

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

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

6 **1. Preamble and Guiding Principles**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

55 **2. Standards of Excellence and Accompanying Criteria in Instruction and 56 Instructionally Related Activities**

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

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

79 **2.1 Departmental Standards for Reappointment.** Candidates for reappointment must be
80 effective in instruction and instructionally related activities. The assessment of teaching
81 effectiveness is listed in §2.3.

82 **2.2 Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion.** In recommendations concerning tenure
83 or promotion, the following criteria for the candidate rating are applied:

84 **2.2.1. The rating “excellent”** is given to a candidate who is effective in instruction and
85 instructionally related activities and demonstrates success in at least one (for tenure or promotion
86 to associate professor) or two (for promotion to professor) of the following products/activities:

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

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

99 **2.2.2. The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who is effective in instruction and
100 instructionally related activities. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is listed in §2.3.

101 **2.3. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities.** The assessment of
102 teaching effectiveness will include the following:

103 **2.3.1. Evaluation of the course materials submitted by the candidate.** The scholarly rigor of
104 the courses and content of the courses taught should follow standard course outlines, if available;
105 otherwise, they should be comparable to the same courses or comparable courses taught by other
106 tenured/probationary faculty. Each course should prepare the students for further courses for which
107 the course in question is a prerequisite. Materials submitted by a candidate to their file should
108 include at least course syllabi, and sample assignments/tests/project. Samples of student work with
109 instructor feedback may be submitted if appropriate for the course. Course materials should clearly
110 convey to the students the student learning outcomes and the relationship of the course to the major
111 and to the broader discipline. Course policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to
112 students. The results of grading practices should be reasonably consistent with department norms
113 for the same course taught by other tenured/probationary faculty during the period of review.

114 **2.3.2. Evaluation of the narrative provided by the candidate.** Evaluators should examine the
115 narrative for appropriate discussion of the four main parts of this document: (i) instructional
116 philosophy and practice, (ii) pedagogical approach and methods, (iii) ongoing professional
117 development as a teacher, (iv) SPOT, and (v) the supervision of research students. The narrative
118 should describe thoughtful and deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may
119 result in adopting new teaching methodologies or in revisions and modifications to courses taught
120 by the candidate. These efforts must also include engagement in professional development
121 activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. There should be evidence
122 that the candidate takes an ongoing and active role in refreshing their courses, maintaining their
123 currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches used by assessing their effectiveness in the
124 classroom. Candidates are expected to address aspects of their SPOT score summaries in their
125 narrative, especially with regard to changes over time or differences between courses. Candidates
126 should describe actions taken to improve student perceptions. If the candidate teaches courses
127 which have high DFW rates (>20%), it is recommended that they address these rates and describe

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

133 **2.3.3. Analysis of written reports of observations of the candidate's teaching during the**
134 **review period by members of the RTP Committee.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

169 **2.3.4. Analysis of students' perception of instruction.** SPOT ratings should be compared with
170 department/college means and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course

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

179 **2.3.5. Evaluation of the candidate's performance in research supervision courses (496, 697,
180 etc.)** Supervision of research students should follow the American Chemical Society (ACS)
181 Guidelines for Undergraduate Chemistry Programs (Section 6, Undergraduate Research). These
182 guidelines apply to both undergraduate and graduate research in the chemistry and biochemistry
183 disciplines, and is outlined in more detail in section 3.5.1. Examples of student work such as
184 comprehensive reports or undergraduate/graduate theses should be included in the file.

185 **2.3.6. Evaluation of academic advising effectiveness if part of the candidate's assigned
186 workload.** The candidate's activities in undergraduate and graduate advising should be described
187 in the narrative. Additional evidence of effectiveness, including letters from students and/or
188 faculty, could also be provided.

189 **2.3.7. Evaluation of materials providing evidence of success in additional instructional and
190 instructionally related activities.**

