

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

4  
5   **1. Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)**  
6

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

17  
18   The listed criteria serve as an initial framework with which to evaluate the candidate's  
19   accomplishments in each category, but a candidate's ranking may be moved up or down based  
20   on evaluations of the overall quality of the candidate's accomplishments. The lists below are  
21   intended as a guideline and not as checklists of minimal qualifications. The overall quality of the  
22   candidate's accomplishments will also be a deciding factor when a candidate has reached  
23   some, but not all, of the criteria for a particular ranking. Files must be complete at the time of  
24   submission to the department RTP committee. Publications are defined as manuscripts that  
25   have final acceptance by the journal.

26  
27  
28   **2. Criteria for the Evaluation of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**  
29

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

32  
33   **2.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure**  
34

35       **2.1.1. Excellent.** For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates should  
36       have achieved all of the criteria described under "Competent" for promotion to associate  
37       professor or award of tenure. In addition, during the period under review the candidates  
38       should have:

39  
40       2.1.1.1 Provided evidence of three or more additional quality contributions to education.  
41       Examples of such contributions are:

- 42           • Obtaining external funding in support of educational activities or programs.
- 43
- 44           • Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as  
45           multimedia or computer-based materials for distribution beyond CSULB.
- 46
- 47           • Offering professional education efforts, such as short courses, forums, or lectures for  
48           academic, government, or private sector professional organizations.

- 49
- 50 • Public education efforts, such as K-12 classroom teaching; community lectures;
- 51 contributions to museums, aquaria, and other public educational exhibits; or
- 52 contributions to science fairs and programs.
- 53
- 54 • Instruction and supervision in additional research and scholarship activities, such as
- 55 summer student research internships, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or
- 56 dissertation committees for students of other institutions, providing research training or
- 57 mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.
- 58
- 59 • Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.
- 60
- 61 • Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or
- 62 graduate students.
- 63

64 **2.1.2 Competent.** For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must

65 have:

66 2.1.2.1 Developed lecture or laboratory course materials that accomplish all of the

67 following:

68

- 69 • Contain current, rigorous, and logically organized content appropriate to the courses
- 70 taught.
- 71
- 72 • Provide explicit student learning outcomes (SLOs).
- 73
- 74 • Effectively facilitate the student learning process and experience.
- 75

76 2.1.2.2 Provided evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:

- 77 • Consideration of scores from university student evaluations in context with the difficulty
- 78 of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and overall
- 79 course rigor. Candidates must provide grade distributions for courses taught during the
- 80 period under review.
- 81
- 82 • Favorable peer reviews of classroom teaching that assess the quality of lecture content
- 83 and the effectiveness of its presentation.
- 84
- 85 • Other evidence indicative of teaching competence, which may include such things as
- 86 peer awards, additional student polling, or critical reviews by external entities (e.g.,
- 87 outside departments, professional societies, peers with expertise in field of specialty).
- 88

89 2.1.2.3 Provided evidence of improvement of pedagogy, including at least two of the

90 following:

91

- 92 • Implementation of effective changes in course content or teaching methods in response
- 93 to student or peer evaluations, prior RTP reviews, or other forms of assessment.
- 94
- 95 • Acquisition and incorporation of discipline-specific materials from scientific literature,
- 96 experts, or other appropriate sources that extend and improve upon existing or standard
- 97 course content.
- 98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

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

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

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

**2.2 Promotion to Professor**

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

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

- Obtaining external funding in support of educational activities or programs.
- Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as multimedia or computer-based materials for distribution beyond CSULB.
- Offering professional education efforts, such as short courses, forums, or lectures for academic, government, or private sector professional organizations.
- Public education efforts, such as K-12 classroom teaching; community lectures; contributions to museums, aquaria, and other public educational exhibits; or contributions to science fairs and programs.
- Instruction and supervision in additional research and scholarship activities, such as summer student research internships, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, or providing research training or mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.
- Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.
- Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or graduate students.

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

2.2.2.1 Developed lecture or laboratory course materials that extend curricular contributions made during the period of review and provide content that is current, relevant, rigorous, and organized and that facilitates student learning.

149 2.2.2.2 Provided evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:  
150 • Consideration of scores from university student evaluations in context with the difficulty  
151 of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and overall  
152 course rigor. Candidates must provide grade distributions for courses taught during the  
153 period under review.

154  
155 • Favorable peer reviews of classroom teaching that assess the quality of lecture content  
156 and the effectiveness of its presentation.

157  
158 • Other evidence indicative of teaching competence, which may include such things as  
159 peer awards, additional student polling, or critical reviews by external entities (e.g.,  
160 outside departments, professional societies, peers with expertise in field of specialty).

