Approved by faculty of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry on 10.30.2025

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

1. Preamble and Guiding Principles

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

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. Further, we recognize that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive, inclusive, collegial environment benefiting our department community.

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry follows rules and regulations set forth in the CNSM and the university RTP policies. The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry establishes specific standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty (Unit 3) within the department. Candidates and RTP committees are required to follow all policies and procedures listed in those documents in addition to the departmental RTP Policy and should be aware that some policies and procedures not addressed in this departmental RTP Policy are addressed in those documents. It is essential that all participants in the RTP process carefully read all three policy documents.

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

Departmental faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. The department RTP committee shall rank each candidate for tenure or promotion as “excellent”, “competent”, or “deficient” in each area. A detailed justification of its ranking shall be provided.

The classification of candidate activities in the three areas of evaluation should follow the descriptions below. In certain circumstances, a set of candidate activities may be reasonably

described as falling within more than one category, across multiple categories, or otherwise not clearly falling into just one category. In such cases, the activities should be placed into a single category of the candidate's choice. This is to avoid the appearance of attempting to receive more credit than a single activity would typically allow (i.e., "double-dipping"), and the candidate should provide justification for the category the activity is placed in. RTP committees should provide flexibility for candidates to make reasonable decisions about the classification of their activities insofar as they do not obviously contradict the classifications described below.

Positive recommendation for tenure or promotion requires at least a rating of competent in each area of evaluation. To receive a positive recommendation from the department RTP committee for tenure or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of *excellent* in the area of instruction and instructionally related activities or in the area of RSCA. To be promoted to full professor candidates must receive at least one rating of *excellent* in one of the three areas of evaluation.

2. Standards of Excellence and Accompanying Criteria in Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

All department faculty members are expected to be effective in instruction and instructionally related activities. To be considered effective, the candidates shall meet the requirements specified in §2.3.1-2.3.7 of the department policy and follow the guidelines specified §2.1 and §2.2 of the CNSM RTP policy. These sections outline expectations for instructional philosophy and practice, pedagogical approaches, ongoing professional development, student perception of teaching, and evaluation methods, including peer observations and holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating our student population. Teaching effectiveness in courses assigned to the candidate during the period of review will be evaluated. Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) is one factor rather than the sole determinant of teaching effectiveness. In addition, the evaluation of supervision of graduate/undergraduate students will be performed if the candidate taught research supervision courses (496, 697, etc.) during the evaluation period. Graduate and undergraduate advising will also be evaluated if it was a part of the candidate’s assignment. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching. The specific expectations for each rating category for tenure or promotion are intended as a guide to evaluators. The evaluators shall determine if the overall quality of the candidate’s accomplishments is commensurate with standards set forth in §2.3 of the department RTP policy.

Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB compensation for any of the instructional activities described in their narratives. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward instruction and instructionally related activities.

2.1 Departmental Standards for Reappointment. Candidates for reappointment must be effective in instruction and instructionally related activities. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is listed in §2.3.

2.2 Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion. In recommendations concerning tenure or promotion, the following criteria for the candidate rating are applied:

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

a. Publication of a textbook.
b. Significant revisions of lecture and/or laboratory courses or development of new courses
c. Exemplary participation in the supervision of undergraduate student research.
d. Significant success in thesis research supervision.
e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories.
f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-based materials for uses beyond the candidate's own teaching.
g. Exemplary performance in classroom instruction.

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

2.2.2. The rating "competent" is given to a candidate who is effective in instruction and instructionally related activities. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is listed in §2.3.

2.3. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities. The assessment of teaching effectiveness will include the following:

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

2.3.2. Evaluation of the narrative provided by the candidate. Evaluators should examine the narrative for appropriate discussion of the four main parts of this document: (i) instructional philosophy and practice, (ii) pedagogical approach and methods, (iii) ongoing professional development as a teacher, (iv) SPOT, and (v) the supervision of research students. The narrative should describe thoughtful and deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies or in revisions and modifications to courses taught by the candidate. These efforts must also include engagement in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. There should be evidence that the candidate takes an ongoing and active role in refreshing their courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches used by assessing their effectiveness in the classroom. Candidates are expected to address aspects of their SPOT score summaries in their narrative, especially with regard to changes over time or differences between courses. Candidates should describe actions taken to improve student perceptions. If the candidate teaches courses which have high DFW rates (>20%), it is recommended that they address these rates and describe

their efforts to reduce these rates in their narrative. This record may include but is not limited to interactions with colleagues on pedagogy, classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the Faculty Center, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, efforts in academic advising of students, and other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

2.3.3. Analysis of written reports of observations of the candidate's teaching during the review period by members of the RTP Committee.