- 191 a. Publication of a chemistry/biochemistry related textbook, including a laboratory manual
192 that has been published and has been adopted in other institutions. The textbook must be
193 intended for the use beyond the confines of CSULB.
- 194 b. Significant revisions of lecture and/or laboratory course or development of a new course.
195 The revisions should go beyond the routine changes to refresh courses. Significant
196 revisions, such as development of a new laboratory curriculum or development of a new
197 course, will be considered in this category. This includes new topics not previously taught
198 in the department in special topics graduate courses. The authorship of laboratory manuals
199 and study guides will also be considered in this category. These products need to be
200 substantially original work, not merely modifications.
- 201 c. Exemplary success in the supervision of undergraduate student research. The candidate
202 must demonstrate significant accomplishments of their research students well beyond the
203 minimum expectations for effectiveness in directing undergraduate research described in
204 §2.3.5. Ordinarily, several students should be coauthors on the candidate's publications or
205 presentations at national or international meetings.
- 206 d. Significant success in thesis research supervision. Ordinarily this requirement is satisfied
207 by inclusion of an MS thesis accepted by the CSULB library in which the candidate served
208 as chair of the thesis committee.
- 209 e. Obtaining substantial external or internal competitive funding for teaching projects or
210 instructional laboratories. Substantial funding is defined as multiple external (federal) or
211 internal (university-wide or CSU system-wide) grants related to teaching effectiveness.
- 212 f. Development of innovative curricular materials, including multimedia and computer-
213 based materials for uses beyond the candidate's own teaching. Normally such materials
214 should be published or otherwise disseminated for uses beyond the confines of CSULB
215 (e.g. public presentation).

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

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

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

229 **3.1. Departmental Standards for Reappointment.** Candidates for reappointment must show
230 evidence that they have begun to develop an independent research program at CSULB. Such
231 evidence should include, at minimum, the following:

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

235 **3.2. Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor.** Candidates for
236 tenure or promotion to associate professor must develop an independent research program at
237 CSULB that results in at least two (2) peer-reviewed primary research publications, or
238 equivalents¹, in which the work originates from the candidate's research group at CSULB. For
239 candidates who receive service credit, see lines 566-568. The candidate is expected to be
240 designated as the sole corresponding author in both publications. Under specific circumstances
241 such as when the candidate's expertise or discipline makes a significant contribution to the
242 publication, the candidate may be designated as a co-corresponding author in one of the two
243 publications. The onus is on the candidate to provide an explanation for demonstrating their
244 independence and for being designated as co-corresponding author. At least one of the two papers
245 should list CSULB student(s) as coauthor(s) of the publication. The quality and significance of the
246 candidate's research publications is of primary importance. The candidate's publications must
247 appear in well-respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-
248 review, as described in §3.5.2.A. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of a continuous
249 and significant effort to secure external funding.¹ The candidate's narrative should provide a clear
250 description of the quality and value of the candidate's research, and this narrative must identify the
251 candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to specific research projects. The overall
252 trajectory of the candidate's research program must demonstrate that the candidate will continue
253 making increasingly distinguished contributions in RSCA. In addition to requirements specified
254 above, the candidate must have at least 1 (one) additional RSCA product from the list provided in
255 §3.4.

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

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

261 **3.2.1. The rating “excellent”** is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in §3.2 and
262 has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in §3.4.

263 **3.2.2. The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in §3.2.

264 **3.3. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor.** Candidates for promotion to the rank
265 of professor are expected to have sustained an ongoing program of research or other scholarly
266 activity that results in peer reviewed RSCA products. The department acknowledges that the
267 professional goals of tenured faculty members might be somewhat different and more diverse than
268 those of junior faculty. Therefore, although the overall standards for promotion to full professor
269 are higher than those for promotion to associate professor, the candidate’s effort may be broadened
270 beyond traditional research and could include significant components related to pedagogy of
271 chemistry and biochemistry. The ongoing program of research or scholarly activity developed by
272 the candidate at CSULB shall result in at least two (2) peer-reviewed publications, or equivalents¹,
273 in which the candidate is designated as the corresponding author. In addition to the requirements
274 specified above, the candidate must have at least two (2) peer-reviewed RSCA products in one or
275 more of the categories listed in § 3.4. The candidate must provide compelling evidence of
276 significant effort to secure external funding.² The candidate’s publications must appear in well-
277 respected international research journals employing the highest standards of peer-review or in
278 international journals devoted to pedagogy of chemistry such as the Journal of Chemical
279 Education, as described in §3.5.2.A below. In recommendations concerning promotion to full
280 professor the following criteria for the candidate rating will be applied:

281 **3.3.1. The rating “excellent”** is given to a candidate who meets all criteria specified in §3.3 and
282 has at least 2 (two) additional RSCA products from the list provided in §3.4.

283 **3.3.2. The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who meets criteria specified in §3.3.

