DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY
COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

1. Preamble and Guiding Principles

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at the California State University, Long Beach is dedicated to maintaining a reputation as an outstanding department on the basis of the rigorous curriculum, the quality of research conducted with bachelors and master-level students, and the caliber of its graduates. The department values teaching and research as equal and essential components of the education of our students and seeks to integrate research with teaching at every possible opportunity in the curriculum. Our teaching and research programs sustain a rigorous and innovative curriculum that focuses on developing the capabilities of students (both majors and non-majors) in chemistry and biochemistry, developing problem-solving, critical thinking, and communication skills, and fostering a culture devoted to scholarship, professional integrity, continued learning, and a responsible work ethic.

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry follows rules and regulations set forth in the CNSM and the university RTP policies. The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry establishes specific standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty within the department.

The departmental RTP recommendations are based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained record of accomplishments over the period of review and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making productive contributions in all three areas of evaluation.

Departmental faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.

The department RTP committee shall rank each candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion as “excellent”, “competent”, or “deficient” in each area. A detailed justification of its ranking shall be provided.

Positive recommendation in any RTP action requires at least a rating of competent in each area of evaluation. In order to receive a positive recommendation from the department RTP committee for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally-related activities or in the area of research,
2. Standards of excellence and accompanying criteria in instruction and instructionally related activities

All department faculty members are expected to be effective in instruction and instructionally related activities. To be considered effective, the candidates shall meet most of the requirements specified in § 2.1 and § 2.2 of the CNSM RTP Policy and §2.2.1-2.2.6 of the department policy. Teaching effectiveness in courses assigned to the candidate during the period of review will be evaluated. In addition, the evaluation of supervision of graduate/undergraduate students will be performed if the candidate taught research supervision courses (496, 695, etc.) during the evaluation period. Graduate and undergraduate advising will also be evaluated if it was a part of the candidate’s assignment. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching. The specific expectations for each rating category are intended as a guide to evaluators. The evaluators shall determine if the overall quality of the candidate’s accomplishments is commensurate with standards set forth in § 2.1 of the department RTP policy for each rating.

2.1 Departmental standards. In recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, or promotion the following criteria for the candidate rating are applied:

2.1.1. The rating of “excellent” is given to a candidate who is effective in instruction and instructionally related activities and demonstrates success in at least one (for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to associate professor) or two (for promotion to professor) of the following products/activities:

a. Publication of a textbook
b. Significant revisions of lecture and laboratory courses or development of new courses
c. Exemplary participation in the supervision of undergraduate student research
d. Significant success in thesis research supervision
e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories
f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-based materials for uses beyond the candidate’s own teaching
g. Exemplary performance in classroom instruction judged by the members of the department RTP committee to be significantly beyond standards of effectiveness normally expected from all faculty.

This requirement may also be satisfied by partially fulfilling a combination of some of the listed criteria at a level such that the candidate's overall record is deemed equivalent to one or two products as appropriate.

2.1.2. The rating “competent” is given to a candidate who is effective in instruction and instructionally related activities.
2.2. Evaluation for instruction and instructionally related activities. The assessment of teaching effectiveness will include the following:

2.2.1. Evaluation of the course materials submitted by the candidate. The scholarly rigor of the courses and content of the courses taught should follow standard course outlines, if available; otherwise, they should be comparable to the same courses or comparable courses taught by other tenured/probationary faculty. Each course should prepare the students for further courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite. Materials submitted by a candidate to her/his file should include at least course syllabi, sample assignments/tests/projects, and samples of student work with instructor feedback\(^1\) if appropriate for the course. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the student learning outcomes and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline. Course policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to students. The results of grading practices should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same course taught by other tenured/probationary faculty during the period of review.\(^2\)

