DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) POLICY

1. Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

The criteria described in this policy can be used as a reference for faculty members at any stage of their career. However, their primary purpose is for the evaluation of faculty applying for tenure or promotion. Faculty members applying for tenure or promotion, as well as probationary faculty members being evaluated for reappointment, will be given a ranking of deficient, competent, or excellent for each of the three areas of evaluation (instruction and instructionally related activities; research, scholarly and creative activities; and service). The RTP committee will provide a more precise review of the candidate's performance in the narrative of the evaluation. Prior to tenure, that ranking should reflect the performance of the candidates during the period of review. The narrative should also discuss the candidate's progress towards the tenure/promotion criteria.

The listed criteria serve as an initial framework with which to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in each category, but a candidate's ranking may be moved up or down based on evaluations of the overall quality of the candidate's accomplishments. The lists below are intended as a guideline and not as checklists of minimal qualifications. The overall quality of the candidate's accomplishments will also be a deciding factor when a candidate has reached some, but not all, of the criteria for a particular ranking. Files must be complete at the time of submission to the department RTP committee. Publications are defined as manuscripts that have final acceptance by the journal.

2. Criteria for the Evaluation of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

There are four main areas of evaluation: development of course materials, evidence of teaching competence, improvement of pedagogy, and mentoring students in research.

2.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

2.1.1. Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates should have achieved all of the criteria described under "Competent" for promotion to associate professor or award of tenure. In addition, during the period under review the candidates should have:

2.1.1.1 Provided evidence of three or more additional quality contributions to education. Examples of such contributions are:
   • Obtaining external funding in support of educational activities or programs.
   • Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as multimedia or computer-based materials for distribution beyond CSULB.
   • Offering professional education efforts, such as short courses, forums, or lectures for academic, government, or private sector professional organizations.
• Public education efforts, such as K-12 classroom teaching; community lectures; contributions to museums, aquaria, and other public educational exhibits; or contributions to science fairs and programs.

• Instruction and supervision in additional research and scholarship activities, such as summer student research internships, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, providing research training or mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.

• Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

• Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or graduate students.

2.1.2 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have:

2.1.2.1 Developed lecture or laboratory course materials that accomplish all of the following:

• Contain current, rigorous, and logically organized content appropriate to the courses taught.

• Provide explicit student learning outcomes (SLOs).

• Effectively facilitate the student learning process and experience.

2.1.2.2 Provided evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:

• Consideration of scores from university student evaluations in context with the difficulty of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and overall course rigor. Candidates must provide grade distributions for courses taught during the period under review.

• Favorable peer reviews of classroom teaching that assess the quality of lecture content and the effectiveness of its presentation.

• Other evidence indicative of teaching competence, which may include such things as peer awards, additional student polling, or critical reviews by external entities (e.g., outside departments, professional societies, peers with expertise in field of specialty).

2.1.2.3 Provided evidence of improvement of pedagogy, including at least two of the following:

• Implementation of effective changes in course content or teaching methods in response to student or peer evaluations, prior RTP reviews, or other forms of assessment.

• Acquisition and incorporation of discipline-specific materials from scientific literature, experts, or other appropriate sources that extend and improve upon existing or standard course content.
• Acquisition and incorporation of enhanced teaching methods obtained through publications on pedagogy, participation in programs or conferences on teaching, or after consultation with colleagues with teaching expertise in the subject area.

2.1.2.4 Incorporated students into ongoing scholarly research activities in a manner that enhances their education. Evidence of this must include student enrollment in supervised research courses.

2.1.3 Deficient. The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be "Competent".

2.2 Promotion to Professor

2.2.1 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidate will have achieved all of the criteria described under "Competent" for promotion to professor. In addition, during the period under review the candidates should have:

2.2.1.1 Provided evidence of four or more additional, valued contributions to education. Examples of such contributions are:

• Obtaining external funding in support of educational activities or programs.

• Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as multimedia or computer-based materials for distribution beyond CSULB.

• Offering professional education efforts, such as short courses, forums, or lectures for academic, government, or private sector professional organizations.

• Public education efforts, such as K-12 classroom teaching; community lectures; contributions to museums, aquaria, and other public educational exhibits; or contributions to science fairs and programs.