161  
162 2.2.2.3 Provided evidence of continuing improvement of pedagogy including two or more of  
163 the following:

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

166  
167 • Acquisition and incorporation of discipline-specific materials (from scientific literature,  
168 experts, or other appropriate sources) that extend and improve upon existing or standard  
169 course content.

170  
171 • Acquisition and incorporation of enhanced teaching methods obtained through  
172 publications on pedagogy, participation in programs or conferences on teaching, or after  
173 consultation with colleagues with teaching expertise in the subject area.

174  
175 2.2.2.4 Continuing incorporation of students into their ongoing scholarly research activities  
176 in a manner that enhances the student's education. Evidence of these activities may  
177 include student enrollment in supervised research courses, chairing of thesis committees,  
178 materials indicating excellent mentoring activities in research, and examples of student  
179 success in research.

180  
181 2.2.2.5 Provided evidence of three or more additional, valued contributions to education.  
182 Examples of such contributions are:

183 • Obtaining external funding in support of educational activities or programs since arrival  
184 to CSULB.

185  
186 • Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as  
187 multimedia or computer-based materials for distribution beyond CSULB.

188  
189 • Offering professional education efforts, such as short courses, forums, or lectures for  
190 academic, government, or private sector professional organizations.

191  
192 • Public education efforts, such as K-12 classroom teaching; community lectures;  
193 contributions to museums, aquaria, and other public educational exhibits; or  
194 contributions to science fairs and programs.

195  
196 • Instruction and supervision in additional research and scholarship activities, such as  
197 summer student research internships, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or

- 198 dissertation committees for students of other institutions, or providing research training  
199 or mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.  
200 • Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.  
201  
202 • Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or  
203 graduate students.

204  
205 **2.2.3 Deficient.** The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be  
206 “Competent”.

### 207 208 **3. Criteria for the Evaluation of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities**

#### 209 210 **3.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure**

211  
212 **3.1.1 Excellent.** For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates should  
213 have:

214  
215 3.1.1.1 Published three or more peer-reviewed research papers. The candidate must be  
216 senior investigator on at least two of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first,  
217 last, or corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial  
218 contribution based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. Beyond  
219 these two papers as senior investigator, senior investigatorship is not required.  
220 Collaborative papers will be assessed based upon the contribution made by the candidate,  
221 which should be clearly described. One or more CSULB students should appear as co-  
222 authors on at least one of these papers.

223  
224 3.1.1.2 Received external funding to support their research.

225  
226 3.1.1.3 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at two or more professional  
227 society meetings, including national or international meetings.

228  
229 3.1.1.4 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at two or more  
230 professional society meetings.

231  
232 3.1.1.5 Served as thesis chair for one or more MS students.

233  
234 3.1.1.6 Engaged in service to the scientific community by refereeing journals or grant  
235 proposals, serving on grant panels or editing a journal.

236  
237 **3.1.2 Competent.** For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must  
238 have:

239  
240 3.1.2.1 Published two peer-reviewed research papers. The candidate must be senior  
241 investigator on both of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first, last, or  
242 corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial contribution  
243 based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. One or more CSULB  
244 students should appear as co-authors on at least one of these papers.

245  
246 3.1.2.2 Received internal (CSULB or CSU) or external funding to support their research.  
247

248 3.1.2.3 Applied for external funding to support their research. In the absence of successful  
249 funding, at least three applications that show evidence of potential success must have been  
250 submitted.

251  
252 3.1.2.4 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at one or more professional  
253 society meetings.

254  
255 3.1.2.5 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at one or more  
256 professional society meetings.

257  
258 3.1.2.6 Served on MS thesis committees.

259  
260 3.1.2.7 Engaged in service to the scientific community by refereeing journals or grant  
261 proposals, serving on grant panels or editing a journal.

262  
263 **3.1.3 Deficient.** The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be  
264 “Competent”.

265  
266 **3.2 Promotion to Professor**

267  
268 **3.2.1 Excellent.** For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted)  
269 the candidates should have:

270 3.2.1.1 Published three or more peer-reviewed research papers. The candidates must be  
271 senior investigator on at least two of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as first,  
272 last, or corresponding author or by evidence that the candidate made a substantial  
273 contribution based on work performed as part of their ongoing research effort. Beyond  
274 these two papers as senior investigator, senior investigatorship is not required.  
275 Collaborative papers will be assessed based upon the contribution made by the candidate,  
276 which should be clearly described. One or more CSULB students should appear as co-  
277 authors on at least two of these papers.