2.2.2. Evaluation of the narrative provided by the candidate. The narrative should describe thoughtful and deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies or in revisions and modifications to courses taught by the candidate. These efforts could also include engagement in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. There should be evidence that the candidate takes an ongoing and active role in refreshing her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. This record may include but is not limited to interactions with colleagues on pedagogy, classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

2.2.3. Analysis of written reports of observations of the candidate’s teaching during the review period by members of the RTP Committee. These class visits must be conducted during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is not teaching at CSULB that semester; in which case, the visitations from the prior year shall be used). The candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to the start of classroom visits, but otherwise visits will be unannounced. The candidate may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the RTP committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee to choose the most appropriate days for visits. The committee members’ evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should address such factors as: instructional clarity, communication with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and electronic media or demonstrations. Written reports based on class visits must

---

\(^1\) This applies to courses taught in Fall 2010 and later.

\(^2\) If no data are available for the same courses, similar courses taught by tenured/probationary faculty should be used for comparison.
be placed in the candidate’s RTP file with a copy to the candidate. The signed reports must include time(s) and date(s) of the visit(s).

2.2.4. Analysis of students’ ratings of instruction. Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department means and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the instructor’s conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to student needs. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on the evaluation form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. Conversely, low ratings of instruction in any single course section do not necessarily indicate the lack of teaching effectiveness.

2.2.5. Evaluation of the candidate’s performance in research supervision courses (496, etc.) Supervision of research students should follow the guidelines of the ACS Committee on Professional Training (CPT, see §3.5.1 of this document). Examples of student work such as comprehensive reports or undergraduate/graduate theses should be included in the file.

2.2.6. Evaluation of advising effectiveness if part of the candidate’s assigned workload. The candidate’s activities in advising should be described in the narrative. Additional evidence of effectiveness, including letters from students and/or faculty, could also be provided.

2.2.7. Evaluation of materials providing evidence of success in additional instructional and instructionally-related activities.

a. Publication of a textbook. The textbook must be intended for the use beyond the confines of CSULB. If authorship of a textbook is considered in the teaching category, it cannot be simultaneously considered as a RSCA product.

b. Significant revisions of lecture and laboratory courses or development of new courses. The revisions should go beyond the routine changes to refresh courses. Significant revisions, such as development of a new laboratory curriculum or development of a new course, will be considered in this category. This includes new topics not previously taught in the department in special topics graduate courses. The authorship of laboratory manuals and study guides will also be considered in this category. These products need to be substantially original work, not merely modifications.

c. Exemplary success in the supervision of undergraduate student research. The candidate must demonstrate significant accomplishments of her/his research students well beyond the minimum expectations for effectiveness in directing undergraduate research described in § 2.2.5. Ordinarily, several students should be coauthors on the candidate’s publications or presentations at national or international meetings.

d. Significant success in thesis research supervision. Ordinarily this requirement is satisfied by inclusion of an MS thesis accepted by the CSULB library in which the candidate served as chair of the thesis committee.

e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories. Substantial funding is defined as multiple external or internal
(university-wide or CSU system-wide) grants related to teaching effectiveness (such as 3E awards).

f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-based materials for uses beyond the candidate’s own teaching. Normally such materials should be published or otherwise disseminated for uses beyond the confines of CSULB (e.g. public presentation).

g. Exemplary performance in classroom instruction judged by the members of the department RTP committee to be significantly beyond the standards of effectiveness normally expected from all faculty.

3. Standards of excellence and accompanying criteria in research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)

Department faculty must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are disseminated to appropriate audiences.

In addition to requirements specified in CNSM RTP Policy § 2.3, the following are the specific standards in RSCA for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

3.1. Departmental Standards for Reappointment.

Candidates for reappointment must show evidence that they have begun to develop an independent research program at CSULB. Such evidence should include, at minimum, the following:

a. the candidate must have established a functional research laboratory on campus and

b. there must be evidence of effort to obtain external funding and

 c. there must be evidence of student participation in the candidate’s research program

In recommendations concerning reappointment the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

3.1.1. The rating “excellent” is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.1 a-c and, in addition, has at least one peer-reviewed journal publication (accepted for publication or published) resulting from the candidate’s research program conducted to a substantial degree at CSULB in which the candidate is designated as the corresponding author.

