



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of Biological Sciences

Approved by the College Faculty
Council (Enter date below):

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Date:

May 9, 2025

Ashley Carter

6/3/2025

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Date

June 2, 2025

Curtis Bennett

6/3/2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Date:

June 2, 2025

For Patricia Perez AVPEA

Malcolm Finney

6/6/2025

Provost Signature:

Date:

Karyn Scissum Gunn

6/23/2025

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) POLICY

1. Mission, Vision, and Values

The Department of Biological Sciences strives to 1) provide high quality instruction for our student body that develops conceptual understanding, analytical skills, and enthusiasm for learning and inquiry in the biological sciences, while leveraging their diverse backgrounds and lived experiences, 2) create an atmosphere of inclusive, student-driven research excellence that advances the department's contribution to new knowledge in the biological sciences, and 3) hire, retain, and support dedicated, quality tenure-track faculty who reflect and support the diverse nature of our campus community.

As a part of a large, public, minority-serving institution with many first-generation students, the department seeks to be an inclusive, student-centric community based on mutual respect, transparency and ethical behavior. The department values teaching and mentored research as important components of the education of our students and seeks to integrate research with teaching whenever possible in the curriculum. We also value involved faculty who share in the governance of the University as well as provide service to their profession and the broader community.

2. Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

The Department of Biological Sciences follows policies set forth in the CNSM and University RTP Policies. Candidates and RTP committees are required to follow all policies and procedures listed in those documents (as well as those in this departmental RTP Policy) and should be aware that some policies and procedures not addressed in this departmental RTP Policy are addressed in those documents. Thus, it is essential that all participants in the RTP process carefully read all three policy documents.

This departmental RTP Policy establishes specific standards of competency and excellence for tenure and promotion of faculty within the department. Additional criteria for those choosing to apply for early tenure and/or promotion are also included. To be recommended for reappointment, a candidate must demonstrate significant and ongoing progress towards a favorable tenure decision in all three areas.

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 profession. Faculty members applying for tenure or promotion will be given a ranking of excellent, competent, or deficient for each of these three areas of evaluation. In addition to rankings, the RTP committee will provide a thorough discussion of the candidate's performance in their evaluation. Probationary faculty members being evaluated for reappointment will be given a ranking of competent or deficient, reflecting the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion. In their evaluation, the RTP committee will also provide a thorough discussion of 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 guidelines. 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.

Departmental RTP recommendations are based on a candidate demonstrating an ongoing and sustained record of accomplishments at CSULB over the period of review and evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making ongoing and sustained contributions in all three areas of evaluation at CSULB. Prior service credit (if applicable) is not sufficient to meet all these criteria; some accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation must be carried out during the candidate's time at CSULB.

Mentorship activities can be multifaceted, so the department here provides some general guidance on how it can be articulated in the candidate's narrative. Mentoring activities resulting from courses that students are enrolled in (especially directed research courses such as BIOL 296 and BIOL 496) should be described in the instruction and instructionally related activities section of the narrative. Here a candidate is encouraged to describe their mentoring philosophy and approach as well as the number of students mentored. Research-related products of mentoring such as student research presentations should be discussed in the RSCA section. Mentoring that serves other faculty, such as being a non-Chair member of a thesis committee or advising probationary faculty, should be described in the service section of the narrative.

The department recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all three areas of evaluation (instruction and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and service). It encourages candidates who experience cultural/identity taxation to describe this additional workload in any area of evaluation they deem appropriate.

As noted in the University and CNSM RTP Policies, a candidate must submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period under review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions, in all three areas of evaluation. The department also encourages candidates to include in the narrative brief descriptions of their goals for the near future in each of the three areas of evaluation. Candidates must also disclose when they receive assigned time or additional CSULB compensation for activities described in their narratives, in any of the three areas of evaluation. This requirement is intended to provide transparency and does not imply that these activities will be excluded from credit toward activities in these areas. The University RTP Policy (section 6.6) notes that candidates are responsible for submitting materials for review via the University-approved process by the deadline.

3. 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. Effort in this area must be ongoing and sustained.

3.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

3.1.1 Competent. For this ranking, the candidate must:

3.1.1.1 Provide evidence that during the period under review they developed lecture or laboratory course materials that accomplish all of the following:

- Contain current, rigorous, and logically organized content appropriate to the courses taught.
- Include explicit student learning outcomes (SLOs) linked to appropriate assessments of progress towards achieving those SLOs. In the narrative the candidate does not need to describe all SLOs and linked assessments; providing a few examples is sufficient. However, representative syllabi for all courses must be included in the course materials.

- Effectively facilitate the student learning process and experience.

3.1.1.2 Provide evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:

- Grade distributions and course completion rates (percent of students at census with final grades of A-C) for all courses taught during the period under review. For courses where completion rates are low compared to department/college standards for courses at this level, the candidate must discuss their efforts to improve student success.
- Consideration of scores from university student evaluations of teaching, including general trends in these evaluations over time. It has been established that a variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., low response rates, gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence student evaluations of teaching, and the RTP Committee should consider these scores in that light. Nevertheless, some attention to these evaluations must be present in the candidate's narrative.
- Favorable reviews of classroom teaching based on multiple classroom peer visitations as described in the CNSM RTP policy that assess the quality of course content, course presentation, and student engagement.

