DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy for the Biomedical Engineering (BME) Department at California State University, Long Beach establishes the mission and guiding principles for the evaluation of Biomedical Engineering tenure-track and tenured faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The policy is developed in accordance with the University RTP Policy (PS 23-24), and the College of Engineering RTP Policy (2025), which govern and supersede the department policy. Therefore, the department policy is limited to providing a more detailed description of the requirements and additional assessment criteria. The department policy at no time will, explicitly or implicitly, abate the requirements approved by the College or the University.

1.0 MISSION, PRINCIPLES, AND VALUES

1.1 Biomedical Engineering Department Mission

Consistent with both the missions of California State University, Long Beach and the College of Engineering (COE), the mission of the Department of Biomedical Engineering at CSULB is to serve the university, and the broader academic and non-academic communities through education, research, and scholarly activities in a diverse, inclusive, and student-centered environment.

1.2 Principles

The BME department is committed to providing a high-quality educational program to students and preparing them as highly skilled biomedical engineers to serve their communities, the State of California, and the nation. A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, and service throughout their careers is necessary to fulfill that commitment. The broad purpose of this document is to provide standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion by providing clear expectations while also allowing flexibility to recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual subdisciplines. This policy strives to balance clarity and flexibility for candidates and evaluators on how faculty can fulfill the Department's and University's academic missions.

1.3 Values

The BME department RTP policy seeks to embody the values described in the university policy:

1.3.1. CSULB BME values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. CSULB BME recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

1.3.2. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interactions help create a supportive, inclusive, collegial environment benefiting the CSULB BME community. This policy should be interpreted as valuing these actions.

1.3.3. CSULB BME recognizes that faculty create and disseminate research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) in widely varying ways. This policy should value diverse forms of RSCA and create mechanisms to recognize and reward them.

1.3.4. Shared governance is vital to CSULB's mission. Good academic citizenship requires all faculty, especially those privileged with tenure, to contribute to shared governance at more than one level. This policy should acknowledge and reward service in shared governance.

1.3.5. All faculty must contribute to CSULB's mission in all three areas: instruction, RSCA, and service. However, since faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting CSULB's mission, this policy should be construed as allowing for adjustments in the weights assigned to instruction, RSCA, and service based upon faculty strengths as well as department, college, and university needs.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION AND REVIEW

Faculty shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in all three of the following areas:

• instructional activities
• research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA)
• service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession

The review procedure should also be used to encourage continuous improvement and professional growth at each step of the RTP process.

2.1 Instructional Activities

The BME department values the effort faculty put towards excelling in the classroom, maintaining instructional relevance and currency, and ensuring that students reach course learning objectives included in the standard course outline (SCO).

Recognizing the multi-disciplinary nature of the biomedical engineering discipline and the fast pace of change in the field, and in alignment with the university and COE policy, the faculty may highlight the role of High Impact Practices that enhance student learning opportunities. As described by section 2.1 of the COE policy, effective teaching practices may include, but are not limited to:

- Continuous Professional Learning: A BME faculty should strive to improve instructional activities continuously and to implement pedagogies that engage students and provide effective learning experiences. Candidate may discuss and document (and committees should consider) any participation in professional development activities that facilitate learning and growth as instructors. Examples could include but are not limited to:
    - ο Evidence for participation in curriculum review, improvement, and/or development of new courses
    - ο Participation in on or off-campus professional development activities, conferences (e.g., BMES or ASEE)
    - ο Participation in teaching development seminars sponsored by the department, College, University, or relevant professional organizations
    - ο Participating in formal or informal pedagogical coaching
    - ο Summary of lessons learned by observing or discussing the instruction of peers and other activities that contribute to the development of improved (narrative of pedagogical lessons, development of improved future implementation of courses)
    - ο Other

- Reflection and Instructional Adaptation: Effective teaching involves ongoing reflection on instructional practices and their effectiveness. Examples could include but are not limited to:

ο   Evidence for formative assessment (e.g., peer evaluation, faculty formative feedback project)