3.1.2. The rating “competent” is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.1 a-c.

3.2. Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor
Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor must develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in at least two (2) peer-reviewed publications in which the candidate is designated as the corresponding author. The quality and significance of the candidate’s research publications is of primary importance. The candidate’s publications must appear in well respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-review. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of a continuous and significant effort to secure external funding. The candidate’s narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the candidate’s research and this narrative must identify the candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. The overall trajectory of the candidate’s research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in RSCA. In addition to requirements specified above, the candidate must have at least 1 (one) additional RSCA product from the list provided in § 3.4.

In recommendations concerning tenure and/or promotion to associate professor the following specific criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

3.2.1. The rating “excellent” is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in § 3.2 and has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in § 3.4. Additionally, CSULB undergraduate or graduate student(s) must be coauthor(s) on some of the candidate’s publications.

3.2.2. The rating “competent” is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.2.

3.3. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to have sustained an ongoing program of research or other scholarly activity that results in peer reviewed RSCA products. The department acknowledges that the professional goals of tenured faculty members might be somewhat different and more diverse than those of junior faculty. Therefore, although the overall standards for promotion to full professor are higher than those for promotion to associate professor, the candidate’s effort may be broadened beyond traditional research and could include significant components related to pedagogy of chemistry and biochemistry.

The ongoing program of research or scholarly activity developed by the candidate at CSULB shall result in at least two (2) peer-reviewed publications in which the candidate is designated as the corresponding author. In addition to the requirements specified above, the candidate must have at least two (2) peer-reviewed RSCA products in one or more of the categories listed in § 3.4. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of significant effort to secure external funding. The candidate’s publications must appear in well respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-review or in international journals devoted to pedagogy of chemistry such as the Journal of Chemical Education.

In recommendations concerning promotion to full professor the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

3 This requirement is also met by the receipt of a significant, non-peer-reviewed, external support for the candidate’s research, such as a large charitable donation arranged by the candidate.
3.3.1. The rating “excellent” is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in § 3.3 and has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in § 3.4.

3.3.2. The rating “competent” is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.3.

3.4. Peer-reviewed RSCA products considered in tenure and promotion recommendations

a. Peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is designated as a corresponding author and peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is a contributing author

b. Peer-reviewed review articles or book chapters

c. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline, such as articles published in the Journal of Chemical Education

d. Awarded external individual research grant(s) or contract(s)

e. Awarded instrument grant(s)

f. One or more articles published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings, counted as a single product

g. One or more patents, counted as a single product

h. One or more published textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses beyond the candidate’s own personal teaching, counted as a single product

i. Two or more research presentations on at least two national or international meetings, counted as a single product

3.5. Evaluation for RSCA

The assessment of the candidate’s research and scholarly activity will be based on peer evaluation. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments. The numerical expectations concerning RSCA products required for each rating category are intended as a guide to evaluators. The RSCA products of appropriate quantity and quality as described in § 3.2 - 3.5 are sufficient to meet criteria for each rating in RSCA. However, fewer RSCA products of superior quality or significance might also be sufficient to satisfy requirements for a particular rating provided that the candidate meets the criteria specified in the CNSM RTP Policy. Additional evidence of excellence may include publications in journals of very high impact (such as Nature, Science, PNAS, Cell, Angewandte Chemie, Journal of the American Chemical Society, Journal of Biological Chemistry), editorials/covers describing the candidate’s publications, significant number (>50) of citations (self-citations excluded) of the candidate’s papers produced at

---

4 The candidate might have multiple products in each category listed in 3-4 a-e.
5 This includes publications in which the candidate is one of the corresponding coauthors.
CSULB, receipt of prestigious research support (such as CAREER NSF or R01 NIH Grant), or comparable evidence.