3.1.1.3 Provide evidence of efforts to improve 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, formative feedback, 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 teaching methods obtained through publications on pedagogy, participation in programs or conferences on teaching, or after consultation with colleagues.

3.1.1.4 Provide evidence of the incorporation of students into their ongoing scholarly research activities in a manner that enhances their education. Evidence of this must include student enrollment in supervised research courses.

3.1.2. Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidate must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to associate professor or award of tenure. In addition, the candidate must:

3.1.2.1. Provide evidence of three or more additional quality contributions to education during the period under review. Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category (i.e., bullet points) below can be considered acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Such categories include but are not limited to:

- Obtaining substantive 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 postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, providing research training or mentorship for professional colleagues or students who are not part of the candidate's lab.
- Supervision of summer student researchers.
- Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

3.1.3 Deficient. The candidate 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, the candidate must:

3.2.1.1 Provide evidence that during the period under review they continued to develop lecture or laboratory course materials that are current, relevant, organized, and that facilitate student learning.

3.2.1.2 Provide evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:

- Grade distributions and course completion rates (percent of students at census with final grades of A-C) for all courses taught during the period under review. For courses where completion rates are low compared to department/college standards for courses at this level, the candidate must discuss their efforts to improve student success.
- Consideration of scores from university student evaluations of teaching, including general trends in these evaluations over time. It has been established that a variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., low response rates, gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence scores of student evaluations of teaching, and the RTP Committee should consider these scores in that light. Nevertheless, some attention to these evaluations must be present in the candidate's narrative.
- Favorable peer reviews of classroom teaching that assess the quality of course content, student engagement, 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).

3.2.1.3 Provide evidence of continued efforts to improve 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, formative feedback, 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 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.

3.2.1.4 Provide evidence of the continuing incorporation of students into their ongoing scholarly research activities in a manner that enhances the student's education. Evidence of these activities must include student enrollment in supervised research courses and may also include materials indicating excellent mentoring activities in research or examples of student success in research.

3.2.1.5 Provide evidence of three or more additional quality contributions to education during the period under review. Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category (i.e., bullet points) below can be considered acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Such categories include but are not limited to:

- Obtaining substantive funding in support of educational activities or programs.
- Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, or other pedagogical products such as multimedia or digital 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 postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, providing research training or mentorship for professional colleagues or students who are not part of the candidate's lab.
- Supervision of summer student researchers.
- Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

3.2.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidate must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to full professor. In addition, the candidate must:

3.2.2.1. Provide evidence of three or more additional quality contributions to education during the period under review, in addition to the three required for a ranking of “Competent” for promotion to professor (thus at least six in total). Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category (i.e., bullet points) below can be considered acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Such categories include but are not limited to:

- Obtaining substantive 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 postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, providing research training or mentorship for professional colleagues or students who are not part of the candidate’s lab.
- Supervision of summer student researchers.
- Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

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 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

The University and CNSM RTP Policies describe RSCA activities as falling into four areas: Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application or Engagement, and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Effort in this area must be ongoing and sustained. The Department primarily values the Scholarship of Discovery (advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities) to satisfy the criteria for RSCA evaluation. The CNSM RTP Policy (2.3.1) notes that “candidates for tenure must develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed publications”.

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 the following or its equivalent:

4.1.1.1 Published two peer-reviewed primary research papers (or peer-reviewed equivalents) based primarily on work done during the period under review. A primary research paper is defined as a paper based on original research that makes a new contribution to the field. The candidate must be senior investigator on both of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as the first, last, or corresponding author. One or more CSULB students must appear as co-author(s) on at least one of these papers.

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

4.1.1.3 Applied for external funding to support their research. In the absence of successful funding, at least two applications that show evidence of potential success must have been submitted to a funding entity.

4.1.1.4 Provided evidence of at least two presentations by the candidate of their research. At least one of these must be at a regional, national or international meeting; the other may be an invited departmental seminar at a non-CSULB campus. The format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated.

4.1.1.5. Provided evidence of at least one presentation of their research by a student under their supervision at a CSU-wide, regional, national, or international meeting. The format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated.

4.1.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidate must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to associate professor or award of tenure. In addition, the candidate must have:

4.1.2.1 Published one or more additional peer-reviewed primary research papers or other peer-reviewed articles such as reviews, methods papers, or book chapters (or peer-reviewed equivalents).

4.1.2.2 Received external funding to support their research.

4.1.2.3 Provided evidence of at least three additional presentations by the candidate or their students of their research at a regional, national, or international meeting or an invited seminar at a non-CSULB campus. The format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated.

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

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 the candidates must have the following or its equivalent:

4.2.1.1 Published two peer-reviewed primary research papers (or peer-reviewed equivalents) based primarily on work done during the period under review. A primary research paper is defined as a paper based on original research that makes a new contribution to the field. The candidate must be senior investigator on both of these papers. Senior investigator is defined as the first, last, or corresponding author. One or more CSULB students must appear as co-authors on both of these papers.