For reappointment and mini reviews, there will be a minimum of two class visits by different members of the RTP committee. These class visits should occur on different days.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, there will be a minimum of four class visits. The expectation is that these four reviews would be as follows, one from the review two years previous to the semester of review, one from the previous year, and two (to multiple classes) from the semester of review, each conducted by the RTP committee of the corresponding year. The candidate may opt out of having reviews from either (or both) of the two previous years, in which case the RTP committee will conduct sufficient visits during the semester of review to bring the total to four visits.

If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be used. At least two observations must be performed during the review period, however a maximum of two observations from prior years may be used. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the RTP committee to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in advance if this situation is likely to arise.

For promotion to Professor, as part of the review process, four class visits shall be made by at least two members of the department RTP committee. Ideally, these class visits will be conducted during the semester in which the review takes place. If the candidate is not teaching at CSULB during the semester of review, then visits made subsequent to the last RTP action during the previous three years or based on guest lectures in other courses during the review period may be used. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the RTP committee to be aware that they must arrange for these visits in advance if this situation is likely to arise.

As per the collective bargaining agreement, the candidate will receive notice of at least five working days prior to the start of classroom visits, which will normally occur over a two-to-three-week period. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. Class visits should include the entire scheduled class period. Exceptions may be made with written approval of the dean and the candidate.

The committee members' evaluation of the candidate in the classroom should address such factors as: instructional clarity, communication with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use of the classroom time, currency and mastery of the subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, electronic media or demonstrations. Written reports based on class visits must be placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to the candidate. The signed reports must include time(s) and date(s) of the visit(s).

2.3.4. Analysis of students' perception of instruction. SPOT ratings should be compared with department/college means and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course

concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and the academic quality of the course. These numerical ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to student needs. SPOT scores alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on the evaluation form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. Conversely, low SPOT scores in any single course section do not necessarily indicate a lack of teaching effectiveness.

2.3.5. Evaluation of the candidate's performance in research supervision courses (496, 697, etc.) Supervision of research students should follow the American Chemical Society (ACS) Guidelines for Undergraduate Chemistry Programs (Section 6, Undergraduate Research). These guidelines apply to both undergraduate and graduate research in the chemistry and biochemistry disciplines, and is outlined in more detail in section 3.5.1. Examples of student work such as comprehensive reports or undergraduate/graduate theses should be included in the file.

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

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

a. Publication of a chemistry/biochemistry related textbook, including a laboratory manual that has been published and has been adopted in other institutions. The textbook must be intended for the use beyond the confines of CSULB.
b. Significant revisions of lecture and/or laboratory course or development of a new course. The revisions should go beyond the routine changes to refresh courses. Significant revisions, such as development of a new laboratory curriculum or development of a new course, will be considered in this category. This includes new topics not previously taught in the department in special topics graduate courses. The authorship of laboratory manuals and study guides will also be considered in this category. These products need to be substantially original work, not merely modifications.
c. Exemplary success in the supervision of undergraduate student research. The candidate must demonstrate significant accomplishments of their research students well beyond the minimum expectations for effectiveness in directing undergraduate research described in §2.3.5. Ordinarily, several students should be coauthors on the candidate's publications or presentations at national or international meetings.
d. Significant success in thesis research supervision. Ordinarily this requirement is satisfied by inclusion of an MS thesis accepted by the CSULB library in which the candidate served as chair of the thesis committee.
e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or instructional laboratories. Substantial funding is defined as multiple external (federal) or internal (university-wide or CSU system-wide) grants related to teaching effectiveness.
f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-based materials for uses beyond the candidate's own teaching. Normally such materials should be published or otherwise disseminated for uses beyond the confines of CSULB (e.g. public presentation).

g. Exemplary performance in classroom instruction significantly beyond the standards normally expected from faculty.