The assessment of the candidate’s research and scholarly activity will include the following:

3.5.1. Examination of evidence that the candidate developed (for tenure or promotion to associate professor) or sustained (for promotion to full professor) an independent research program at CSULB involving students. The candidate must present evidence that the candidate’s research program developed on campus meets the following characteristics described in American Chemical Society Committee on Professional Training Guidelines: “Undergraduate research is conducted with a faculty advisor or mentor. The student’s research project is typically based on the faculty mentor’s research interests, which allows the student to draw upon the mentor’s expertise and resources and also allows the faculty mentor to develop a productive research program. The mentor meets regularly with the student to make research plans, assess risks associated with the proposed research, and review results. The student is encouraged to take primary responsibility for the project and to make substantial input into its direction. The student-mentor relationship also builds student confidence, offers encouragement when necessary, and provides guidance and assistance for the student’s future education and career development. Undergraduate research should be envisioned as publishable in a peer-reviewed journal. Research builds upon the previous accomplishments of other scholars. For research to have any meaning or effect, it must be communicated to the scientific community. Peer-review is the generally accepted means of monitoring and insuring the quality of research. While not every undergraduate research project will result in a peer-reviewed publication, it should be the intent of each project to contribute to such a result. When an individual student research project is not of wide enough scope for an entire publication, it can often be combined with other undergraduate research projects into a more comprehensive study that merits publication.” The documentation produced by the student under guidance of the candidate must include, at minimum: (a) comprehensive written report authored by the student describing her/his research results, or (b) honors undergraduate thesis, or (c) defended MS thesis. The candidate’s narrative must describe the overall goals of her/his research program at CSULB and the nature of students’ involvement.

3.5.2. Examination of RSCA products submitted by the Candidate

3.5.3.A. Peer-reviewed journal publications authored or coauthored by the candidate

It is expected that the candidate will publish in international research journals with the highest standards of peer-review. It is the responsibility of the faculty member preparing a publication to consult with her/his mentor and the department chair to determine whether the venue is of “international” status. Ordinarily, such journals must be indexed by the Science Citation Index and should have an impact factor above the median in each sub-discipline of chemistry/biochemistry. The list of high quality chemistry/biochemistry journals is developed by the department chair in consultation with the faculty. For publications in other professional journals, the assessment of journal quality, including comparison of relevant impact factors, will be performed. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a corresponding author will be counted as a whole RSCA product. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a contributing author will be counted as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the level of the candidate’s contribution. The candidate's narrative should
provide a clear description of the candidate’s responsibility and intellectual contribution to jointly authored papers. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author on a publication submitted to the file. Peer-reviewed journal publications included in the file should be published or accepted for publication at the time the candidate’s file is submitted for departmental RTP review. The papers submitted for publication after the open period deadline shall not be considered in the candidate’s review. Such papers will only be considered in evaluation(s) performed in the subsequent academic year(s).

3.5.3.B. Peer-reviewed review article or book chapters. These should be published in international research journals with the highest standards of peer-review or in book series or monographs. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding the candidate’s contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author on a publication. In such cases the publication will be considered as fractional RSCA product.

3.5.3.C. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline, such as articles published in the Journal of Chemical Education or in journals of comparable quality. Each publication in which the candidate is a corresponding author will be counted as a whole RSCA product. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding the candidate’s contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author on a publication. In such cases the publication will be considered as a fractional RSCA product.

3.5.3.D. Awarded external research grant(s) or contract(s). Each awarded grant or contract in which the candidate serves as PI will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate serves as a Co-PI, each awarded grant or sub-contract will be considered as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the candidate’s contributions in preparing the grant and her/his role in the described research project. The documentation from the grant PI regarding the candidate’s contributions is strongly recommended in such cases.

3.5.3.E. Awarded instrument grant. Each awarded grant in which the candidate serves as a PI will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate serves as a Co-PI, each awarded grant will be considered as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the candidate’s contributions. The documentation from the grant PI regarding the candidate’s contributions is strongly recommended in such cases.

