

1 **Approved by faculty of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry on May 21, 2010**
2

3 **DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY**
4 **COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS**
5 **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH**
6 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**
7

8 **1. Preamble and Guiding Principles**
9

10 The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at the California State University, Long Beach
11 is dedicated to maintaining a reputation as an outstanding department on the basis of the rigorous
12 curriculum, the quality of research conducted with bachelors and master-level students, and the
13 caliber of its graduates. The department values teaching and research as equal and essential
14 components of the education of our students and seeks to integrate research with teaching at
15 every possible opportunity in the curriculum. Our teaching and research programs sustain a
16 rigorous and innovative curriculum that focuses on developing the capabilities of students (both
17 majors and non-majors) in chemistry and biochemistry, developing problem-solving, critical
18 thinking, and communication skills, and fostering a culture devoted to scholarship, professional
19 integrity, continued learning, and a responsible work ethic.
20

21 The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry follows rules and regulations set forth in the
22 CNSM and the university RTP policies. The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)
23 Policy of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry establishes specific standards of
24 excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty within
25 the department.
26

27 The departmental RTP recommendations are based on a candidate demonstrating a sustained
28 record of accomplishments over the period of review and evidence leading to the belief that a
29 candidate will continue making productive contributions in all three areas of evaluation.
30

31 Departmental faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the
32 impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally-
33 related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and 3) service to the
34 department, college, university, community, and the profession.
35

36 The department RTP committee shall rank each candidate for reappointment, tenure or
37 promotion as “excellent”, “competent”, or “deficient” in each area. A detailed justification of its
38 ranking shall be provided.
39

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

44 scholarly and creative activities. In order to be promoted to full professor candidates must
45 receive at least one rating of *excellent* in one of the areas of evaluation.

46 **2. Standards of excellence and accompanying criteria in instruction and** 47 **instructionally related activities**

48
49 All department faculty members are expected to be effective in instruction and instructionally
50 related activities. To be considered effective, the candidates shall meet most of the requirements
51 specified in § 2.1 and § 2.2 of the CNSM RTP Policy and §2.2.1-2.2.6 of the department policy.
52 Teaching effectiveness in courses assigned to the candidate during the period of review will be
53 evaluated. In addition, the evaluation of supervision of graduate/undergraduate students will be
54 performed if the candidate taught research supervision courses (496, 695, etc.) during the
55 evaluation period. Graduate and undergraduate advising will also be evaluated if it was a part of
56 the candidate's assignment. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach
57 while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate's accomplishments in
58 teaching. The specific expectations for each rating category are intended as a guide to evaluators.
59 The evaluators shall determine if the overall quality of the candidate's accomplishments is
60 commensurate with standards set forth in § 2.1 of the department RTP policy for each rating.

61
62 **2.1 Departmental standards.** In recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, or
63 promotion the following criteria for the candidate rating are applied:

64
65 **2.1.1. The rating of "excellent"** is given to a candidate who is effective in
66 instruction and instructionally related activities and demonstrates success in at least one (for
67 reappointment, tenure, or promotion to associate professor) or two (for promotion to professor)
68 of the following products/activities:

- 69
70 a. Publication of a textbook
71 b. Significant revisions of lecture and laboratory courses or development of new courses
72 c. Exemplary participation in the supervision of undergraduate student research
73 d. Significant success in thesis research supervision
74 e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or
75 instructional laboratories
76 f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-
77 based materials for uses beyond the candidate's own teaching
78 g. Exemplary performance in classroom instruction judged by the members of the
79 department RTP committee to be significantly beyond standards of effectiveness
80 normally expected from all faculty.

81
82 This requirement may also be satisfied by partially fulfilling a combination of some of the listed
83 criteria at a level such that the candidate's overall record is deemed equivalent to one or two
84 products as appropriate.

85
86 **2.1.2. The rating "competent"** is given to a candidate who is effective in instruction and
87 instructionally related activities.