278  
279 3.2.1.2 Received external funding to support their research.

280  
281 3.2.1.3 Presented their research in poster or oral presentations at multiple professional  
282 society meetings, including national or international meetings.

283  
284 3.2.1.4 Provided evidence that students have presented their research at multiple  
285 professional society meetings.

286  
287 3.2.1.5 Graduated two or more MS students since the candidates’ arrival at CSULB.

288  
289 3.2.1.6 Provided evidence of standing in their field. Such evidence could include (among  
290 other things):

291 • Publication of invited review articles

292  
293 • Presentation of one or more invited symposium talks at national or international  
294 meetings

295  
296 • Presentation of invited seminars

297

298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **4. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service**

### **4.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure**

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

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

4.1.1.2 Engaged in high-quality service activities at the department level and assumed an effective leadership role in at least one departmental service activity. This should include service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum

348 revision or document revision). Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from  
349 committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine  
350 participation. The quality of service may also be assessed through such things as  
351 presentations to the faculty in both oral and written form and documents or policies  
352 produced.

353  
354 4.1.1.3 Engaged in service at the college or university level.

355  
356 4.1.1.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community by organizing scientific meetings or  
357 symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies (e.g., as an  
358 appointed or elected officer or committee member).

359  
360 4.1.1.5 Engaged in service to the broader community through activities such as outreach to  
361 local schools or community groups.

362  
363 **4.1.2 Competent.** For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must  
364 have:

365  
366 4.1.2.1 Regularly participated in faculty governance, such as faculty meetings and retreats.

367  
368 4.1.2.2 Engaged in service activities at the department level. This should include service  
369 on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or  
370 Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum  
371 revision or document revision).

372  
373 **4.1.3 Deficient.** The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be  
374 “Competent”.

## 375 376 **4.2 Promotion to Professor**

377  
378 **4.2.1 Excellent.** For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted)  
379 the candidates should have:

380  
381 4.2.1.1 Regularly participated in faculty governance, such as faculty meetings and retreats.  
382 Demonstration of leadership and collegiality in these activities will be expected of senior  
383 faculty to receive a rank of excellent.

384  
385 4.2.1.2 Engaged in high-quality service activities at the department level and assumed an  
386 effective leadership role in multiple departmental service activities. This should include  
387 service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies,  
388 or Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum  
389 revision or document revision). Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from  
390 committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine  
391 participation. The quality of service may also be assessed through such things as  
392 presentations to the faculty in both oral and written form and documents or policies  
393 produced.

394  
395 4.2.1.3 Engaged in service at the college or university level and assumed an effective  
396 leadership role in at least one of these college or university service activities. Candidates  
397 are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how  
398 their contributions exceed routine participation.

399  
400 4.2.1.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community by organizing scientific meetings or  
401 symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies (e.g., as an  
402 appointed or elected officer or committee member).

403  
404 4.2.1.5 Engaged in service to the broader community through activities such as outreach to  
405 local schools or community groups.

406  
407 **4.2.2 Competent.** For this ranking, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted)  
408 the candidates must have:

409  
410 4.2.2.1 Regularly participated in faculty governance, such as faculty meetings and retreats.

411  
412 4.2.2.2 Engaged in high-quality service activities at the department level and assumed an  
413 effective leadership role in at least one departmental service activity. This should include  
414 service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies,  
415 or Curriculum and Assessment) and could also include ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum  
416 revision or document revision). Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from  
417 committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine  
418 participation. The quality of service may also be assessed through such things as  
419 presentations to the faculty in both oral and written form and documents or policies  
420 produced.

421  
422 4.2.2.3 Engaged in service at the college or university level.

423  
424 4.2.2.4 Engaged in service to the scientific community by organizing scientific meetings or  
425 symposia, or participating in the governance activities of professional societies (e.g., as an  
426 appointed or elected officer or committee member).

427  
428 4.2.2.5 Engaged in service to the broader community through activities such as outreach to  
429 local schools or community groups.

430  
431 **4.2.3 Deficient.** The candidates will receive this ranking if they are not judged to be  
432 “Competent”.

## 433 434 **5. Amendments**

435  
436 Amendments to this document may be proposed in writing to the Department by any three full-  
437 time, tenure-track faculty members of the Department.

438  
439 Proposed amendments shall be brought before the faculty for discussion and potential action in  
440 accordance with the Department By-Laws.

441  
442 Action on the proposed amendments shall require a secret ballot in accordance with the  
443 Department By-Laws. Passage of amendments shall require a two-thirds majority of those  
444 eligible to vote and the approval of the Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.