3.5.3.F. One or more peer-reviewed conference proceeding, counted as a single product. These need to be of full publication quality and need to undergo the peer-review process. Some examples of eligible peer-review conferences proceedings are National Meetings of ACS, Electrochemical Society Meetings, Materials Research Society Meetings, or comparable proceedings series.

3.5.3.G. One or more patents issued to the candidate for items related to the discipline, counted as a single product. The provisional patent application should be filed before the candidate’s file is submitted for departmental RTP review.
3.5.3.H. One or more published textbooks, curricula, or instructional technology developed for use beyond the candidate's own personal teaching, counted as a single product. The materials in this category must be disseminated nationally and clearly intended for the general use beyond the confines of CSULB.

3.5.3.I. Two or more research presentations at two different national or international meetings, counted as a single product. Both oral and poster presentations will be considered in this category.

3.5.4. Examination of the candidate’s narrative. The narrative should describe the overall goals and progress of the candidate’s research or scholarly activity at CSULB including a brief description of the candidate’s future RSCA plans and direction.

4. Standards of excellence and accompanying criteria in service

Faculty members are expected to participate in faculty governance through active involvement on committees at the department, college, and university levels. The department expects that the involvement of the candidate in service will increase as he/she moves through the ranks. Faculty are expected to participate in department activities, which include active participation at department seminars and meetings with seminar guests, attending thesis defenses, and attending other faculty meetings including the advisory council breakfast. Maintenance of shared department instrumentation shall be considered as service to the department. Faculty service considered in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions could also include participation in service to the community or to the profession. Such service could involve, but is not limited to, service to professional organizations; profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through discipline-oriented activities, such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media interviews; volunteering consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations; membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards; conference presentations; and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline. In evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments in service, the department RTP committee will consider the criteria and expectations specified in § 2.4 of the CNSM RTP Policy.

4.1. Candidates for reappointment must show evidence that they have begun involvement in faculty governance at the department level. The department acknowledges that the involvement in service at this point of the candidate’s career is normally limited to department level committees.

An excellent rating will be given to a candidate who actively serves on department committees as assigned by the department chair or elected. The rating “excellent” requires active participation, which may involve authorship of committee documents such as minutes, policy statements or similar materials. Evidence of active participation might also include a letter from the committee chair.

The rating “competent” will be given to the candidate who serves on department committees as assigned by the department chair or elected.
4.2. Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor must become actively involved in faculty governance. It is expected that the candidate serves on several committees at the department level. The candidate should also be involved in service on at least one committee/council either at the college, university or CSU system level. Normally, it is not expected that the candidate is extensively involved in service during the probationary period, as this is the period in which primary emphasis should be placed on establishing the required teaching and research programs. However, each faculty member is expected to participate in professional activities relating to chemistry and biochemistry, such as attendance at professional meetings, reviews of grant proposals; or other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the academic community. Service to professional organizations and to the community is also encouraged.

The rating “excellent” will be given to a candidate who, in addition to service on the department committees as assigned by the department chair, is also actively involved in service on one or more college or university or CSU system committees. It is expected that the candidate has played an active role in one or more of the department/college/university committees. Evidence of active participation may include the authorship of pertinent materials produced by the committee or a letter from the committee chair.

The rating “competent” will be given to the candidate who participates in faculty governance as specified in the CNSM policy.

4.3. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to play an active role in the governance of the department, college, or university. In recommendations concerning promotion to full professor the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

The rating “excellent” is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty governance. The candidate’s record must include quality performance in at least four activities from the following list:

a. 2 year membership of a major CNSM committee or college or university council
b. membership on the department RTP Committee
c. chairing a college council or CNSM curriculum committee or one of the university councils,
d. service on the Academic Senate
e. chairing a university-wide committee
f. leading role in grant applications for institutional research/instructional activities, such as RISE, MARC, Howard Hughes, or comparable programs
g. leadership role in professional organizations
h. significant reviewing duties in professional journals ( > 10 reviews)
i. active interactions with industrial, educational, and research institutions or governmental agencies
j. volunteering consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations
k. membership on review panels for conference presentations, awards, and fellowships
The rating “competent” is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty governance.