3. Standards of Excellence and Accompanying Criteria in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Department faculty must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are disseminated to appropriate audiences. Candidates must disclose any scholarly or creative activities for which they received reassigned time, grant buyouts, or additional compensation. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward RSCA activities. Sections 3.1 to 3.4 describe the specific standards in RSCA for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

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

a. the candidate must have established a functional research program on campus
b. there must be evidence of effort to obtain external funding
c. there must be evidence of CSULB student participation in the candidate's research program

3.2. Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor must develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in at least two (2) peer-reviewed primary research publications, or equivalents[1], in which the work originates from the candidate's research group at CSULB. For candidates who receive service credit, see lines 566-568. The candidate is expected to be designated as the sole corresponding author in both publications. Under specific circumstances such as when the candidate's expertise or discipline makes a significant contribution to the publication, the candidate may be designated as a co-corresponding author in one of the two publications. The onus is on the candidate to provide an explanation for demonstrating their independence and for being designated as co-corresponding author. At least one of the two papers should list CSULB student(s) as coauthor(s) of the publication. The quality and significance of the candidate's research publications is of primary importance. The candidate's publications must appear in well-respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-review, as described in §3.5.2.A. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of a continuous and significant effort to secure external funding.[1] The candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the candidate's research, and this narrative must identify the candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to specific research projects. The overall trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in RSCA. In addition to requirements specified above, the candidate must have at least 1 (one) additional RSCA product from the list provided in §3.4.

[1] The onus is on the candidate to provide convincing supporting evidence. The candidate should consult with the department chair and the chair of the RTP committee prior to submission of the packet to determine whether the equivalents are appropriate.

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

3.2.1. The rating "excellent" is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in §3.2 and has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in §3.4.

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

3.3. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor. Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to have sustained an ongoing program of research or other scholarly activity that results in peer reviewed RSCA products. The department acknowledges that the professional goals of tenured faculty members might be somewhat different and more diverse than those of junior faculty. Therefore, although the overall standards for promotion to full professor are higher than those for promotion to associate professor, the candidate's effort may be broadened beyond traditional research and could include significant components related to pedagogy of chemistry and biochemistry. The ongoing program of research or scholarly activity developed by the candidate at CSULB shall result in at least two (2) peer-reviewed publications, or equivalents[1], in which the candidate is designated as the corresponding author. In addition to the requirements specified above, the candidate must have at least two (2) peer-reviewed RSCA products in one or more of the categories listed in § 3.4. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of significant effort to secure external funding.[2] The candidate's publications must appear in well-respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-review or in international journals devoted to pedagogy of chemistry such as the Journal of Chemical Education, as described in §3.5.2.A below. In recommendations concerning promotion to full professor the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

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

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

3.4. Peer-reviewed RSCA products considered in tenure and promotion recommendations[3,4]

a. Peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is designated as a corresponding author[5] and peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is a contributing author.
b. Peer-reviewed review articles or book chapters.
c. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline, such as articles published in the Journal of Chemical Education
d. Awarded external research grant(s) or contract(s), supporting the candidate's individual research.
e. Awarded instrument grant(s).
f. One or more articles published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings, counted as a single product.
g. One or more provisional patents, patents, or technology transfer products, counted as a single product.
h. One or more published textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses beyond the candidate's own personal teaching, counted as a single product.
i. Two or more research presentations on at least two national or international meetings, counted as a single product.

[1] The onus is on the candidate to provide convincing supporting evidence. The candidate should consult with the department chair and the chair of the RTP committee prior to submission of the packet to determine whether the equivalents are appropriate.

[2] This requirement is also met by the receipt of a significant, non-peer-reviewed, external support for the candidate's research, such as a large charitable donation arranged by the candidate.

[3] The candidate might have multiple products in each category listed in §3.4 a-i.

[4] For all categories, equivalents will be considered.

[5] This includes publications in which the candidate is one of the corresponding coauthors.