• Instruction and supervision in additional research and scholarship activities, such as summer student research internships, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, or providing research training or mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.

• Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

• Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or graduate students.

2.2.2 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have:

2.2.2.1 Developed lecture or laboratory course materials that extend curricular contributions made during the period of review and provide content that is current, relevant, rigorous, and organized and that facilitates student learning.
2.2.2.2 Provided evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:

- Consideration of scores from university student evaluations in context with the difficulty of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and overall course rigor. Candidates must provide grade distributions for courses taught during the period under review.

- Favorable peer reviews of classroom teaching that assess the quality of lecture content and the effectiveness of its presentation.

- Other evidence indicative of teaching competence, which may include such things as peer awards, additional student polling, or critical reviews by external entities (e.g., outside departments, professional societies, peers with expertise in field of specialty).

2.2.2.3 Provided evidence of continuing improvement of pedagogy including two or more of the following:

- Implementation of effective changes in course content or teaching methods in response to student or peer evaluations, prior RTP reviews, or other forms of assessment.

- Acquisition and incorporation of discipline-specific materials (from scientific literature, experts, or other appropriate sources) that extend and improve upon existing or standard course content.

- Acquisition and incorporation of enhanced teaching methods obtained through publications on pedagogy, participation in programs or conferences on teaching, or after consultation with colleagues with teaching expertise in the subject area.

2.2.2.4 Continuing incorporation of students into their ongoing scholarly research activities in a manner that enhances the student’s education. Evidence of these activities may include student enrollment in supervised research courses, chairing of thesis committees, materials indicating excellent mentoring activities in research, and examples of student success in research.

2.2.2.5 Provided evidence of three or more additional, valued contributions to education. Examples of such contributions are:

- Obtaining external funding in support of educational activities or programs since arrival to CSULB.

- Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as multimedia or computer-based materials for distribution beyond CSULB.

- Offering professional education efforts, such as short courses, forums, or lectures for academic, government, or private sector professional organizations.

- Public education efforts, such as K-12 classroom teaching; community lectures; contributions to museums, aquaria, and other public educational exhibits; or contributions to science fairs and programs.

- Instruction and supervision in additional research and scholarship activities, such as summer student research internships, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or
dissertation committees for students of other institutions, or providing research training
or mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.

• Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

• Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or
graduate students.

2.2.3 Deficient. The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be
“Competent”.

3. Criteria for the Evaluation of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

3.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

3.1.1 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates should have:

3.1.1.1 Published three or more peer-reviewed research papers. The candidate must be
senior investigator on at least two of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first,
last, or corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial
contribution based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. Beyond
these two papers as senior investigator, senior investigatorship is not required.
Collaborative papers will be assessed based upon the contribution made by the candidate,
which should be clearly described. One or more CSULB students should appear as co-
authors on at least one of these papers.

3.1.1.2 Received external funding to support their research.

3.1.1.3 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at two or more professional
society meetings, including national or international meetings.

3.1.1.4 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at two or more
professional society meetings.

3.1.1.5 Served as thesis chair for one or more MS students.

3.1.1.6 Engaged in service to the scientific community by refereeing journals or grant
proposals, serving on grant panels or editing a journal.

3.1.2 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have:

3.1.2.1 Published two peer-reviewed research papers. The candidate must be senior
investigator on both of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first, last, or
corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial contribution
based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. One or more CSULB
students should appear as co-authors on at least one of these papers.

3.1.2.2 Received internal (CSULB or CSU) or external funding to support their research.
3.1.2.3 Applied for external funding to support their research. In the absence of successful funding, at least three applications that show evidence of potential success must have been submitted.

3.1.2.4 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at one or more professional society meetings.

3.1.2.5 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at one or more professional society meetings.

3.1.2.6 Served on MS thesis committees.

3.1.2.7 Engaged in service to the scientific community by refereeing journals or grant proposals, serving on grant panels or editing a journal.