88

89 **2.2. Evaluation for instruction and instructionally related activities.** The assessment of
90 teaching effectiveness will include the following:

91
92 **2.2.1. Evaluation of the course materials submitted by the candidate.** The scholarly rigor of
93 the courses and content of the courses taught should follow standard course outlines, if available;
94 otherwise, they should be comparable to the same courses or comparable courses taught by other
95 tenured/probationary faculty. Each course should prepare the students for further courses for
96 which the course in question is a prerequisite. Materials submitted by a candidate to her/his file
97 should include at least course syllabi, sample assignments/tests/projects, and samples of student
98 work with instructor feedback¹ if appropriate for the course. Course materials should clearly
99 convey to the students the student learning outcomes and the relationship of the course to the
100 major and to the broader discipline. Course policies and grading practices should be clearly
101 conveyed to students. The results of grading practices should be reasonably consistent with
102 department norms for the same course taught by other tenured/probationary faculty during the
103 period of review.²

104
105 **2.2.2. Evaluation of the narrative provided by the candidate.** The narrative should describe
106 thoughtful and deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in
107 adopting new teaching methodologies or in revisions and modifications to courses taught by the
108 candidate. These efforts could also include engagement in professional development activities
109 associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. There should be evidence that the
110 candidate takes an ongoing and active role in refreshing her/his courses, maintaining their
111 currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the
112 classroom. This record may include but is not limited to interactions with colleagues on
113 pedagogy, classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of
114 the Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or
115 conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that contribute to the
116 development of teaching effectiveness.

117
118 **2.2.3. Analysis of written reports of observations of the candidate's teaching during the**
119 **review period by members of the RTP Committee.** These class visits must be conducted
120 during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is not teaching at
121 CSULB that semester; in which case, the visitations from the prior year shall be used). The
122 candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur during the open period. The
123 candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to the start of classroom visits, but
124 otherwise visits will be unannounced. The candidate may submit course syllabi or otherwise
125 notify the RTP committee when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee to
126 choose the most appropriate days for visits. The committee members' evaluations of the
127 candidate in the classroom should address such factors as: instructional clarity, communication
128 with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time,
129 currency and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used,
130 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.

131 be placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to the candidate. The signed reports must
132 include time(s) and date(s) of the visit(s).

133
134 **2.2.4. Analysis of students' ratings of instruction.** Student ratings of instruction should be
135 compared with department means and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of
136 course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These
137 numerical ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the
138 instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to student
139 needs. Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching
140 effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on the evaluation form—or the entire form, by itself
141 and in isolation from other information—does not provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.
142 Conversely, low ratings of instruction in any single course section do not necessarily indicate the
143 lack of teaching effectiveness.

144
145 **2.2.5. Evaluation of the candidate's performance in research supervision courses (496, etc.)**
146 Supervision of research students should follow the guidelines of the ACS Committee on
147 Professional Training (CPT, see §3.5.1 of this document). Examples of student work such as
148 comprehensive reports or undergraduate/graduate theses should be included in the file.

149
150 **2.2.6. Evaluation of advising effectiveness if part of the candidate's assigned workload.** The
151 candidate's activities in advising should be described in the narrative. Additional evidence of
152 effectiveness, including letters from students and/or faculty, could also be provided.

153
154 **2.2.7. Evaluation of materials providing evidence of success in additional instructional and**
155 **instructionally-related activities.**

- 156
- 157 a. Publication of a textbook. The textbook must be intended for the use beyond the confines
158 of CSULB. If authorship of a textbook is considered in the teaching category, it cannot be
159 simultaneously considered as a RSCA product.
 - 160 b. Significant revisions of lecture and laboratory courses or development of new courses.
161 The revisions should go beyond the routine changes to refresh courses. Significant
162 revisions, such as development of a new laboratory curriculum or development of a new
163 course, will be considered in this category. This includes new topics not previously taught
164 in the department in special topics graduate courses. The authorship of laboratory manuals
165 and study guides will also be considered in this category. These products need to be
166 substantially original work, not merely modifications.
 - 167 c. Exemplary success in the supervision of undergraduate student research. The candidate
168 must demonstrate significant accomplishments of her/his research students well beyond
169 the minimum expectations for effectiveness in directing undergraduate research described
170 in § 2.2.5. Ordinarily, several students should be coauthors on the candidate's publications
171 or presentations at national or international meetings.
 - 172 d. Significant success in thesis research supervision. Ordinarily this requirement is satisfied
173 by inclusion of an MS thesis accepted by the CSULB library in which the candidate
174 served as chair of the thesis committee.
 - 175 e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or
176 instructional laboratories. Substantial funding is defined as multiple external or internal

