Approved by Faculty Affairs: September 6, 2023

Approved by the NSM Faculty Council: September 16, 2022

Approved by Dean Bennett: September 16, 2022

Approved by Faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences: September 7, 2022

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 competent, excellent, or deficient 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 RTP committee 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. It is the candidate's responsibility to submit a narrative that clearly articulates the quality and value of each contribution. 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 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have:

2.1.1.1 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.

2.1.1.2 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.

2.1.1.3 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.

2.1.1.4 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.

2.1.2. Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidates must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to associate professor or award of tenure (developing course materials, teaching competently, improving their pedagogy, and incorporating students into scholarly research activities) such that their overall performance is considered by the committee to be well above competent. In addition, during the period under review the candidates must have:

2.1.2.1. Provided evidence of three or more additional quality contributions to education. Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category are acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Examples of such categories 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 supervision of student research in the summer, 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.

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

2.2 Promotion to Professor

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

2.2.1.1 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.

2.2.1.2 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).

2.2.1.3 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.

2.2.1.4 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.

2.2.1.5. Provided evidence of three or more additional, valued contributions to education. Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category are acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Examples of such categories 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 supervision of student research in the summer, 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 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidates must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to full professor (developing course materials, teaching competently, improving their pedagogy, and incorporating students into scholarly research activities) such that their overall performance is considered by the committee to be well above competent. In addition, during the period under review the candidates must have:

2.2.2.1. Provided evidence of three or more additional, valued contributions to education, in addition to the three required for a ranking of "Competent" for promotion to professor (six total). Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category are acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Examples of such categories 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 supervision of student research in the summer, 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 at least "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 Competent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have:

3.1.1.1 Published two peer-reviewed research papers based primarily on work done during the period under review. 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 must appear as co-authors on at least one of these papers.

3.1.1.2 Received internal (CSULB or CSU) or external funding to support their research.

3.1.1.3 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.

3.1.1.4 Provided evidence of at least two presentations of their research at two or more meetings of professional societies, including at least one national or international meeting. The presenting author and format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated. The presenting author of at least one presentation should be a CSULB student, and the presenting author of at least one presentation should be the candidate.

3.1.1.5 Served on MS thesis committees.

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

3.1.2.1 Published three or more peer-reviewed research papers. The candidate must be senior investigator on at least two of these papers; those two must be based primarily on work done during the period under review. 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 must appear as co-authors on at least one of these papers.

3.1.2.2 Received external funding to support their research.

3.1.2.3 Provided evidence of at least four presentations of their research at two or more meetings of professional societies, including at least one national or international meeting. The presenting author and format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated. The presenting author of at least one presentation should be a CSULB student, and the presenting author of at least one presentation should be the candidate.

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

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

3.2 Promotion to Professor

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

3.2.1.1 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.

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

3.2.1.3 Provided evidence of at least four presentations of their research at two or more meetings of professional societies, including at least one national or international meeting.

The presenting author and format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated. The presenting author of at least one presentation should be a CSULB student, and the presenting author of at least one presentation should be the candidate.

3.2.1.4 Graduated one or more MS students since the candidates' arrival at CSULB.

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

3.2.2.1 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.

3.2.2.2 Received external funding to support their research.

3.2.2.3 Provide evidence of at least six presentations of their research at three or more meetings of professional societies, including at least one national or international meeting. The presenting author and format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated. The presenting author of at least one presentation should be a CSULB student, and the presenting author of at least one presentation should be the candidate.

3.2.2.4 Graduated two or more MS students since the candidates' arrival at CSULB.

3.2.2.5 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

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

4. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

4.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

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

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

4.1.1.2 Engaged in service activities at the department level. 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).

4.1.1.3 Engaged in service activities at the college level.

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

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

4.1.2.2 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.

4.1.2.3 Engaged in service at the college and university level.

4.1.2.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community, for example by serving as a referee for journal articles or grant proposals, serving on grant panels, editing a journal, organizing scientific meetings or symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies as an appointed or elected officer or committee member.

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

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

4.2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

4.2.1.2 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 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 significant service at the college, university, or CSU system level.

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

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

4.2.2.1 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.

4.2.2.2 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.

4.2.2.3 Engaged in significant service at the college, university, or CSU system level and assumed an effective leadership role in at least one of these service activities. Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine participation.

4.2.2.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community, for example by serving as a referee for journal articles or grant proposals, serving on grant panels, editing a journal, organizing scientific meetings or symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies 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 at least "Competent".

5. Consideration of Service and Teaching Outside of the Department

Candidates and RTP Committees should refer to current Memoranda of Understanding when evaluating service and teaching done outside the Department of Biological Sciences.

6. 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.