4.2.1.2 Received or continued external funding to support their research or provided evidence of continued pursuit of external funding (defined as at least three submitted proposals that show evidence of potential success).

4.2.1.3 Provided evidence of at least two presentations by the candidate of their research. At least one of these must be at a regional, national or international meeting; the other may be

invited departmental seminars presented by the candidate at a non-CSULB campus. The format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated.

4.2.1.4 Provided evidence of at least two presentations of their research by a student under their supervision at a CSU-wide, regional, national, or international meeting. The format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated.

4.2.1.5 Graduated one or more MS students since the candidate's arrival at CSULB.

4.2.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidate must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to professor. In addition, the candidate must have the following or its equivalent:

4.2.2.1 Published one or more additional peer-reviewed primary research papers or other peer-reviewed articles such as reviews, methods papers, or book chapters (or peer-reviewed equivalents).

4.2.2.2 Received external funding to support their research.

4.2.2.3 Provided evidence of at least three additional presentations by the candidate or their students of their research at a regional, national, or international meeting or an invited seminar at a non-CSULB campus. The format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated.

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

4.2.2.5 Provided evidence of standing in their field. Such evidence could include (among other things):

- Publication of invited review articles
- Presentation of 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
- Elected office in national or international societies in the candidates' discipline

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

5. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

Service activities are expected of all faculty (depending on rank) to the department, college, university, scientific community, and the broader community. Effort in this area must be ongoing and sustained.

5.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

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

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

5.1.1.2 Engaged in service activities at the department level. This must include service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) or ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum revision or document revision).

5.1.1.3 Engaged in service activities at the college level.

5.1.1.4 Served as a member of a Biological Sciences Department MS thesis committee for a student not under the faculty's direct supervision.

5.1.1.5 Engaged in formal or informal mentoring and/or supporting/advising of students, faculty or staff in university/college/department programs outside of instruction and RSCA activities. These may include but are not limited to writing letters of recommendation, advising student organizations, and providing mentorship or career advice to students.

5.1.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have met all requirements for Competent and:

5.1.2.1 Assumed an effective leadership role in at least one departmental service activity. This could include service on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) or 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.

5.1.2.2 Engaged in service at the university level.

5.1.2.3 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.

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

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

5.2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

5.2.1.3 Engaged in significant service at the college, university, or CSU system level.

5.2.1.4 Engaged in service to the broader community (through activities such as outreach to local schools or community groups) or the scientific community (through activities such as serving as a referee for journal articles or grant proposals or serving on grant panels).

5.2.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates must have met all requirements for Competent and:

5.2.2.1 Assumed an effective leadership role in multiple departmental service activities. This must include leadership on elected committees (e.g., faculty and staff search committees, Graduate Studies, or Curriculum and Assessment) or ad hoc committees (e.g., curriculum revision or document revision) or student-focused programs (e.g., Research Training Programs). 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.

5.2.2.2 Assumed an effective leadership role in at least one service activity at the college, university, or CSU system levels. Candidates are encouraged to solicit written input from committee chairs or members that describe how their contributions exceed routine participation.

5.2.2.3 Engaged in service to both the broader community (through activities such as outreach to local schools or community groups) and 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.

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

6. Consideration of Service and Teaching Outside of the Department

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

7. Early Tenure or Early Promotion

7.1. 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. According to the University RTP Policy, a candidate for early tenure and promotion must "achieve a record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies." The CNSM RTP policy clarifies this in the following manner, "The college interprets this as meaning achieving a rating of "excellent" in each of the three categories and exceeding a rating of "excellent" in substantial ways in at least one of these categories. It must also include at least one exceptional circumstance and compelling reason as described in the next section." [CNSM RTP Policy 5.5.2]

7.2. To "achieve a record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements" in the Department of Biological Sciences policies, at least one of the activities or honors the candidate describes as evidence of excellence in one of the three categories (Instruction, RSCA, or Service) must be exceptional or particularly compelling, examples of which are provided in 7.3.

7.3. Examples of exceptional or particularly compelling activities and honors (the list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the department RTP committee in this category):

- (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, etc.) 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).

7.4. These exceptional or particularly compelling activities or honors shall have been carried out within the evaluation period and while the candidate is a CSULB faculty member.

7.5. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

7.5.1. In addition, candidates for early tenure are strongly encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process according to the current Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.

7.5.2. Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

8. Service Credit

Candidates who are given credit by the University for time served at prior institutions can count achievements (e.g., publications) relevant to the policies outlined above for the credit period (e.g., two years) toward reappointment and tenure and promotion. However, there is an expectation that candidates will continue to demonstrate ongoing productivity in Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities, RSCA, and Service following their appointment at CSULB. The candidate must clearly articulate what they are requesting credit for in their RTP narrative.

9. Additional Processes

University and CNSM RTP Policies govern additional processes such as withdrawal from review, addition of new materials in files after deadlines, rebuttals/responses to evaluations, and external evaluations. As noted above, it is essential that all participants in the RTP process carefully read all three policy documents in full to inform themselves about these processes.

10. 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 of Biological Sciences By-Laws.

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