- 177 (university-wide or CSU system-wide) grants related to teaching effectiveness (such as 3E
178 awards).
- 179 f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-
180 based materials for uses beyond the candidate's own teaching. Normally such materials
181 should be published or otherwise disseminated for uses beyond the confines of CSULB
182 (e.g. public presentation).
- 183 g. Exemplary performance in classroom instruction judged by the members of the
184 department RTP committee to be significantly beyond the standards of effectiveness
185 normally expected from all faculty.

186 187 188 **3. Standards of excellence and accompanying criteria in research, scholarly, 189 and creative activities (RSCA)**

190
191 Department faculty must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that demonstrate
192 intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty members are expected to
193 produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or
194 pedagogy of the disciplines and that are disseminated to appropriate audiences.

195
196 In addition to requirements specified in CNSM RTP Policy § 2.3, the following are the specific
197 standards in RSCA for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Chemistry
198 and Biochemistry.

199 200 **3.1. Departmental Standards for Reappointment.**

201
202 **Candidates for reappointment** must show evidence that they have begun to develop an
203 independent research program at CSULB. Such evidence should include, at minimum, the
204 following:

- 205
206 a. the candidate must have established a functional research laboratory on campus
207 and
208 b. there must be evidence of effort to obtain external funding
209 and
210 c. there must be evidence of student participation in the candidate's research program

211
212 In recommendations concerning reappointment the following criteria for the candidate rating will
213 be applied:

214
215 **3.1.1. The rating "excellent"** is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.1 a-c
216 and, in addition, has at least one peer-reviewed journal publication (accepted for publication or
217 published) resulting from the candidate's research program conducted to a substantial degree at
218 CSULB in which the candidate is designated as the corresponding author.

219
220 **3.1.2. The rating "competent"** is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.1 a-c.

221 222 **3.2. Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor**

223 **Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor** must develop an independent
224 research program at CSULB that results in at least two (2) peer-reviewed publications in which
225 the candidate is designated as the corresponding author. The quality and significance of the
226 candidate's research publications is of primary importance. The candidate's publications must
227 appear in well respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-
228 review. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of a continuous and significant effort to
229 secure external funding.³ The candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the
230 quality and value of the candidate's research and this narrative must identify the candidate's
231 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. The overall trajectory
232 of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue making
233 increasingly distinguished contributions in RSCA. In addition to requirements specified above,
234 the candidate must have at least 1 (one) additional RSCA product from the list provided in § 3.4.
235

236 **In recommendations concerning tenure and/or promotion to associate professor** the
237 following specific criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:
238

239 **3.2.1. The rating “excellent”** is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in § 3.2 and
240 has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in § 3.4. Additionally,
241 CSULB undergraduate or graduate student(s) must be coauthor(s) on some of the candidate's
242 publications.
243

244 **3.2.2. The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.2.
245

246 **3.3. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor** 247

248 Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to have sustained an ongoing
249 program of research or other scholarly activity that results in peer reviewed RSCA products. The
250 department acknowledges that the professional goals of tenured faculty members might be
251 somewhat different and more diverse than those of junior faculty. Therefore, although the overall
252 standards for promotion to full professor are higher than those for promotion to associate
253 professor, the candidate's effort may be broadened beyond traditional research and could include
254 significant components related to pedagogy of chemistry and biochemistry.
255

256 The ongoing program of research or scholarly activity developed by the candidate at CSULB
257 shall result in at least two (2) peer-reviewed publications in which the candidate is designated as
258 the corresponding author. In addition to the requirements specified above, the candidate must
259 have at least two (2) peer-reviewed RSCA products in one or more of the categories listed in
260 § 3.4. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of significant effort to secure external
261 funding.³ The candidate's publications must appear in well respected international research
262 journals employing the highest standards of peer-review or in international journals devoted to
263 pedagogy of chemistry such as the Journal of Chemical Education.