284 **3.4. Peer-reviewed RSCA products considered in tenure and promotion recommendations^{3,4}**

- 285 a. Peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is designated as a corresponding
286 author⁵ and peer-reviewed journal publications in which the candidate is a contributing
287 author.
- 288 b. Peer-reviewed review articles or book chapters.
- 289 c. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline, such as articles published
290 in the Journal of Chemical Education
- 291 d. Awarded external research grant(s) or contract(s), supporting the candidate’s individual
292 research.
- 293 e. Awarded instrument grant(s).
- 294 f. One or more articles published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings, counted as a
295 single product.
- 296 g. One or more provisional patents, patents, or technology transfer products, counted as a
297 single product.
- 298 h. One or more published textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for
299 uses beyond the candidate’s own personal teaching, counted as a single product.
- 300 i. Two or more research presentations on at least two national or international meetings,
301 counted as a single product.

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

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

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

308 ⁴ For all categories, equivalents will be considered.

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

310 **3.5. Evaluation for RSCA.** The assessment of the candidate's research and scholarly activity will
311 be based on peer evaluation. The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach
312 while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate's accomplishments. The
313 numerical expectations concerning RSCA products required for each rating category are intended
314 as a guide to evaluators. The RSCA products of appropriate quantity and quality as described in
315 §3.2-3.5 are sufficient to meet criteria for each rating in RSCA. However, fewer RSCA products
316 of superior quality or significance might also be sufficient to satisfy requirements for a particular
317 rating provided that the candidate meets the criteria specified in the CNSM RTP Policy. Additional
318 evidence of excellence may include publications in journals of very high impact (such as Nature
319 family journals, Science, PNAS, Cell, publications in the Q1 journals (the top 25% of journals in
320 the candidate's research field), editorials/covers describing the candidate's publications,
321 significant number (>50) of citations (self-citations excluded) of the candidate's papers produced
322 at CSULB, receipt of prestigious research support (such as NSF CAREER or NIH R01 grants), or
323 comparable evidence.

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

325 **3.5.1. Examination of evidence that the candidate developed (for tenure or promotion to
326 associate professor) or sustained (for promotion to full professor) an independent research
327 program at CSULB involving undergraduate and graduate students in the candidate's
328 research program at CSULB.** The candidate must present evidence that the candidate's research
329 program developed on campus meets the characteristics described in the ACS Guidelines for
330 Undergraduate Chemistry Programs (Section 6, Undergraduate Research). The following has been
331 adopted from the ACS guidelines on undergraduate research and apply to both undergraduate and
332 graduate research in chemistry and biochemistry: "Undergraduate research is conducted with a
333 faculty advisor or mentor. The student's research project is typically based on the faculty mentor's
334 research interests, which allows the student to draw upon the mentor's expertise and resources and
335 allows the faculty mentor to develop a productive research program. The mentor meets regularly
336 with the student to make research plans, assess risks associated with the proposed research, and
337 review results. The student is encouraged to take primary responsibility for the project and to make
338 substantial input into its direction. The student-mentor relationship also builds student confidence,
339 offers encouragement when necessary, and provides guidance and assistance for the student's
340 future education and career development. Undergraduate research should be envisioned as
341 publishable in a peer-reviewed journal. Research builds upon the previous accomplishments of
342 other scholars. For research to have any meaning or effect, it must be communicated to the
343 scientific community. Peer-review is the generally accepted means of monitoring and ensuring the
344 quality of research. While not every undergraduate research project will result in a peer-reviewed
345 publication, it should be the intent of each project to contribute to such a result. When an individual
346 student research project is not of wide enough scope for an entire publication, it can often be

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

353 **3.5.2. Examination of RSCA products submitted by the Candidate**

354 **3.5.2.A. Peer-reviewed journal publications authored or coauthored by the candidate.** It is
355 expected that the candidate will publish in international research journals with the highest
356 standards of peer-review. It is the responsibility of the candidate preparing a publication to consult
357 with their mentor and the department chair to determine whether the venue is appropriate.
358 Ordinarily, such journals must be indexed by the Science Citation Index and should not be lower
359 than Q3 quartile. For publications in professional journals not in the Science Citation Index, the
360 assessment of journal quality, including comparison of relevant impact factors, will be performed.
361 Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a corresponding author will be
362 counted as a whole RSCA product as long as the work originates from the candidate's research
363 group at CSULB. Each peer-reviewed journal publication in which the candidate is a contributing
364 author will be counted as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the level of the
365 candidate's contribution. The candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the
366 candidate's responsibility and intellectual contribution to jointly authored papers. The
367 documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly
368 recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author on a publication submitted
369 to the file. Peer-reviewed journal publications included in the file should be published or accepted
370 for publication at the time the candidate's file is submitted for departmental RTP review.