3.1.3 Deficient. The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be "Competent".

3.2 Promotion to Professor

3.2.1 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted) the candidates should have:

3.2.1.1 Published three or more peer-reviewed research papers. The candidates must be senior investigator on at least two of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first, last, or corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial contribution based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. Beyond these two papers as senior investigator, senior investigatorship is not required. Collaborative papers will be assessed based upon the contribution made by the candidate, which should be clearly described. One or more CSULB students should appear as co-authors on at least two of these papers.

3.2.1.2 Received external funding to support their research.

3.2.1.3 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at multiple professional society meetings, including national or international meetings.

3.2.1.4 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at multiple professional society meetings.

3.2.1.5 Graduated two or more MS students since the candidates’ arrival at CSULB.

3.2.1.6 Provided evidence of standing in their field. Such evidence could include (among other things):

- Publication of invited review articles

- Presentation of one or more invited symposium talks at national or international meetings

- Presentation of invited seminars
• Editorships of journals in the candidates’ discipline
• Service on grant or technical review panels
• Renewal of peer-reviewed grants
• Elected office in national or international societies in the candidates’ discipline

3.2.2 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted) the candidates must have:

3.2.2.1 Published two or more peer-reviewed research papers. The candidates must be senior investigator on at least two of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first, last, or corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial contribution based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. Beyond these two papers as senior investigator, senior investigatorship is not required. Collaborative papers will be assessed based upon the contribution made by the candidate, which should be clearly described. One or more CSULB students should appear as co-authors on at least one of these papers.

3.2.2.2 Received or continued external funding to support their research and provided evidence of continued pursuit of external funding.

3.2.2.3 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at multiple professional society meetings, including national or international meetings.

3.2.2.4 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at multiple professional society meetings.

3.2.2.5 Graduated one or more MS students since the candidates’ arrival at CSULB.

3.2.2.6 Engaged in service to the scientific community by refereeing journals or grant proposals, serving on grant panels or editing a journal.

3.2.3 Deficient. The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be “Competent”.

4. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

4.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

4.1.1 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted) the candidates should have:

4.1.1.1 Regularly participated in faculty governance, such as faculty meetings and retreats.

4.1.1.2 Engaged in high-quality service activities at the department level and assumed an effective leadership role in at least one departmental service activity. This should include service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum
Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine participation. The quality of service may also be assessed through such things as presentations to the faculty in both oral and written form and documents or policies produced.

4.1.3 Deficient. The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be “Competent”.

4.2 Promotion to Professor

4.2.1 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted) the candidates should have:

4.2.1.1 Regularly participated in faculty governance, such as faculty meetings and retreats. Demonstration of leadership and collegiality in these activities will be expected of senior faculty to receive a rank of excellent.

4.2.1.2 Engaged in high-quality service activities at the department level and assumed an effective leadership role in multiple departmental service activities. This should include service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum revision or document revision). Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine participation. The quality of service may also be assessed through such things as presentations to the faculty in both oral and written form and documents or policies produced.

4.2.1.3 Engaged in service at the college or university level and assumed an effective leadership role in at least one of these college or university service activities. Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine participation.
4.2.1.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community by organizing scientific meetings or symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies (e.g., as an appointed or elected officer or committee member).

4.2.1.5 Engaged in service to the broader community through activities such as outreach to local schools or community groups.

4.2.2 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted) the candidates must have:

4.2.2.1 Regularly participated in faculty governance, such as faculty meetings and retreats.

4.2.2.2 Engaged in high-quality service activities at the department level and assumed an effective leadership role in at least one departmental service activity. This should include service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum revision or document revision). Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine participation. The quality of service may also be assessed through such things as presentations to the faculty in both oral and written form and documents or policies produced.

4.2.2.3 Engaged in service at the college or university level.

4.2.2.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community by organizing scientific meetings or symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies (e.g., as an appointed or elected officer or committee member).

4.2.2.5 Engaged in service to the broader community through activities such as outreach to local schools or community groups.

4.2.3 Deficient. The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be “Competent”.

5. Amendments

Amendments to this document may be proposed in writing to the Department by any three full-time, tenure-track faculty members of the Department.

Proposed amendments shall be brought before the faculty for discussion and potential action in accordance with the Department By-Laws.

Action on the proposed amendments shall require a secret ballot in accordance with the Department By-Laws. Passage of amendments shall require a two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.