264 In recommendations concerning promotion to full professor the following criteria for the
265 candidate rating will be applied:
266

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.

267 **3.3.1. The rating “excellent”** is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in § 3.3 and
268 has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in § 3.4.

269
270 **3.3.2. The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in § 3.3.

271
272 **3.4. Peer-reviewed RSCA products considered in tenure and promotion recommendations⁴**

273
274 a. Peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is designated as a corresponding
275 author⁵ and peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is a contributing author

276
277 b. Peer-reviewed review articles or book chapters

278
279 c. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline, such as articles published in
280 the Journal of Chemical Education

281
282 d. Awarded external individual research grant(s) or contract(s)

283
284 e. Awarded instrument grant(s)

285
286 f. One or more articles published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings, counted as a single
287 product

288
289 g. One or more patents, counted as a single product

290
291 h. One or more published textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses
292 beyond the candidate’s own personal teaching, counted as a single product

293
294 i. Two or more research presentations on at least two national or international meetings, counted
295 as a single product

296
297 **3.5. Evaluation for RSCA**

298
299 The assessment of the candidate’s research and scholarly activity will be based on peer
300 evaluation. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the
301 overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments. The numerical expectations
302 concerning RSCA products required for each rating category are intended as a guide to
303 evaluators. The RSCA products of appropriate quantity and quality as described in § 3.2 - 3.5 are
304 sufficient to meet criteria for each rating in RSCA. However, fewer RSCA products of superior
305 quality or significance might also be sufficient to satisfy requirements for a particular rating
306 provided that the candidate meets the criteria specified in the CNSM RTP Policy. Additional
307 evidence of excellence may include publications in journals of very high impact (such as Nature,
308 Science, PNAS, Cell, Angewandte Chemie, Journal of the American Chemical Society, Journal
309 of Biological Chemistry), editorials/covers describing the candidate’s publications, significant
310 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.

311 CSULB, receipt of prestigious research support (such as CAREER NSF or R01 NIH Grant), or
312 comparable evidence.

313
314 The assessment of the candidate's research and scholarly activity will include the following:
315

316 **3.5.1. Examination of evidence that the candidate developed (for tenure or promotion to**
317 **associate professor) or sustained (for promotion to full professor) an independent research**
318 **program at CSULB involving students.** The candidate must present evidence that the
319 candidate's research program developed on campus meets the following characteristics described
320 in American Chemical Society Committee on Professional Training Guidelines: "Undergraduate
321 research is conducted with a faculty advisor or mentor. The student's research project is typically
322 based on the faculty mentor's research interests, which allows the student to draw upon the
323 mentor's expertise and resources and also allows the faculty mentor to develop a productive
324 research program. The mentor meets regularly with the student to make research plans, assess
325 risks associated with the proposed research, and review results. The student is encouraged to take
326 primary responsibility for the project and to make substantial input into its direction. The
327 student-mentor relationship also builds student confidence, offers encouragement when
328 necessary, and provides guidance and assistance for the student's future education and career
329 development. Undergraduate research should be envisioned as publishable in a peer-reviewed
330 journal. Research builds upon the previous accomplishments of other scholars. For research to
331 have any meaning or effect, it must be communicated to the scientific community. Peer-review is
332 the generally accepted means of monitoring and insuring the quality of research. While not every
333 undergraduate research project will result in a peer-reviewed publication, it should be the intent
334 of each project to contribute to such a result. When an individual student research project is not
335 of wide enough scope for an entire publication, it can often be combined with other
336 undergraduate research projects into a more comprehensive study that merits publication." The
337 documentation produced by the student under guidance of the candidate must include, at
338 minimum: (a) comprehensive written report authored by the student describing her/his research
339 results, or (b) honors undergraduate thesis, or (c) defended MS thesis. The candidate's narrative
340 must describe the overall goals of her/his research program at CSULB and the nature of students'
341 involvement.