3.5. Evaluation for RSCA. The assessment of the candidate's research and scholarly activity will be based on peer evaluation. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate's accomplishments. The numerical expectations concerning RSCA products required for each rating category are intended as a guide to evaluators. The RSCA products of appropriate quantity and quality as described in §3.2-3.5 are sufficient to meet criteria for each rating in RSCA. However, fewer RSCA products of superior quality or significance might also be sufficient to satisfy requirements for a particular rating provided that the candidate meets the criteria specified in the CNSM RTP Policy. Additional evidence of excellence may include publications in journals of very high impact (such as Nature family journals, Science, PNAS, Cell, publications in the Q1 journals (the top 25% of journals in the candidate's research field), editorials/covers describing the candidate's publications, significant number (>50) of citations (self-citations excluded) of the candidate's papers produced at CSULB, receipt of prestigious research support (such as NSF CAREER or NIH R01 grants), or comparable evidence.

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

3.5.1. Examination of evidence that the candidate developed (for tenure or promotion to associate professor) or sustained (for promotion to full professor) an independent research program at CSULB involving undergraduate and graduate students in the candidate's research program at CSULB. The candidate must present evidence that the candidate's research program developed on campus meets the characteristics described in the ACS Guidelines for Undergraduate Chemistry Programs (Section 6, Undergraduate Research). The following has been adopted from the ACS guidelines on undergraduate research and apply to both undergraduate and graduate research in chemistry and biochemistry: "Undergraduate research is conducted with a faculty advisor or mentor. The student's research project is typically based on the faculty mentor's research interests, which allows the student to draw upon the mentor's expertise and resources and allows the faculty mentor to develop a productive research program. The mentor meets regularly with the student to make research plans, assess risks associated with the proposed research, and review results. The student is encouraged to take primary responsibility for the project and to make substantial input into its direction. The student-mentor relationship also builds student confidence, offers encouragement when necessary, and provides guidance and assistance for the student's future education and career development. Undergraduate research should be envisioned as publishable in a peer-reviewed journal. Research builds upon the previous accomplishments of other scholars. For research to have any meaning or effect, it must be communicated to the scientific community. Peer-review is the generally accepted means of monitoring and ensuring the quality of research. While not every undergraduate research project will result in a peer-reviewed publication, it should be the intent of each project to contribute to such a result. When an individual student research project is not of wide enough scope for an entire publication, it can often be

combined with other undergraduate research projects into a more comprehensive study that merits publication." The documentation produced by the student under guidance of the candidate must include, at minimum: (a) comprehensive written report authored by the student describing their research results, or (b) honors undergraduate thesis, or (c) defended MS thesis. The candidate's narrative must describe the overall goals of their research program at CSULB and the nature of students' involvement.

3.5.2. Examination of RSCA products submitted by the Candidate

3.5.2.A. Peer-reviewed journal publications authored or coauthored by the candidate. It is expected that the candidate will publish in international research journals with the highest standards of peer-review. It is the responsibility of the candidate preparing a publication to consult with their mentor and the department chair to determine whether the venue is appropriate. Ordinarily, such journals must be indexed by the Science Citation Index and should not be lower than Q3 quartile. For publications in professional journals not in the Science Citation Index, the assessment of journal quality, including comparison of relevant impact factors, will be performed. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a corresponding author will be counted as a whole RSCA product as long as the work originates from the candidate's research group at CSULB. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a contributing author will be counted as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the level of the candidate's contribution. The candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to jointly authored papers. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author on a publication submitted to the file. Peer-reviewed journal publications included in the file should be published or accepted for publication at the time the candidate's file is submitted for departmental RTP review.

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

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

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

3.5.2.E. Awarded instrument grant. Each awarded grant in which the candidate serves as a PI will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate serves as a Co-PI, each awarded grant will be considered as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the candidate's

contributions. The documentation from the grant PI regarding the candidate's contributions is strongly recommended in such cases.

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

3.5.2.G. One or more provisional patents, patents, or technology transfers issued to the candidate for items related to the discipline, counted as a single product. A provisional patent application should be filed before the candidate's file is submitted for departmental RTP review. issued to the candidate for items related to the discipline, counted as a single product. A provisional patent application should be filed before the candidate's file is submitted for departmental RTP review.

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

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

3.5.3. Examination of the candidate's narrative. The narrative should describe the overall goals and progress of the candidate's research or scholarly activity at CSULB including a description of the quality and value of the candidate's scholarly activity. Candidates should discuss the trajectory and evolution of the research and discuss their plans for sustained RSCA.