371 **3.5.2.B. Peer-reviewed review article or book chapters.** These should be published in
372 international research journals with the highest standards of peer-review or in book series or
373 monographs. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding the candidate's
374 contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author
375 on a publication. In such cases, the publication will be considered as fractional RSCA product.

376 **3.5.2.C. Peer-reviewed publications related to pedagogy of the discipline,** such as articles
377 published in the Journal of Chemical Education or in journals of comparable quality. Each
378 publication in which the candidate is a corresponding author will be counted as a whole RSCA
379 product. The documentation from at least one senior co-author regarding the candidate's
380 contributions is strongly recommended if the candidate does not serve as a corresponding author
381 on a publication. In such cases the publication will be considered as a fractional RSCA product.

382 **3.5.2.D. Awarded external research grant(s) or contract(s).** Each awarded grant or contract in
383 which the candidate serves as PI will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate serves
384 as a Co-PI, each awarded grant or sub-contract will be considered as a whole or fractional RSCA
385 product depending on the candidate's contributions in preparing the grant and their role in the
386 described research project. The documentation from the grant PI regarding the candidate's
387 contributions is strongly recommended in such cases.

388 **3.5.2.E. Awarded instrument grant.** Each awarded grant in which the candidate serves as a PI
389 will be counted as a whole RSCA product. If the candidate serves as a Co-PI, each awarded grant
390 will be considered as a whole or fractional RSCA product depending on the candidate's

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

393 **3.5.2.F. One or more peer-reviewed conference proceedings counted as a single product.**
394 These need to be of full publication quality and need to undergo the peer-review process. Some
395 examples of eligible peer-review conferences proceedings are National Meetings of ACS,
396 Electrochemical Society Meetings, Materials Research Society Meetings, or comparable
397 proceedings series.

398 **3.5.2.G. One or more provisional patents, patents, or technology transfers** issued to the
399 candidate for items related to the discipline, counted as a single product. A provisional patent
400 application should be filed before the candidate's file is submitted for departmental RTP review.
401 issued to the candidate for items related to the discipline, counted as a single product. A provisional
402 patent application should be filed before the candidate's file is submitted for departmental RTP
403 review.

404 **3.5.2.H. One or more published textbooks, curricula, or instructional technology developed
405 for use beyond the candidate's own personal teaching, counted as a single product.** The
406 materials in this category must be disseminated nationally and clearly intended for the general use
407 beyond the confines of CSULB.

408 **3.5.2.I. Two or more research presentations at two different national or international
409 meetings, counted as a single product.** Both oral and poster presentations will be considered in
410 this category.

411 **3.5.3. Examination of the candidate's narrative.** The narrative should describe the overall goals
412 and progress of the candidate's research or scholarly activity at CSULB including a description of
413 the quality and value of the candidate's scholarly activity. Candidates should discuss the trajectory
414 and evolution of the research and discuss their plans for sustained RSCA.

415 **4. Standards of Excellence and Accompanying Criteria in Service**

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

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

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

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

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

445 **4.1. Departmental Standards for Reappointment.** Candidates must show evidence that they
446 have begun involvement in faculty governance at the department level assigned by the department
447 chair. The department acknowledges that the involvement in service at this point of the candidate's
448 career is normally limited to department level committees.

449 **4.2. Departmental Standards for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor.** Candidates must
450 become actively involved in faculty governance. It is expected that the candidate will serve on
451 several committees at the department level. The candidate must also be involved in service on at
452 least one college and/or university or CSU system committees/activities/events. Normally, it is not
453 expected that the candidate will be extensively involved in service during the probationary period,
454 as this is the period in which primary emphasis should be placed on establishing the required
455 teaching and research programs. However, each faculty member is expected to participate in
456 professional activities relating to chemistry and biochemistry, such as reviews of manuscript and
457 grant proposals, or other professional activities deemed equally valuable to the academic
458 community. Service to professional organizations and to the community is also encouraged.

459 **4.2.1. The rating "excellent"** will be given to a candidate who actively engages in service beyond
460 the "competent" requirements with the addition of two of the following: one college and/or
461 university or CSU system committees/activities/events, or community/STEM outreach events, or
462 service to profession. Evidence of active participation may include the authorship of pertinent
463 materials produced by the committee or a letter from the committee chair.

464 **4.2.2. The rating "competent"** will be given to the candidate who participates in faculty
465 governance at the department and college levels, as specified in the CNSM RTP policy (§2.4.4).
466 The rating of competent will be given if the candidate has provided service on department level
467 committees, participated in one college or university level committee/activity/event, and has been
468 an active member of the department (e.g., attending seminars, department meetings, retreats).