342
343 **3.5.2. Examination of RSCA products submitted by the Candidate**
344

345 **3.5.3.A. Peer-reviewed journal publications authored or coauthored by the candidate**

346 It is expected that the candidate will publish in international research journals with the highest
347 standards of peer-review. It is the responsibility of the faculty member preparing a publication to
348 consult with her/his mentor and the department chair to determine whether the venue is of
349 "international" status. Ordinarily, such journals must be indexed by the Science Citation Index
350 and should have an impact factor above the median in each sub-discipline of
351 chemistry/biochemistry. The list of high quality chemistry/biochemistry journals is developed by
352 the department chair in consultation with the faculty. For publications in other professional
353 journals, the assessment of journal quality, including comparison of relevant impact factors, will
354 be performed. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a corresponding
355 author will be counted as a whole RSCA product. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in
356 which the candidate is a contributing author will be counted as a whole or fractional RSCA
357 product depending on the level of the candidate's contribution. The candidate's narrative should

358 provide a clear description of the candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to
359 jointly authored papers. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding these
360 contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author
361 on a publication submitted to the file. Peer-reviewed journal publications included in the file
362 should be published or accepted for publication at the time the candidate's file is submitted for
363 departmental RTP review. The papers submitted for publication after the open period deadline
364 shall not be considered in the candidate's review. Such papers will only be considered in
365 evaluation(s) performed in the subsequent academic year(s).

366
367 **3.5.3.B. Peer-reviewed review article or book chapters.** These should be published in
368 international research journals with the highest standards of peer-review or in book series or
369 monographs. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding the candidate's
370 contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author
371 on a publication. In such cases the publication will be considered as fractional RSCA product.

372
373 **3.5.3.C. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline,** such as articles
374 published in the Journal of Chemical Education or in journals of comparable quality. Each
375 publication in which the candidate is a corresponding author will be counted as a whole RSCA
376 product. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding the candidate's
377 contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author
378 on a publication. In such cases the publication will be considered as a fractional RSCA product.

379
380 **3.5.3.D. Awarded external research grant(s) or contract(s).** Each awarded grant or contract
381 in which the candidate serves as PI will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate
382 serves as a Co-PI, each awarded grant or sub-contract will be considered as a whole or fractional
383 RSCA product depending on the candidate's contributions in preparing the grant and her/his role
384 in the described research project. The documentation from the grant PI regarding the candidate's
385 contributions is strongly recommended in such cases.

386
387 **3.5.3.E. Awarded instrument grant.** Each awarded grant in which the candidate serves as a PI
388 will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate serves as a Co-PI, each awarded grant
389 will be considered as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the candidate's
390 contributions. The documentation from the grant PI regarding the candidate's contributions is
391 strongly recommended in such cases.

392
393 **3.5.3.F. One or more peer-reviewed conference proceeding, counted as a single product.**
394 These need to be of full publication quality and need to undergo the peer-review process. Some
395 examples of eligible peer-review conferences proceedings are National Meetings of ACS,
396 Electrochemical Society Meetings, Materials Research Society Meetings, or comparable
397 proceedings series.

398
399 **3.5.3.G. One or more patents** issued to the candidate for items related to the discipline, counted
400 as a single product. The provisional patent application should be filed before the candidate's file
401 is submitted for departmental RTP review.

402

403 **3.5.3.H. One or more published textbooks, curricula, or instructional technology developed**
404 **for use beyond the candidate's own personal teaching, counted as a single product.** The
405 materials in this category must be disseminated nationally and clearly intended for the general
406 use beyond the confines of CSULB.

407
408 **3.5.3.I. Two or more research presentations at two different national or international**
409 **meetings, counted as a single product.** Both oral and poster presentations will be considered in
410 this category.

411
412 **3.5.4. Examination of the candidate's narrative.** The narrative should describe the overall
413 goals and progress of the candidate's research or scholarly activity at CSULB including a brief
414 description of the candidate's future RSCA plans and direction.

