the Department Chair by full time faculty. General willingness to serve will be a precondition for submitting names to the Chair.
2. Those nominated will be contacted by the Department Chair to obtain permission to place their names on the ballot.
3. The ballot will then be created along with a short bio of each of the candidates. The ballot will be distributed to the tenure track faculty for their vote according to secure procedures.
4. The name(s) of those elected to serve will be disseminated to the entire faculty.

II. General Policies and Procedures

- A. In addition to the Department Chair, the Department Personnel Committee will advise each candidate regarding the retention, tenure, and promotion process consistent with Section 600. Advisement will include but is not limited to guidance about the preparation and development of each faculty member's Professional Information File (PIF), the classroom visitation process, selection of pertinent materials for review, and general information about the reappointment, retention, tenure, and promotion process.
- B. The Department Personnel Committee will submit the RTM Personnel Policies and Procedures to the tenure track faculty for review and approval at least every five years or sooner if the majority of faculty wishes to do so; consistent with college policies/procedures.
- C. Preparation
 - 1. The Associate Vice-President for Faculty Affairs notifies the Department Chair of candidates eligible for reappointment, retention, promotion and tenure, and supplies the "Academic Year Calendar of Personnel Procedures" complete with deadline dates. Upon receipt, the Department Chair will provide the "Academic Year Calendar of Personnel Procedures" as well as the RTM Personnel Policies and Procedures to RTM faculty. The Personnel Committee will then adopt and distribute to the faculty a specific calendar by which the reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure process will be implemented.
 - 2. Each faculty member under consideration may request to meet with the Department Personnel Committee and/or the Department Chair. The request must be made at least six weeks prior to the due date for the Department letters. The purpose of the meeting is to elaborate upon material in their Professional Information File.

III. Procedures for Gathering Teaching Effectiveness Data

- A. Class visits will be conducted by the Department Chair (or designee) and at least one member of the Department Personnel Committee, at least one time per year until the faculty member reaches the rank of Professor. Class visits consistent with scheduling criteria identified in Section 600 will be completed early enough in the semester for inclusion in the personnel review cycle. Peer evaluations from a representative set of courses (levels, types, and formats) taught since hire should be conducted for each candidate. Peer reviews will be conducted by a variety of eligible faculty over the total period of review for each candidate.
 - 1. The RTM faculty approved *Teaching Effectiveness Peer Review Forms* will be used. Written reports of visits will be distributed to faculty reviewed and placed in the PAF
 - 2. Those conducting peer reviews will meet with those being evaluated to discuss findings.
- B. Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness will be conducted for a variety of courses with the minimum number of student evaluations consistent with Section 600. Additional evaluations may be requested by individual faculty members. At the conclusion of each

semester, a copy of the campus standardized quantitative and qualitative student evaluation forms will be placed in the appropriate Personnel Action File (PAF).

1. Scores demonstrating a significant variance from the Department's current mean will be discussed with the candidate by the Department Chair or designated faculty member. Since individual courses vary, comparison of student scores is one factor in the evaluation process. Candidates may include an explanation for such scores in the Personnel Information File (PIF).
 2. Upon receipt of the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness scores, the Department Chair will distribute to faculty the composite departmental median and mean scores and the standard deviation for all student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Composite scores provide a baseline for comparison purposes for faculty involved in the reappointment, retention, promotion and tenure process, as well as for providing faculty with a means of additional evaluation of their own scores.
- C. Samples of instructional materials, such as course syllabi, various forms of assessment and evaluation of student learning, electronic platforms or other documentation may be placed by the candidate in the PIF. Additional materials may be requested by any reviewing agencies or reviewers.

IV. Procedures for Student Consultation on Personnel Matters

Members of the Department Personnel Committee will receive student input at a meeting for which the date, time, and location is disseminated at least two weeks in advance. Student input will be requested regarding all areas of faculty responsibilities for candidates under review.

- A. Meeting announcements will be disseminated by word-of-mouth, posted on bulletin boards, through electronic communication, and other appropriate means.
- B. Student consultations with the members of the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair will be conducted at a campus location other than faculty offices in order to be done in a manner designed to preserve confidentiality.
- C. At least two members of the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair will receive student input. Ideally all committee members would be present.
- D. Written testimony from students will be handled in accordance with Section 600.
- E. A copy of the statement that includes the signature of the source shall be placed in the Personnel Action File and a copy given to the affected faculty member, who will be advised that they have the right to review and respond according to the procedures outlined in Section 600.

