

Approved by Faculty Affairs: September 6, 2023

Approved by the NSM Faculty Council: September 16, 2022

Approved by Dean Bennett: September 16, 2022

Approved by Faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences: September 7, 2022

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

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

2. 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.

2.1 Promotion to Associate Professor or Award of Tenure

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

2.1.1.1 Developed lecture or laboratory course materials that accomplish all of the following:

Contain current, rigorous, and logically organized content appropriate to the courses taught.

Provide explicit student learning outcomes (SLOs).

Effectively facilitate the student learning process and experience.

2.1.1.2 Provided evidence of teaching competence, including each of the following:

Consideration of scores from university student evaluations in context with the difficulty of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and overall

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

2.2.1.5. Provided evidence of three or more additional, valued contributions to education. Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category are acceptable. Fewer contributions to education that involve more significant effort and involvement of the candidate can be considered to meet the stated numerical requirement. Examples of such categories are:

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

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 supervision of student research in the summer, postdoctoral advisement, service on thesis or dissertation committees for students of other institutions, or providing research training or mentorship for internal or external professional colleagues or students.

Providing substantial pedagogical coaching for other educators.

Substantial and ongoing participation in the core curriculum for undergraduate majors or graduate students.

2.2.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review, the candidates must have carried out all the activities described under "Competent" for promotion to full professor (developing course materials, teaching competently, improving their pedagogy, and incorporating students into scholarly research activities) such that their overall performance is considered by the committee to be well above competent. In addition, during the period under review the candidates must have:

2.2.2.1. Provided evidence of three or more additional, valued contributions to education, in addition to the three required for a ranking of "Competent" for promotion to professor (six total). Clearly separate contributions that fall within a given category are acceptable. Fewer

3.1.2 Excellent. For this ranking, during the period under review the candidates should have:

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

3.1.2.2 Received external funding to support their research.

3.1.2.3 Provided evidence of at least four presentations of their research at two or more meetings of professional societies, including at least one national or international meeting. The presenting author and format (poster, oral) of each presentation should be indicated. The presenting author of at least one presentation should be a CSULB student, and the presenting author of at least one presentation should be the candidate.

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

3.1.3 Deficient. The candidates 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, during the period under review (unless otherwise noted) the candidates must have:

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

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

3.2.1.3 Provided evidence of at least four presentations of their research at two or more meetings of professional societies, including at least one national or international meeting.

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

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

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

4.1.1.3 Engaged in service activities at the college level.

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

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

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

6. Amendments

Amendments to this document may be proposed in writing to the