4. Standards of Excellence and Accompanying Criteria in Service

Faculty members are expected to participate in faculty governance through active involvement on committees at the department, college, university level, and CSU system level. Academic service consists of activities (other than teaching and RSCA) that strengthen shared governance processes and contribute to the mission of the university, benefiting students, faculty, department, college, university, discipline/profession and/or community. Faculty members are expected to maintain active engagement in service throughout their careers. Note that 3 WTU of our 15 WTU load is designated for service.

Faculty members must disclose when they receive reassigned time or additional CSULB compensation for any of the service activities described in their narratives. This disclosure is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward service activities.

The candidate's narrative should address the scope and purpose, extent and level of their participation, the outcomes, and the contributions of the service activities to the missions of the university, the college, or the department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise, as applicable.

The department expects that the involvement of the candidate in service will increase as they move through the ranks. Faculty are expected to participate in department activities, which include active

participation at department seminars and meetings with seminar guests, attending thesis defenses, and attending faculty meetings. Maintenance of shared department instrumentation shall be considered as service to the department. Faculty service considered in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions could also include participation in service to the community or to the profession. Such service could involve, but is not limited to, service to professional organizations; profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international levels through discipline-oriented activities, such as committees, workshops, speeches, and media interviews; volunteering consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations; membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards; conference presentations; and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline. In evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in service, the department RTP committee will consider the criteria and expectations listed below.

4.1. Departmental Standards for Reappointment. Candidates must show evidence that they have begun involvement in faculty governance at the department level assigned by the department chair. The department acknowledges that the involvement in service at this point of the candidate's career is normally limited to department level committees.

4.2. Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates must become actively involved in faculty governance. It is expected that the candidate will serve on several committees at the department level. The candidate must also be involved in service on at least one college and/or university or CSU system committees/activities/events. Normally, it is not expected that the candidate will be extensively involved in service during the probationary period, as this is the period in which primary emphasis should be placed on establishing the required teaching and research programs. However, each faculty member is expected to participate in professional activities relating to chemistry and biochemistry, such as reviews of manuscript and grant proposals, or other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the academic community. Service to professional organizations and to the community is also encouraged.

4.2.1. The rating "excellent" will be given to a candidate who actively engages in service beyond the "competent" requirements with the addition of two of the following: one college and/or university or CSU system committees/activities/events, or community/STEM outreach events, or service to profession. Evidence of active participation may include the authorship of pertinent materials produced by the committee or a letter from the committee chair.

4.2.2. The rating "competent" will be given to the candidate who participates in faculty governance at the department and college levels, as specified in the CNSM RTP policy (§2.4.4). The rating of competent will be given if the candidate has provided service on department level committees, participated in one college or university level committee/activity/event, and has been an active member of the department (e.g., attending seminars, department meetings, retreats).

4.3. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor. Candidates shall have provided significant service and leadership on campus and service in the community or the profession. In recommendations concerning promotion to full professor the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

4.3.1. The rating "excellent" is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty governance and has been an active member of the department (attending seminars, department meetings, retreats). The candidate's record must include an active role in at least four activities

from the following list.[1] The evaluation is based on quantity and quality of the services (based upon the description of activities in the narrative).

a. Two-year membership of a major CNSM committee or college or university council
b. Membership on the department RTP and/or Executive Committee
c. Chairing a major college-level committee, such as college council or CNSM curriculum committee (or one of the university councils)
d. Chairing a university-wide committee
e. Leading or serving on department, college or university level committees including but not limited to hiring committee, RTP committee, college council, RSCA review committee, academic senate, etc.
f. Leading role in grant applications for institutional research/instructional activities, such as URISE, LSAMP, Beckman scholar program, or comparable programs
g. Membership of internal or external program evaluation committees.
h. Leadership role in professional organizations
i. Significant reviewing duties in professional journals (> 10 reviews in five years)
j. Active interactions with industrial, educational, and research institutions or governmental agencies
k. Volunteering consultancies to schools, local governments, and community service organizations
l. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants, fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for general expertise in the discipline.
m. Participating in department/college recruitment events (e.g. CNSM open house, SOAR)
n. Advising student groups/clubs for at least two years

4.3.2 The rating "competent" is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty governance, and the candidate's record must include active role in at least two activities from the list described above[1] (§4.3.1).