V. Procedures for External Peer Review of Scholarship Equivalencies

Scholarly material not currently part of a systematic peer review process (e.g. peer reviewed journal article) can be submitted for peer review in order to evaluate the scholarship for

acceptance as a *Category One* product (Section VI.C.1, 2 and 3). Peer review will be consistent with the following guidelines:

- A. The term “peer” refers to individuals outside of CSUN who have demonstrated expertise in the subject area of the material to be reviewed.
- B. Normally the “peers” would be from academic backgrounds consistent with the subject matter. However, individuals who possess unique knowledge of the field or subject matter may be invited if their expertise is clearly identified.
- C. The candidate must obtain a peer review according to the guidelines below:
 - 1. The candidate will make a written request for a peer review to the Department Personnel Committee with a copy to the Department Chair.
 - 2. For the purpose of forming a pool of potential reviewers, names with current resumes may be submitted by the candidate to members of the Department Personnel Committee, and the Department Chair within three weeks of the written request.
 - 3. The Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee will jointly review and verify the peer reviewers' expertise within two weeks of receipt of names.
 - 4. A three-person peer review team will be identified within two weeks of verification of expertise. One reviewer will be chosen by the candidate, one by the Department Personnel Committee and one jointly selected. The Department Chair will select the third reviewer if no agreement can be reached between the candidate and the Department Personnel Committee.
 - 5. A single-blind review of the submitted work will be conducted. Materials are sent to each peer reviewer with explicit instructions to return the review to the Department Chair within six weeks. The Department Chair will provide the reviews to the candidate. The candidate then has the choice of adding this scholarship submission to his/her PIF as an equivalency to publication (Section VI-C-1.) If the scholarship is submitted then the individual reviews will be submitted to the department personnel committee but do not need to be included in the PIF.
 - 6. An aggregate mean score of 3.5 or higher on the faculty approved RTM *Scholarly Peer Review Form* is considered acceptable as peer reviewed scholarship and equivalency to publication.

VI. Criteria for Making Judgments for Retention and Promotion

A. Professional Preparation

Examples of extensive relevant experience include but are not limited to: Attendance at conferences, work as a practitioner in the field, consultation with organizations in the

field, completion of professional continuing education courses, and achievement of specialization or certifications.

B. Teaching Effectiveness and Direct Instructional Contributions

Evidence of effective teaching and instructional contributions includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Course outlines, syllabi, reading lists and other instructional materials/platforms.
2. Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness that meet or exceed the department mean scores of the last three years. (Scores more than a standard deviation below the department mean or scores showing significant decline over previous year/s are discussed with the faculty person as outlined in Procedures Section III).
3. Reviews that reflect an aggregate mean of 3.5 or higher on the RTM faculty approved *Teaching Effectiveness Peer Review Form*.

C. Contributions to the Field of Study

The RTM department standards are consistent with the University Standard defined in Section 600. The RTM department specifically embraces a broad view of scholarship. The seminal work of Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation (1990) provides a framework for this broader approach and faculty are encouraged to create a consistent pattern of scholarship that might involve contributions from a variety of dimensions. Boyer's model identifies a scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Specific criteria are identified in VI.C.1-3.

The key principles for evaluation by the department are documentation of several types of scholarship, dissemination of the scholarship, and evidence of the quality of scholarship by a peer reviewed process.

The relative weight of any type of scholarship will be determined in the context of departmental and university mission and needs combined with personal strengths and interests of the faculty member. The scholarship/creative endeavors must relate to the recreation, hospitality, and/or tourism field of study.

Category One and *Category Two* reflect a broad range of scholarship. *Category One* reflects specific material that is peer reviewed and disseminated through traditional publication or non-traditional distribution. *Category One* scholarship represents products that can be disseminated through classic academic distribution channels (e.g. journals). *Category Two* reflects other important forms of scholarship that is presented to the field through other means than those described in *Category One*.

The following broad range of scholarly/creative endeavors represent the minimum criteria of contributions to the field of study for RTM faculty. At least 3 of the following activities are required from *Category One* and at least 3 activities are required from

Category Two while under consideration for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. At least 3 activities from *Category One* and 3 activities from *Category Two* are required for advancement to the rank of Professor.

Materials counted in an earlier promotion/tenure decision may not be used in subsequent promotion decisions. The following criteria clarify the definition of publication and will be acceptable evidence of publication:

1. *Category One A: Published Scholarly and Creative Endeavor Contributions* resulting from an established peer review process.
 - a. An article published in a refereed professional or other scholarly journal, or a letter of acceptance from a journal with a copy of the accepted article.
 - b. A professionally peer-reviewed published book or monograph or a letter of acceptance from the editor and/or the publisher with a copy of the submitted book or monograph.
2. *Category One B: Scholarly Equivalencies to Publication that Include an Existing Peer Review Process*
 - a. A chapter in a peer-reviewed professionally published book or monograph or a letter of acceptance from the editor and/or the publisher with a draft of the submitted chapter.
 - b. Artistic products that have a juried or refereed process such as competitively reviewed murals, poetry, performance, music.
3. *Category One C: Scholarly Equivalencies to Publication that Require External Peer Review.*

The following range of contributions will be considered as equivalencies to traditional publication referenced in VI.C.1 which have established peer review systems. The assumption is that any equivalencies would not show evidence of a personal or professional conflict of interest. Examples of scholarship that can be submitted for external peer review using the *Scholarly Peer Review Form* are listed below:

 - a. Media presentation suitable for education/commercial use (i.e. videotapes, slide presentations, TV materials) and accepted for use by licensed commercial or public media broadcaster, or accepted for distribution by a national organization which distributes such material or by a national professional organization who endorses the material for sale or distribution to its membership, subject to external peer review.
 - b. Instruction manual accepted for publication designed to complement a published text and submitted for external peer review.