ο   Evidence for reflection and results from teaching

ο   Evidence for changes made to courses based on evidence (reflection or formative assessment)

ο   Evidence could include before and after examples of syllabi, assignments, or other activities

ο   The narrative emphasizes continuous improvement activities

ο   Reflection of qualitative or quantitative student perception data, including consideration of all questions from student SPOT evaluation forms

ο   Changes to course materials according to ABET assessment results

ο   Other

- Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Faculty should utilize instructional approaches methods that align with course, curriculum goals, and program objectives, accommodate diverse student needs, and facilitate achievement of desired outcomes. Candidates shall present evidence, which may include but is not limited to:

  ο   Creation and use of educational materials such as syllabi, major assignments, continuous assessments, teaching videos, and other relevant materials

  ο   Organizing field trips and industrial tours to enhance learning

  ο   Supervision of independent studies, research projects, theses, and dissertations

  ο   Incorporating research findings into teaching

  ο   Implementing best practices in advising and mentoring

  ο   Adjusting teaching and curriculum to meet current and future demands of the engineering and technology sectors

  ο   Inclusive teaching practices, commitment to equitable learning environment, developing resources to support social well-being of students

  ο   Sample student work (e.g., assignments, projects, and exams) that demonstrate student learning and achievement

  ο   Assessment results that reflect students' accomplishments and alignment with course specific outcomes, and ABET assessment examples

  ο   Evidence for formative assessment (e.g., peer evaluation, faculty formative feedback project)

  ο   Evidence of inclusive and equitable teaching practices, promoting student support for all students including underrepresented or first-generation students

  ο   Evidence for developing resources, curricula and programs, leading or contributing to activities or workshops on promoting student success

  ο   Assessment of course and/or student learning outcomes, particularly for program review or accreditation, to demonstrate effective instructional practices and student learning outcomes

  ο   Peer observations and feedback, including classroom visits conducted by peer evaluators or members of the department RTP committee, as well as support letters.

  ο   Other

SPOT (Student Perceptions Of Teaching) and course GPA will be considered as one element in assessing instructional effectiveness, but it shall not be the sole indicator of such effectiveness in accordance with

CSULB Policy Statement-17-05. Candidates may provide an explanation if any of their SPOT scores are below department and college norms and discuss any actions taken in response to these scores if appropriate.

Furthermore, the department encourages the faculty to incorporate their research expertise into existing or new courses to reflect emerging BME knowledge. This can include the improvement of existing materials, introducing new materials, and teaching laboratory experiments or computer simulations.

As described in section 2.1. of the COE policy, evaluators should consider a holistic review of all the multiple modes of evidence provided and student evaluations should be complementary, considered within context, and as a tool for continuous improvement of the instructional practices.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Research and scholarly activities are critical to the development of the faculty in the BME department, as well as in promoting the student learning experience by engaging them in the research and publication process. Every member of the BME faculty is expected to develop an ongoing research program with student involvement, make significant contributions to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, and have evidence of success in the research community through the peer review process.

Section 2.2 of the College RTP policy will be used as the basis for faculty evaluation.

As outlined in the University Policy and the COE policy, RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take diverse forms. Examples can include but are not limited to:

- Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to:

    o Refereed journal and refereed conference publications appropriate to the discipline
    o Conference (for example the annual Biomedical Engineering Society) and seminar presentations and invited talks
    o Patents, patent application, project contracts with industry
    o Grant research awards/grants including internal and external funding, as well as efforts in seeking funding (submitted proposals)
    o Conference or symposium presentations by students/trainees mentored by the faculty as part of research activities
    o Juried presentations, exhibitions in notable venues
    o Recognitions and honors bestowed by the University, professional societies, government agencies or industry to the candidate
    o Other

- Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to:

    o Published literature reviews, textbooks, book chapters
    o Industrial standards/manuals, technical reports, contract proposals
    o Meta-analyses
    o Other

- Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of

Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to:

- ο Technical/industrial reports, program evaluations, grant proposals
- ο Supervision and mentorship of students in RSCA activities, or other BME relevant projects in applied engineering projects or lab development projects
- ο Evidence for trainee success upon graduation in industry, academic, or government settings
- ο Research collaboration with industry, hospitals/clinics, or other academic institutions (for example, R1 designated universities, national labs)
- ο Application of candidate's disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside the university (e.g., technical reports, program evaluations)
- ο Editorship of Journals, Books, or Book Chapters
- ο Other

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to:

- ο Educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences
- ο Publishing a new instructional method
- ο Grant proposals supporting instructional activities
- ο Recognitions and honors bestowed by the University, professional societies, government agencies (e.g., prestigious GRFP fellowship awarded by the NSF) to students mentored by the candidate
- ο Other

This policy does not limit candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or accomplishments. BME faculty members are encouraged to publish peer-reviewed articles in appropriate academic journals in BME or related to BME. Candidates are advised to specify the type and level of their contribution to the article. Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.

2.3 Service

In alignment with COE policy (section 2.3.), the BME faculty are expected to demonstrate commitment to the mission and the goals of the department, College, University, community, and profession. Faculty contributions in service should be acknowledged and valued and not be diminished or considered less important than instruction and RSCA. Faculty are encouraged to highlight outcomes and estimate the hours of work per semester (or per year) for a given service activity.

The department recognizes the unique and valuable service that the faculty provide. Acceptable service activities may take both informal and formal forms within a structured role, and the evaluative areas of services outlined below should not be construed as exhaustive:

- Campus Service: Active participation and appropriate leadership roles. Examples include:
  - ο Participation in the department, College, University, CSU systemwide committees or task forces

- Contributions to the department's continuous improvement (e.g., ABET assessment, new program initiatives)
- Participation in the oversight or maintenance of department resources, labs, and facilities
- Participation in supervision of student workers
- Engagement in student organizations as a faculty advisor or contributor
- Participation or leadership in College or University events (e.g., Day at the Beach, K-12 students visiting campus).
- Service to the CFA
- Development or contribution to on campus events (e.g., conferences, symposiums, exhibitions)
- Other

- **Service to the Profession:** Active participation in professional activities. Examples include:

  - Serving as an organizer, contributor, chair for a professional meeting, symposium, of a conference
  - Contribution or membership on technical program committees
  - Leadership or service in professional societies
  - Reviewer for grants or peer-reviewed or scholarly publications
  - Mentoring, coaching, advising of colleagues and students
  - Other

- **Community Service:** Active participation and engagement in community

  - Serving as an organizer, board member, consultant with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise
  - Engaging with broader public (e.g., K-12 school visits, outreach, interviews)
  - Other

As detailed in COE RTP section 2.3., both candidates and evaluators should assess service activities not only in terms of quantity but also with a focus on their quality, duration, and impact. Contribution to diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, both on campus and off campus, should be acknowledged and valued. Additionally, mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. Although service activities like these may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways, evaluators should recognize their importance, and candidates should endeavor to describe and provide evidence of these activities. Additional detailed guidelines can be found in the University and COE RTP Policy.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 3 of the College RTP Policy.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 4 of the College RTP Policy.

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

5.1 Reappointment Consideration for Tenure-track Faculty

As stated in Section 5.1 of the College RTP Policy.

5.2 Awarding of Tenure

As stated in Section 5.2 of the College RTP Policy.

5.3 Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor

As stated in section 5.3 of the College RTP Policy.

5.4 Appointment/Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is the highest academic honor that the University awards to its own faculty and consequently the standards for evaluation are higher than to Associate Professor. In the period since promotion to Associate Professor, the individual should demonstrate continuing adherence to all the standards as stated in sections 2.1-2.3 above, and in the College's RTP policy, in particular section 5.4.

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

As stated in Section 5.5 of the College RTP Policy.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

As stated in Section 6 of the University RTP Policy.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

As stated in Section 7 of the University RTP Policy.

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

Changes to the BME RTP Policy may occur as a result of:

• Changes in the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), as well as changes in the University RTP Policy and/or Procedures.

• Amendments approved by the majority vote of the BME tenured and probationary faculty, and approval of the College Faculty Council, College Dean, and the Provost.