4.4 Evaluation for Service. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments in service. The numerical expectations concerning service activities listed in 4.3 a-k are intended as a guide to evaluators. Multiple combinations of various service contributions may be deemed equivalent to requirements specified for each rating. The candidate must provide a list that shows membership on the various committees. In cases where the candidate had an active or leading role in the committee, he/she must document the service products. A service letter from the chair of the committee describing details of the role of the candidate as a committee member may be provided in cases in which the candidate is not the chair but needs to document an active role. If available, letters of appointment on college/university/CSU system committees need to be included. For other service products, such as grant reviewing, proper documentation needs to be included.

5. Department RTP Procedures

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry will follow the general guidelines of the university document. The specific procedures that will be used by the department in following these guidelines are outlined below. The criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor apply to candidates hired with the expectation of performing research in chemistry or biochemistry. Separate guidelines will be developed for faculty hired with the expectation of conducting research in chemistry education or the department will defer to standards and criteria in RSCA specified in the RTP Policy of the Department of Science Education at CSULB.

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry RTP Committee shall consist of five members elected by secret ballot from among the department’s tenured faculty. The department committee shall include at least three members holding the rank of professor, unless there are not three eligible faculty members. The secret ballot shall include names of all tenured faculty in the department except academic administrators, those faculty who are candidates for promotion, continuing members of the department RTP committee, faculty elected to serve or serving on the college RTP committee, and those faculty who are on full or partial leave of absence during the academic year. Eligible faculty may request to have their name removed from the ballot. All department probationary and tenured faculty are eligible to vote and may vote for any number of candidates up to the number of open slots. The results of the secret ballot are announced to the tenure/probationary faculty within five working days of the election. The faculty members receiving the highest number of votes in the secret ballot, subject to the requirement of there being at least three members with the rank of professor, will join the department RTP committee. The five members shall serve staggered terms of two academic years. The departmental election shall normally be held during the first week of classes in the fall semester of each academic year. If an elected member resigns or otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which he/she was elected, the department will elect a replacement to serve the rest of the unexpired term.

In the case of promotion to full professor, only new materials that were not part of the review for promotion to associate professor or, in the case of faculty hired at the associate professor level, since beginning work at CSULB will be considered.
The period of review for reappointment, tenure, and promotion includes the year(s) of service credit. Accomplishments made elsewhere for which service credit was awarded will fully count towards tenure and promotion actions, so long as a substantial fraction of the total required products within each area are derived from work carried out at CSULB. The accomplishments achieved at CSULB and elsewhere should be clearly documented in the candidate’s narrative.

The committee’s deliberations are confidential. The recommendations of the committee concerning (1) rankings in each area of evaluation and (2) final recommendation concerning RTP action are made by simple majority vote of the committee membership. The committee members opposing the majority recommendation may submit a minority report(s) outlining the rationale for their decision. Such documentation shall be part of the department committee recommendation.

The department chair shall inform new faculty members of the standards of performance expected by the department and of the procedures to be followed in evaluating performance. The department chair will provide copies of the department, college and university RTP policies to new faculty during their first semester at CSULB. At least once a year the department chair shall meet with each probationary faculty member for a discussion on performance. The department chair is urged to write an independent evaluation for each RTP candidate. The department committee shall provide the chair with its reports of classroom visitations if not admitted to the file during the open period.

The tenured/probationary faculty of the department, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to this policy. Amendments may be proposed by a petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured/probationary faculty.

Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the department to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.

Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the department within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college council, college dean, and the university Provost.

Effective: Fall 2010