- c. Design of recreation, play, or tourism structure or product or item accepted for marketing by a manufacturer and subject to external peer review.
- d. Computer software suitable for instructional purposes or professional development, and accepted for distribution by commercial computer software company, submitted for external review.
- e. Funded or unfunded research with clear written products that are publicly available, but not resulting in traditional publication, subject to external peer review .

4. *Category Two: Contributions to the Field of Study:*

The Department of Recreation and Tourism Management values other contributions/scholarly activities in addition to publications. Examples include:

- a. Invited lecturer or platform/poster presenter at professional conferences
- b. Author of peer-reviewed grant awards
- c. Recognition as an exemplary scholar award at regional, State, regional, national or international professional association.
- d. Author of *published reviews* of books, book chapters, and published articles
- e. Reviewer of manuscripts for professional or scholarly journals
- f. Reviewer of research proposals for granting agencies
- g. Chairperson of sessions at professional conferences
- h. Invited participant at colloquia
- i. Author of published abstracts in a peer-reviewed journal
- j. Design and implementation of curriculum for professional development programs in the field
- k. Author of national association position statement or paper when officially accepted and published by a national professional organization
- l. Editor of proceedings for professional conference, etc., when those proceedings are published
- m. Dissemination of evaluation or assessment studies for communities or recreation organizations serving those communities
- n. Administration of grants awarded
- o. A candidate may request to have other items be considered; subject to decision of the departmental personnel committee.

5. Other criteria considerations related to contributions to the field of study

- a. Co-authored (2 authors) or multi-authored (3 or more authors) publications require a statement explaining the level and nature of the candidate's contribution to that publication. Extent of contribution will be summarized by a letter or email which will be included by the candidate in the PIF.
- b. Publications should be closely related to the author's identified field(s) of professional expertise and competence.
- c. A significant revision of previously published materials for re-publication (e.g. a second edition) must be documented by a letter from editor/publisher.
- d. Participation in professional organizations and fulfillment of significant responsibilities should be documented by the candidate to describe their contribution.

D. Contributions to the University and Community

1. Clarification of the term "Community Service"

Community Service involves contributions of "services" to community agencies and organizations, which draw upon the academic expertise and professional competence of the candidate.

2. Clarification of the Term "Effective Participation"

"Effective participation" should be documented by the candidate to reflect elements such as: the nature of the committee assignment, the expenditure of time, the nature of the contribution made by the candidate, and the significance of this involvement as it contributes to the mission of the university.

3. Contributions to the University and community which help make a faculty member a valuable addition to the University, College, and Department include service on Departmental, College, and University Committees. In addition to committees, service examples may include, but are not limited to serve in the following roles:

- a. Mentor a visiting scholar
- b. Department chairperson
- c. Guest lecturer or giving presentations related to discipline
- d. Service on graduate committees at another regionally accredited College or University
- e. Member of an external accreditation team
- f. Teacher of a continuing education course
- g. Clinical supervision

- h. Primary writer of accreditation report
 - i. Extensive student advisement and mentoring
 - j. Leadership role in development of university based program initiatives
 - k. Extensive recruiter of students and faculty
 - l. Provider of direct community services – may include presentations or consultations or training
 - m. Faculty advisor to student organization
 - n. Peer adviser and mentor for retention, promotion, and teaching
 - o. Curriculum developer
 - p. Member or chairperson of a professional conference committee
 - q. Active (not honorary) board member in a community, professional, or educational organization or active implementation of organization initiatives
 - r. Elected officer in professional organization
4. A minimum of 4 different activities (from one or more of the example categories listed above in VI.D.3) must be completed for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure. Promotion from the rank of Associate Professor to the rank of Professor would require a minimum of 5 activities during the normal period in rank as outlined in Section 600.

VII. Granting of Tenure

The tenure decision is the most important decision in the personnel process. The primary consideration for the award of tenure is benefit to the University and evidence of commitment to continued personal and professional development consistent with the Department and University expectations and criteria.

VIII. Criteria for Early Promotion

A candidate who meets and exceeds, in a period of time shorter than that required for normal promotion, all of the criteria cited in Section 600 as well as the departmental criteria for advancement to the next rank, may request consideration for early promotion prior to the normal period of review. The request for early promotion will be consistent with Section 600.