4.4 Evaluation of Service. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate's accomplishments in service. The numerical expectations concerning service activities listed in 4.3 a-n are intended as a guide to evaluators. Multiple combinations of various service contributions may be deemed equivalent to requirements specified for each rating. The quality of service is the primary consideration, rather than mere membership of a number of committees. The candidate must document the service products, e.g. how many hours were devoted to the service activity, how many applications were reviewed in case of a RSCA proposal committee, how many candidates were reviewed for a faculty or lecturer hiring committee. A service letter from the chair of the committee describing details of the role of the candidate as a committee member is recommended in cases in which the candidate is not the chair but needs to document an active role. If available, letters of appointment on college/university/CSU system committees need to be included. For other service products, such as grant reviewing, proper documentation needs to be included such as time commitment, and number of grants reviewed.

[1] For all categories, equivalents will be considered.

5. Department RTP Procedures

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry will follow the general guidelines of the college and university RTP policy documents. The specific procedures that will be used by the department in following these guidelines are outlined below.

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

5.2 Candidates under Review. Candidates should consult the college and university RTP policy and mission statements of the college and university. A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional training and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The period of review for promotion to full professor is the period after the most recent review for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Activities performed in the academic year prior to the awarding of tenure or promotion but not included in the file or materials submitted for tenure and promotion to associate professor, may be considered to fall within the period of review for promotion to full professor. For faculty members who begin their employment with tenure and appointment at the associate level, the period of review includes all time since being hired with that status.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any. In their

narratives, candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation should describe how their teaching, RSCA, and service activities were influenced by this.

The candidate's narrative should not exceed 10,000 words (approximately 20 single-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins). In addition to the material above, the narrative should include a discussion of how the candidate addressed any substantial concerns raised during previous reviews.

The period of review for reappointment, tenure, and promotion includes the year(s) of service credit. Accomplishments completed at other institutions for which service credit has been granted shall be fully counted toward tenure and promotion. There is an expectation that candidates will continue to demonstrate ongoing and sustained productivity in Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, RSCA, and Service following their appointment at CSULB. Typically, at least 50% of the required accomplishments in each area shall be completed while in residence at CSULB. The candidate should clearly articulate in their narrative which accomplishments are achieved at CSULB versus previous institutions.

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

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

Early Tenure or Early Promotion. A potential candidate should seek (and receive) initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons.

To be considered for early tenure and promotion the candidate should receive the rating of excellent in all three categories and exceeding a rating of excellent in substantial ways in at least one of these three categories and must include at least one example from the list of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons below.

Examples of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons:

a) National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality teaching.
b) National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality DEIA activities.
c) National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality service.
d) National, State, or University-level recognition for innovative or high-quality RSCA.
e) Grant success well beyond what is typical in the discipline for rank.
f) Extremely prominent publications in highly ranked journals.

g) Chairing a significant college or university committee (e.g., College Council during a year with significant work, Academic Senate, GEGC, CEPC, FPCC) or service in highly unusual situations for rank (e.g. to University or Profession).
h) Acquiring additional Student Mentorship/DEI grants that span more than one department.
i) Leading the creation of a significant new curricular or instructionally-related program (beyond the creation of courses).

5.3 Amendment of the RTP Policy. The department chairperson, Executive Committee, or at least five faculty tenured/probationary faculty of the department, may recommend an amendment to this RTP policy. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the faculty called within fifteen instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by the chair of the department to the faculty at least five instructional days before the public hearing. Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the department within twenty instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college council, college dean, and the university president or designee.

Effective: xxxx

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2026**

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below):	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature:	Date:
10/23/2025	[signature]	11/15/2025

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below):	College Dean Name & Signature:	Date
11/12/2025	Curtis Bennett	11/15/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below):	Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs Name & Signature:	Date:
11/15/2025	Patricia Perez	11/16/2025

Provost Signature:	Date:
[signature]	11/17/25

1250 BELLFLOWER BOULEVARD · LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90840 · 562 | 985 | 5212 · FAX 562 | 985| 1680