469 **4.3. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor.** Candidates shall have provided
470 significant service and leadership on campus and service in the community or the profession. In
471 recommendations concerning promotion to full professor the following criteria for the candidate
472 rating will be applied:

473 **4.3.1. The rating "excellent"** is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty
474 governance and has been an active member of the department (attending seminars, department
475 meetings, retreats). The candidate's record must include an active role in at least four activities

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

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

499 **4.3.2 The rating “competent”** is given to a candidate who actively participates in faculty
500 governance, and the candidate’s record must include active role in at least two activities from the
501 list described above¹ (§4.3.1).

502 **4.4 Evaluation of Service.** The evaluators shall apply a holistic and comprehensive approach
503 while assessing the overall quality and significance of the candidate’s accomplishments in service.
504 The numerical expectations concerning service activities listed in 4.3 a-n are intended as a guide
505 to evaluators. Multiple combinations of various service contributions may be deemed equivalent
506 to requirements specified for each rating. The quality of service is the primary consideration,
507 rather than mere membership of a number of committees. The candidate must document the service
508 products, e.g. how many hours were devoted to the service activity, how many applications were
509 reviewed in case of a RSCA proposal committee, how many candidates were reviewed for a faculty
510 or lecturer hiring committee. A service letter from the chair of the committee describing details of
511 the role of the candidate as a committee member is recommended in cases in which the candidate
512 is not the chair but needs to document an active role. If available, letters of appointment on
513 college/university/CSU system committees need to be included. For other service products, such
514 as grant reviewing, proper documentation needs to be included such as time commitment, and
515 number of grants reviewed.

516 ¹ For all categories, equivalents will be considered.

517 **5. Department RTP Procedures**

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

521 **5.1 RTP Committee.** The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry RTP Committee shall
522 consist of five members elected by secret ballot from among the department's tenured faculty. The
523 department committee shall include at least three members holding the rank of professor, unless
524 there are not three eligible faculty members. The secret ballot shall include names of all tenured
525 faculty in the department except academic administrators, those faculty who are candidates for
526 promotion, continuing members of the department RTP committee, faculty elected to serve or
527 serving on the college RTP committee, and those faculty who are on full or partial leave of absence
528 during the academic year. All department probationary and tenured faculty are eligible to vote and
529 may vote for any number of candidates up to the number of open slots. The faculty members
530 receiving the highest number of votes in the secret ballot, subject to the requirement of there being
531 at least three members with the rank of professor, will join the department RTP committee. The
532 five members shall serve staggered terms of two academic years. The departmental election shall
533 normally be held during the first week of classes in the fall semester of each academic year. If an
534 elected member resigns or otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which they were
535 elected, the department will elect a replacement to serve the rest of the unexpired term.

536 **5.2 Candidates under Review.** Candidates should consult the college and university RTP policy
537 and mission statements of the college and university. A candidate for RTP should make every effort
538 to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult
539 with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding
540 the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also
541 encouraged to use additional training and resources offered by the college, the University, and the
542 California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting
543 and presenting evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include
544 all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and
545 explain all supporting materials.

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

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

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

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

566 The period of review for reappointment, tenure, and promotion includes the year(s) of service
567 credit. Accomplishments completed at other institutions for which service credit has been granted
568 shall be fully counted toward tenure and promotion. There is an expectation that candidates will
569 continue to demonstrate ongoing and sustained productivity in Instruction and Instructionally
570 Related Activities, RSCA, and Service following their appointment at CSULB. Typically, at least
571 50% of the required accomplishments in each area shall be completed while in residence at
572 CSULB. The candidate should clearly articulate in their narrative which accomplishments are
573 achieved at CSULB versus previous institutions.

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

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

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

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

595 Examples of exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons:

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

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

609 **5.3 Amendment of the RTP Policy.** The department chairperson, Executive Committee, or at least
610 five faculty tenured/probationary faculty of the department, may recommend an amendment to this
611 RTP policy. Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for the
612 faculty called within fifteen instructional days following their receipt and shall be distributed by
613 the chair of the department to the faculty at least five instructional days before the public hearing.
614 Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a favorable vote of a
615 majority of the tenured/probationary faculty voting in a secret ballot conducted by the department
616 within twenty instructional days of the public hearing and they have the concurrence of the college
617 council, college dean, and the university president or designee.

618 Effective: xxxx