415
416

417 **4. Standards of excellence and accompanying criteria in service**

418
419 Faculty members are expected to participate in faculty governance through active involvement
420 on committees at the department, college, and university levels. The department expects that the
421 involvement of the candidate in service will increase as he/she moves through the ranks. Faculty
422 are expected to participate in department activities, which include active participation at
423 department seminars and meetings with seminar guests, attending thesis defenses, and attending
424 other faculty meetings including the advisory council breakfast. Maintenance of shared
425 department instrumentation shall be considered as service to the department. Faculty service
426 considered in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions could also include participation in
427 service to the community or to the profession. Such service could involve, but is not limited to,
428 service to professional organizations; profession-related activities at local, state, national, and
429 international levels through discipline-oriented activities, such as committees, workshops,
430 speeches, and media interviews; volunteering consultancies to schools, local governments, and
431 community service organizations; membership on selection and review panels for instructional
432 grants, fellowships, awards; conference presentations; and other efforts calling for general
433 expertise in the discipline. In evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in service, the
434 department RTP committee will consider the criteria and expectations specified in § 2.4 of the
435 CNSM RTP Policy.

436
437 **4.1. Candidates for reappointment** must show evidence that they have begun involvement in
438 faculty governance at the department level. The department acknowledges that the involvement
439 in service at this point of the candidate's career is normally limited to department level
440 committees.

441
442 An excellent rating will be given to a candidate who actively serves on department committees
443 as assigned by the department chair or elected. The rating "excellent" requires active
444 participation, which may involve authorship of committee documents such as minutes, policy
445 statements or similar materials. Evidence of active participation might also include a letter from
446 the committee chair.

447 The rating "competent" will be given to the candidate who serves on department committees as
448 assigned by the department chair or elected.

449
450 **4.2. Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor** must become actively
451 involved in faculty governance. It is expected that the candidate serves on several committees at
452 the department level. The candidate should also be involved in service on at least one
453 committee/council either at the college, university or CSU system level. Normally, it is not
454 expected that the candidate is extensively involved in service during the probationary period, as
455 this is the period in which primary emphasis should be placed on establishing the required
456 teaching and research programs. However, each faculty member is expected to participate in
457 professional activities relating to chemistry and biochemistry, such as attendance at professional
458 meetings, reviews of grant proposals; or other professional activities deemed equally valuable to
459 the academic community. Service to professional organizations and to the community is also
460 encouraged.

461
462 **The rating “excellent”** will be given to a candidate who, in addition to service on the
463 department committees as assigned by the department chair, is also actively involved in service
464 on one or more college or university or CSU system committees. It is expected that the candidate
465 has played an active role in one or more of the department/college/university committees.
466 Evidence of active participation may include the authorship of pertinent materials produced by
467 the committee or a letter from the committee chair.

468
469 **The rating “competent”** will be given to the candidate who participates in faculty governance
470 as specified in the CNSM policy.

471
472 **4.3. Candidates for promotion to full professor** are expected to play an active role in the
473 governance of the department, college, or university. In recommendations concerning promotion
474 to full professor the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

475
476 **The rating “excellent”** is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty governance.
477 The candidate’s record must include quality performance in at least four activities from the
478 following list:

- 479
480 a. 2 year membership of a major CNSM committee or college or university council
481 b. membership on the department RTP Committee
482 c. chairing a college council or CNSM curriculum committee or one of the university councils,
483 d. service on the Academic Senate
484 e. chairing a university-wide committee
485 f. leading role in grant applications for institutional research/instructional activities, such as
486 RISE, MARC, Howard Hughes, or comparable programs
487 g. leadership role in professional organizations
488 h. significant reviewing duties in professional journals (> 10 reviews)
489 i. active interactions with industrial, educational, and research institutions or governmental
490 agencies
491 j. volunteering consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service
492 organizations
493 k. membership on review panels for conference presentations, awards, and fellowships
494

495 **The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty governance.
496

497 **4.4 Evaluation for Service.** The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach
498 while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments in
499 service. The numerical expectations concerning service activities listed in 4.3 a-k are intended as
500 a guide to evaluators. Multiple combinations of various service contributions may be deemed
501 equivalent to requirements specified for each rating. The candidate must provide a list that shows
502 membership on the various committees. In cases where the candidate had an active or leading
503 role in the committee, he/she must document the service products. A service letter from the chair
504 of the committee describing details of the role of the candidate as a committee member may be
505 provided in cases in which the candidate is not the chair but needs to document an active role. If
506 available, letters of appointment on college/university/CSU system committees need to be
507 included. For other service products, such as grant reviewing, proper documentation needs to be
508 included.
509

510 **5. Department RTP Procedures**

511
512 The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry will follow the general guidelines of the
513 university document. The specific procedures that will be used by the department in following
514 these guidelines are outlined below. The criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor
515 apply to candidates hired with the expectation of performing research in chemistry or
516 biochemistry. Separate guidelines will be developed for faculty hired with the expectation of
517 conducting research in chemistry education or the department will defer to standards and criteria
518 in RSCA specified in the RTP Policy of the Department of Science Education at CSULB.
519

520 The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry RTP Committee shall consist of five members
521 elected by secret ballot from among the department’s tenured faculty. The department committee
522 shall include at least three members holding the rank of professor, unless there are not three
523 eligible faculty members. The secret ballot shall include names of all tenured faculty in the
524 department except academic administrators, those faculty who are candidates for promotion,
525 continuing members of the department RTP committee, faculty elected to serve or serving on the
526 college RTP committee, and those faculty who are on full or partial leave of absence during the
527 academic year. Eligible faculty may request to have their name removed from the ballot. All
528 department probationary and tenured faculty are eligible to vote and may vote for any number of
529 candidates up to the number of open slots. The results of the secret ballot are announced to the
530 tenure/probationary faculty within five working days of the election. The faculty members
531 receiving the highest number of votes in the secret ballot, subject to the requirement of there
532 being at least three members with the rank of professor, will join the department RTP committee.
533 The five members shall serve staggered terms of two academic years. The departmental election
534 shall normally be held during the first week of classes in the fall semester of each academic year.
535 If an elected member resigns or otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which he/she
536 was elected, the department will elect a replacement to serve the rest of the unexpired term.
537

538 In the case of promotion to full professor, only new materials that were not part of the review for
539 promotion to associate professor or, in the case of faculty hired at the associate professor level,
540 since beginning work at CSULB will be considered.

541
542 The period of review for reappointment, tenure, and promotion includes the year(s) of service
543 credit. Accomplishments made elsewhere for which service credit was awarded will fully count
544 towards tenure and promotion actions, so long as a substantial fraction of the total required
545 products within each area are derived from work carried out at CSULB. The accomplishments
546 achieved at CSULB and elsewhere should be clearly documented in the candidate's narrative.

547
548 The committee's deliberations are confidential. The recommendations of the committee
549 concerning (1) rankings in each area of evaluation and (2) final recommendation concerning
550 RTP action are made by simple majority vote of the committee membership. The committee
551 members opposing the majority recommendation may submit a minority report(s) outlining the
552 rationale for their decision. Such documentation shall be part of the department committee
553 recommendation.

554
555 The department chair shall inform new faculty members of the standards of performance
556 expected by the department and of the procedures to be followed in evaluating performance. The
557 department chair will provide copies of the department, college and university RTP policies to
558 new faculty during their first semester at CSULB. At least once a year the department chair shall
559 meet with each probationary faculty member for a discussion on performance. The department
560 chair is urged to write an independent evaluation for each RTP candidate. The department
561 committee shall provide the chair with its reports of classroom visitations if not admitted to the
562 file during the open period.

563
564 The tenured/probationary faculty of the department, voting by secret ballot (with pro and con
565 arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to this policy. Amendments may be
566 proposed by a petition from ten percent (10%) of the tenured/probationary faculty.

567
568 Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called
569 within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair
570 of the department to the faculty at least five (5) instructional days before the public hearing.

571
572 Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a
573 majority of the tenured/probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the
574 department within twenty (20) instructional days of the public hearing and they have the
575 concurrence of the college council, college dean, and the university Provost.

576
577 Effective: Fall 2010